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Abstract

This dissertation investigates Iron II Judean pillar figurines and their place in Judean ritual. First, the project identifies major trends in the interpretation of figurines and evaluates them using ancient Near Eastern texts, archaeological context, the Hebrew Bible, and iconography. Second, it focuses on the significance of major iconographic shifts in figurine production, using the various types of data to understand these shifts and their implications for figurine function.

The dissertation first analyzes four major trends in the study of these statuettes, showing that interpreters begin with assumptions based upon figurine iconography and only then take into account Israelite religion, biblical texts, and archaeology (Chapter 2). The study then explores textual descriptions of figurine rituals from the Neo-Assyrian Empire. These suggest that figurine rituals were highly complex and that the absence of accompanying ritual texts is a barrier to interpretation (Chapter 3).

 Chapters 4-7 examine the archaeological contexts and technological characteristics of the figurines. Chapter 4 focuses on Kathleen Kenyon’s excavations in Jerusalem, Chapter 5 focuses on Yigal Shiloh’s excavations in the same area, Chapter 6 describes the results of a new petrographic study of Jerusalem figurines, and Chapter 7 summarizes the data and compares them with the archaeological contexts of figurines found in other areas of Judah. The analysis demonstrates that the majority of figurines were found as random trash in domestic structures, that figurines were used by people from various socio-economic levels, that figurines were not commonly associated with
domestic shrines, and that figurines have no significant correlation with artifacts associated with women’s activity areas. The data also have important implications for the understanding of iconography in Jerusalem and surrounding areas.

Turning to the Hebrew Bible, Chapter 8 explores the descriptions of clay objects and idol production in biblical texts. This survey of passages shows that production from clay was not prohibited and that concerns over the production of idols focus on images from stone, wood, and metal. It also demonstrates that clay, as a production material, had a unique ability to bridge the gap between sacred and profane realms.

Chapter 9 investigates the various components of the figurines through stylistic analysis and comparative iconography. The chapter argues that the figurines were probably associated with protection and healing. It also discusses the rise of the pillar figurine style in Judah and Jerusalem, the significance of its regional adaptation, and the importance of the image’s ambiguity for its function and dissemination.

Finally, Chapter 10 locates the figurines in their socio-historic context within Iron II Judah, as a part of the Neo-Assyrian Empire. The chapter evaluates the likelihood that the Neo-Assyrian Empire provided the cultural context for the spread of figurine rituals associated with healing and protection in the Iron II. It also summarizes biblical depictions of healing rituals and the role of divine intermediaries, closing with a final evaluation of the dominant interpretive paradigms and a summary of figurine development and function.
Dedication

From a rose to her prince.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION AND METHODOLOGY

While small female figurines from southern Israel are often interpreted as the consort of Yahweh, the iconic female image has paramours of her own—a veritable harem in fact. Indeed, everywhere one looks, from television documentaries to scholarly conferences, from newspaper clippings to academic journals, excavation reports, internet blogs, antiquities shops, and museum displays, this female image attracts crowds of admirers vying to correctly identify her identity.

Sadly, the street could be paved with the broken hearts of those suitors who have tried and failed to unlock the secrets they assume she hides. Despite the amount of attention bestowed upon her, most interpreters are left to contend with each other as they posit theory after theory; and, much like love-sick beaux, their theories are more indicative of each scholar’s own positions and desires than they are effective mechanisms with which to appreciate the image’s complexity.

In the main, analysts have been content with one of two options. Interpreters often devote their attention to describing the form of the figurine, focusing on her charms, so to speak. And after much trying and failing, it can safely be concluded that this method is no more successful for clay females than it is for real ones. The other main strategy involves inferential flights of fancy about the figurines’ function and meaning, which however pleasant or gratifying, are no more substantial than any other variety of daydream.

For these reasons, and many others that will be explained in due course, the time is ripe for a new investigation of the pillar figurines. For this investigation to be worthwhile, however, it must move beyond the level of description and inference to
examine carefully all types of data that may be brought to bear on the meaning and function of the figurines. As a corollary, any new methodology must be willing to dispense with, or at least critically examine, the oft-repeated interpretations used to explain the figurines. These include general impressions about the figurines as goddesses or their connection with female religion. Only by looking beyond the surface of these interpretations in order to evaluate their heuristic strength can the conversation move beyond a shallow focus on the appearance of the figurines toward forming an appreciation of their polyvalence in Judean ritual practice.

To that end, the present work investigates small terracotta female figurines dating from the eighth to the sixth centuries B.C.E. and their place in Judean religion, culture, and politics. The project has two overall goals. First, it identifies major trends in scholarly interpretations of figurines and uses ancient Near Eastern texts, archaeological context, biblical texts, and iconography to test these assumptions. Second, it focuses on underdeveloped questions concerning the figurines, particularly the significance of major iconographic shifts in figurine production and style, attempting to use the data to understand these shifts and their implications for figurine function and Judean ritual life. As a first step in this process, the present chapter lays the groundwork for the following study by briefly describing the figurines (1.1), and then explaining the background of the study of apotropaic ritual (1.2), theoretical considerations in the study of ritual (1.3), methodological issues related to archaeological investigations of figurines (1.4), and the framework for the archaeological approach adopted in this study (1.5). The chapter concludes with a short synopsis of each of the following chapters, including an
overview of the methods and conclusions associated with each part of the dissertation (1.6).

1.1 Brief description of figurines

For the sake of clarification, Judean Pillar Figurines, or JPFs, are small clay figurines with pillar bases and arms either supporting or holding the breasts; a small number hold a disk or a child. These types of figurine bodies have two different styles of heads. One type consists of a separately molded face attached to the body by a clay tang; these wear a short wig covering the ears and have almond-shaped eyes, smiling mouths, eyebrows, and noses. In contrast, hand-made heads are pinched, forming a nose and shallow eye impressions; and they are constructed in tandem with the bodies. They sometimes wear a turban, a turban with sidelocks, or a cap. Figurines of all types were covered with whitewash and paint.

Although both styles of heads are mentioned in the literature, studying their relative popularity and distribution is difficult. In publications from earlier eras the molded heads and their archaeological contexts are published to varying degrees. In contrast, pinched-head figurines may be mentioned but few photos, drawings, or contexts are published. Thus, it is almost impossible to study different depositional patterns and chronological developments using the data of older excavations, which include a number of important sites in the Shephelah like Gezer and Beth Shemesh. Early excavations from Jerusalem were plagued by the same problems, and only in the last several decades have
excavations produced reports with a level of specificity that allows this type of investigation.

1.2 Apotropaic ritual

As is explained in Chapter 2, interpreters have occasionally described the figurines as magical talismans and apotropaic objects. Even a brief foray into writings on Israelite religion and archaeology gives the impression that the term “apotropaic” is a catch-all category intended to cover objects of a symbolic nature that do not fit neatly into prescribed categories of analysis. As Chris Tuttle, an expert on Nabataean figurines, has warned, “Unless it is possible to also articulate how and why the object and its imagery could serve a protective or warding role, defining the given object as apotropaic only provides an illusion of comprehended function and meaning” (emphasis mine).¹ Further, Tuttle cautions that each culture contains its own system of meaning attributed to images, even those borrowed from other areas.² Thus, the danger inherent in this category of analysis is that it may do little more than obfuscate the true nature of such objects, claiming to categorize them while providing only minimal analytical insight.


² Ibid., 320-21.
1.2.1. The history of a category

Given the general lack of clarity about what constitutes apotropaic practice, a brief examination of the word’s origin is in order. Faraone discusses the terms talisman and apotropaion, arguing that the latter is related to the two words—apotropein, “to turn away or avert,” and apotropaios, “that which averts.” He also suggests that both talisman and apotropaion refer to “large, often overlapping fields of protective ritual” but that they are distinguishable. A talisman protects by its mere presence and may be hidden; but an apotropaion is displayed openly, often at thresholds, to frighten off human and supernatural evil.³

This distinction is ultimately problematic. Faraone admits that, though both terms are “native” descriptions to Greek culture, they largely postdate the archaic and classical periods. Tetelesmenon is used by late antique authors but not by the Greeks themselves to describe protective statues. Furthermore, apotropaios is used as an epithet for protective gods or to describe a type of sacrifice; but it does not seem to describe stationary objects.⁴

Thus, the term “apotropaic,” as referring to a category of religious practices, beliefs, and objects, remains largely anachronistic, even as applied to ancient Greece; and one wonders how it came to be a category of analysis in the study of religion. Jane Harrison is one of the earliest English-language scholars to discuss the concept, if not use

---


⁴ Ibid., 4-5.
the exact terminology. Harrison claims that aversion, or “sending away,” rituals constitute one of the major aspects of Greek religion; these rituals are often referred to as ἀποπομπαί. She continues, claiming that the word has no English equivalent and is best, though problematically, rendered by “exorcism.” Given that word’s negative connotations, Harrison chooses to use “ceremonies of riddance.”⁵ She claims the “gods of aversion” are regularly referred to as either ἀποτρόπαιοι or ἀποπομπαῖοι and cites examples in Plato, Harpocration, Pausanias, Babrius, and Hippocrates.⁶

Harrison contrasts these aversion aspects of Greek religion, or ἀποτροπή, with the elements of service, θεραπεία, which were limited in their application to the Olympian gods. Including both in her definition of Greek religion, Harrison creates an unfortunate dichotomy between the “rites of service,” which she describes as having a “cheerful and rational character,” and the “rites of aversion,” which are “gloomy,” “tend toward superstition,” and target demons and chthonic deities.⁷

This problematic distinction repeats itself throughout her comprehensive work, as Harrison attempts to identify the rites of aversion, which she believes are the true core of many religious practices, even those subsequently associated with Olympian deities.⁸ These rites belong to the “lower stratum” and are characterized by such adjectives as

---


⁶ Ibid., 9-10.

⁷ Ibid., 4, 8, 10.

⁸ Ibid., 10.
“primitive,” “barbarous,” and “repulsive.” Although Harrison claims to supply a corrective to English scholarship on Greek religion by focusing on ritual, the result is still a general schematization of religion based on whether the motivation is fear or rational worship, with aversion rituals clearly considered less sophisticated at best, though more frequently “primitive,” “superstitious,” or “magical.” Thus, it is no surprise when Harrison proclaims her indebtedness to Frazer and his work on primitive religion.

To summarize, in Harrison’s view, the Greek terminology refers to rituals designed to drive away malevolent forces, particularly underworld deities, ghosts, or demons. These rituals are motivated by irrational fear and often fall under the realm of

........................................

9 Ibid., 29. Note that Harrison is not entirely negative about the potential in these rites. She believes that they formed the condition of possibility for the Greece’s “deepest and most enduring religious impulse,” the mystery cults of Dionysus and Orpheus.

10 Ibid., vii.


superstition or magic. The problems with such dichotomies in the study of religion have been rehearsed at length elsewhere, though rarely do these conversations focus on apotropaic practice in particular.\textsuperscript{13} Moreover, as Catherine Bell has argued, even studies claiming to esteem ritual often dichotomize between thought and action, where thought is considered a higher stage in the evolution of religion.\textsuperscript{14}

As for the term “apotroaic,” Harrison preferred the phrase “rituals of aversion.”\textsuperscript{15} As the term has been applied to the Greek \textit{herms}, or phalli, Burkert suggests the neologism “\textit{apotropäisch}” was coined by the school of Albrecht Dieterich.\textsuperscript{16} The German school to which Burkert attributes this movement begins as early as 1865 with Wilhelm Mannhardt, to whom Frazer was indebted, and was furthered by the work of Hermann Usener and the \textit{Religionswissenschaft} of Albrecht Dieterich, Ludwig Deubner, and Martin Persson Nilsson.\textsuperscript{17} Burkert claims that this school reduced Greek religion to

---


\textsuperscript{14} Trying to uphold ritual’s primacy while allowing it to devolve into a ranked binary opposition where action is contrasted with and superseded by thought is a common feature of many studies of ritual. On this point see Catherine Bell, \textit{Ritual Theory, Ritual Practice} (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992), 30-46; and for another summary of Harrison see Catherine Bell, \textit{Ritual: Perspectives and Dimensions} (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997), 6.

\textsuperscript{15} Nor is it used by other British scholars like Frazer or Robertson Smith.

\textsuperscript{16} Burkert, \textit{Structure and History}, 40, 161 n.3.
“rituals explained by hypothetical primitive beliefs, largely concerning vegetation and fertility,” in which “myth is disregarded.”

Because Harrison was following Frazer, who was himself influenced by the Religionswissenschaft school, the scarcity of the term apotropaic in their scholarship is curious. It appears to have entered English-language scholarship through one of Harrison’s cohorts in the “Myth and Ritual School,” namely Samuel Hooke, who studied the Bible and the ancient Near East. These scholars focused on rituals like the dying and rising god/king and were particularly interested in the “sacred marriage.” Like Harrison, Hooke believed that ritual’s primary concern was the resolution of mundane problems of daily life, making it instrumental in nature. Also like Frazer, Hooke compared rituals over vast stretches of time and space.

---


18 Burkert, Structure and History, 36.


Of some significance, this school also devoted considerable attention to the study of images, approaching them with the same methodology. For example, Hooke connects the cedar with the goddess Ishtar and applies this interpretation to vegetation images and imagery from the ancient Near East and ancient Israel, regardless of their context. Again, special interest was given to the Ishtar/Tammuz myth and the themes of fertility and regeneration.22

Hooke appears to have been exposed to the term apotropaic while translating two major works by Adolphe Lods, the first of which was published in 1932. In these works Lods, citing Frazer, labels many elements of Israelite religion “apotropaic,” including Israelite mourning rites,23 the *herem*,24 the Passover,25 animal sacrifice,26 and the scape goat ritual.27 One year later Hooke edited a collection of essays, originally given as lectures in London and Oxford, which describe the functions of Babylonian diviners, enchanters, and hymners28 and the Passover as apotropaic.29 Thus it seems that Hooke

22 Samuel H. Hooke, *Babylonian and Assyrian Religion* (Hutchinson’s University Library World Religions; London: Hutchinson's University Library, 1953), 44.


24 Ibid., 289.

25 Ibid., 293.


27 Ibid., 314-15.

must have encountered the term in his work with continental scholarship and subsequently helped initiate this term into English-language scholarship.

In 1935 Hooke himself gave a series of lectures in which he mentioned apotropaic “Astarte figurines”30 and the apotropaic sacrifices of a kid or lamb described in Mesopotamian texts.31 It is probably significant that one of the earliest applications of this category to archaeological objects occurred in a discussion of nude female figurines. In this regard it might be compared to the earlier German interpretations of phalli. Nor is it surprising that just one year after Hooke’s lectures were published, Albright, to whom Hooke refers, interprets the figurines as goddess figures used for magical rites.32

Thus, the academic milieu that saw the rise of “apotropaic” as a descriptive term was marked by methodological challenges. Regardless of their spoken intentions, scholars frequently depicted ritual-based religion, particularly aspects they considered to be apotropaic, as debased and primitive. In order to interpret objects and define them as apotropaic, they made comparisons without consideration of geographic range or


30 Samuel H Hooke, The Origins of Early Semitic Ritual (The Schweich Lectures of the British Academy; London: Published for the British Academy by Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press, 1938), 25.

31 Ibid., 49-50; he cites the work of Jane Harrison.

temporal proximity. Furthermore the categories “ritual” and especially “apotropaic ritual” were applied to objects associated with human sexual anatomy, which were interpreted as inducers of fecundity and fertility.

Also under the rubric of apotropaic ritual, objects depicting sexualized aspects of the human body (from a European perspective) were considered aspects of primitive religion, exotic at best and debased at worst. Moreover, unlike the few Greek texts that recount rituals of aversion, the term is applied to objects with no textual proof that they were used to avert evil, chthonic beings, or other dangers. Rather, it appears that objects depicting a sexual body were assumed to be apotropaic based on their iconography alone.

Ironically, in English-language scholarship the term was more frequently applied to ancient Near Eastern texts than to the Greek texts that share its linguistic origins. As mentioned, the term was applied to Babylonian religion by Hooke and others. Yet, the problem is even more complicated when discussing cultures to which this terminology is entirely foreign. Nakamura openly admits that, in the case of Neo-Assyrian figurine rituals, it is impossible to know “exactly how Mesopotamians conceived of apotropaic power in their rituals.” She likewise admits that studying this phenomenon involves

---

33 In addition to references listed above he calls plaques used to drive away demons apotropaic; and he uses the term to describe animal masks worn by priests when they performed apotropaic and protective rituals. See Hooke, Babylonian and Assyrian Religion, 34, 53.

imposing modern, western paradigms on another culture.\textsuperscript{35} Furthermore, Ellis has shown that the ritual texts describing these Mesopotamian practices perhaps postdate the use of images, thus complicating the relationship between the verbal witness and the iconographic tradition. This suggests to Ellis that the ninth and eighth centuries B.C.E. marked a period of adjustment in concepts about “protective images,” characterized by “uncertainty, vagueness, and disagreement.”\textsuperscript{36} Thus, the Mesopotamians themselves may not have agreed upon the purposes and motivations for apotropaic ritual action.

\subsection*{1.2.2 Pros and cons}

In the end, without appropriate caution, the term “apotropaic” is little more than a meaningless category. Moreover, the term may be so fraught, given its genealogical background, that it inadvertently categorizes objects, especially sexualized objects, as illicit, magical, and primitive. Instead of providing a mediating category between action attempts to connect this idea to terminology in \emph{šep lemûti}; but since his article predates the best publication of the text, (F. A. M. Wiggermann, \emph{Mesopotamian Protective Spirits: The Ritual Texts} [Groningen: Styx, 1992]), his argument is difficult to follow. Moreover, while \textit{pālîl} may come from \textit{palâlu} meaning, “to go in front, to proceed” (\textit{CAD} 12:50-51) in protection, this is not the same thing as a term or category that classifies various religious beliefs and acts or that sheds light on all the risks from which a person might be in need of protection.

\textsuperscript{35} Nakamura, “Dedicating Magic,” 23. Note that Nakamura does not investigate the use of the term “apotropaic” in antiquity or in scholarship, nor does she offer a complete definition of the term. It appears to mean “protective” in her analysis (ibid., 18, 21).

and belief, it runs the risk of being subsumed by the rubrics “popular religion” or “magic” as that which is antithetical to true religion, rational morality, and orthodoxy.

At the same time, the category could be useful for complicating these wooden distinctions. To take a modern example, a cross worn around the neck participates in multiple levels of religious expression, as an officially sanctioned symbol used outside the confines of official religious space and officiates. As part of a larger sign system, it naturally implies larger versions of the symbol used in collective ritual; but it is also an individual object of personal piety. As an adornment, it even crosses the supposed boundary between sacred and profane, used as either a fashion statement or an object endowed with the ability to protect and provide. Thus, if the dangers of the category “apotropaic” are never entirely forgotten and the complexity and ambiguity of the experience it describes are emphasized, the category apotropaic provides an avenue, not for reversing binary oppositions that so frequently plague the study of religion, but for imploding the binary from within.

More specifically, in the following pages the term apotropaic refers to protective ritual, though without the pejorative connotations found in Harrison’s work. Moreover, protective ritual is often closely related to exorcistic and healing rituals, particularly in Neo-Assyrian texts (see Chapter 3). For example, the same ritual object may be used to dispel evil as well as guard against its return; and these evil forces are frequently held responsible for illness, the impetus for ritual intervention.
1.3 Analyzing ritual

There remains the question of how best to proceed studying apotropaic ritual in ancient Judah. Catherine Bell has shown that many theories of ritual unwittingly reproduce a dichotomy between thought and action while at the same time claiming that ritual mediates between them. In its ultimate manifestation, the scholar herself will be associated with thought, as the inquiring subject, and the object of her inquiry—the ritual and those performing it—will become associated with action. Unfortunately, as Bell points out, binary oppositions usually exist as ranked hierarchies, meaning that one side will be privileged over the other, usually thought over action, but belief over ritual, science over religion, and religion over magic might be added as well.

One way of deconstructing this binary system is by studying, not ritual as a frozen category, but “ritualization,” the process whereby certain activities are set apart. This ritualization of practices produces ritual bodies that embody the unspoken and frequently unnoticed logics of the ritual, as well as the concomitant power structures that constitute individuals as social bodies. Participants then redeploy these structures in non-ritualized space and time.

37 Bell, Ritual Theory, 30-46.

38 This avoids the extensive debate between definitions of ritual which try to essentialize ritual in a set of unique criteria and non-definitions that claim any activity can be considered a ritual (ibid, 70).

39 Ibid., 98, 107, 199-223. A “social body,” taken from Foucaultian analysis, is the process whereby individuals are created and reconstituted in their interactions with others and the entire “network of strategic power relations” (ibid., 203, citing Michel Foucault, Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-77 [ed. Colin Gordon; New York: Pantheon, 1980], 187).
In this theory, ambiguity is integral to the function of ritualized activity, holding together in a loose systematic fashion beliefs that may be at variance when examined more closely.\textsuperscript{40} By framing ritual in this way, Bell attempts to avoid the thought-action dichotomy. In other words, by identifying ways of knowing and acting other than those guided by rational thought, Bell addresses the complex nature of most ritualized action. Much the same as one’s fingers “know” how to play a song on the piano without conscious reflection, a ritualized agent embodies the various practices and hierarchies operative within the ritual nexus.

However, Bell argues that ritualized activity is “situational” and must be studied in relation to other activities in a given culture to identify the ways in which people make ritualized activities distinctive.\textsuperscript{41} Furthermore, one of Bell’s premises is that the ritualized bodies participating in the activity do not fully understand what it is they are doing, though they may be aware of their own motivations and goals.\textsuperscript{42} One implication of this

\textsuperscript{40} Bell, \textit{Ritual}, 106, 184-87.

\textsuperscript{41} Bell, \textit{Ritual Theory}, 81-82, 90, 93, 176.

\textsuperscript{42} Ibid., 82, 205, 207. Note that Bell has been criticized for this view. See Ronald L. Grimes, “Performance Theory and the Study of Ritual,” in \textit{New Approaches to the Study of Religion: Volume 2: Textual, Comparative, Sociological, and Cognitive Approaches} (ed. Peter Antes, Armin W. Geertz, and Randi R. Warne; Religion and Reason 43; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2004), 132, 134-35. Grimes argues that Bell maintains a privileged place for herself as the theorist who understands what the ritual actors themselves cannot see, taping into a long-ranging debate over emic and etic approaches to the study of religion. While he concedes that ritual actors often do not understand the full implications of their actions, he claims to attribute them with more agency then he believes Bell allows. His critique is correct, in the sense that Bell does not openly own the privileged position she creates for the theorist (herself) who views and analyzes the cultural system. At times, however, Grime’s criticism approaches caricature, exaggerating the extremity of Bell’s position and missing the nuance of the Foucaultian power analytics that she incorporates into her work. Elsewhere, Bell is credited with emphasizing the role of the participant in ritual (Elizabeth Collins, “Reflections on Ritual and on Theorizing about Ritual,” \textit{Journal of Ritual Studies} 12 [1998]: 4).
premise is that even words read or recited during the course of the ritual may have little analytical bearing; what matters is what the performance of the incantations or prayers is doing, not only what they are saying.\textsuperscript{43}

Thus, the only way ritualization can be studied is by a close examination of the cultural system, similar to an anthropological “thick description” where the full complexities of cultural interactions are acknowledged.\textsuperscript{44} Obviously, this causes problems for anyone studying ancient history, even when cultures are well documented, since ritual texts may not reveal any information about how they were performed nor can their content be taken as a reliable indicator of the ritual’s ultimate social function. This type of analysis is even more difficult when the textual record is neither comprehensive nor necessarily datable.

Although some scholars do not find this problematic and attempt to study the Hebrew Bible as if it were akin to a thick description of observable subjects, this methodology has created some of the problems in the study of figurine rituals.\textsuperscript{45}

\textsuperscript{43} Bell, \textit{Ritual Theory}, 111-14.

\textsuperscript{44} On the origin and definition of “thick description” in anthropology see Clifford Geertz, “Thick Description: Toward an Interpretive Theory of Culture,” in \textit{The Interpretation of Cultures} (New York: Basic Books, 1973), 5-6, 9-10. For Bell’s treatment of Geertz see Bell, \textit{Ritual Theory}, 50, 176; Bell, \textit{Ritual}, 66-67, 80.

\textsuperscript{45} E.g., although Klingbeil is aware of the complexities in Bell’s theory and the problems applying ritual studies to biblical texts (Gerald A. Klingbeil, \textit{Bridging the Gap: Ritual and Ritual Texts in the Bible} [Bulletin for Biblical Research Supplements 1; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2007], 52-69), his solution seems to focus on “interbiblical interpretive strategies,” i.e., using other texts in the Bible to help understand whatever is unclear in the text under investigation (ibid., 130-31), and extrabiblical comparison, though with a well-considered methodology (ibid., 132-33). For a similar position see M. Daniel Carroll R., “Re-examining ‘Popular Religion’: Issues of Definition and Sources: Insights from Interpretive Anthropology,” in \textit{Rethinking Contexts, Rereading Texts: Contributions from the Social Sciences to
Furthermore, even if biblical texts contained clearly datable references to clay figurines (which they do not), not even these redacted texts would provide enough information to embark upon the requisite detailed analysis. Thus, it is no wonder that interpretations of figurines that focus on biblical texts appear emaciated.

Fortunately, ritualized activity produces materials, some of which may remain in the archaeological record. In their present disposal contexts, these remains may suggest as much about the way rituals functioned in society as would the self-testimony of the ritual agents. Thus, although the material record will still never produce enough data to provide a thick description of ancient Judah, it is the best opportunity for analyzing ritualized action.46

---

46 Oddly, though Klingbeil (ibid., 174-81) discusses “ritual objects,” he refers only to their depiction in the text rather than to actual objects recovered in the archaeological record. For more on various archaeological approaches and theoretical positions in the study of religion see Lars Fogelin, “The Archaeology of Religious Ritual,” Annual Review of Anthropology 36 (2007): 55-71. The approach taken in this dissertation is a combination of what Fogelin refers to under the rubric of Archaeology of Action, particular as dependent on practice theory, and under the rubric of Rituals and Symbols, with an emphasis on symbols as power. This is not to downplay the significant difficulties interpreting ritual remains in the archaeological record, not the least of which is the absence of information with which to interpret the remains. Nor is it to ignore the difficulties that ensue when the archaeological record is interpreted through the aid of historical or ethnographic sources. On these points see Evangelos Kyriakidis, “Archaeologies of Ritual,” in The Archaeology of Ritual (ed. Evangelos Kyriakidis; Cotsen Advanced Seminars 3; Los Angeles: Cotsen Institute of Archaeology, University of California, 2007), 297-98.
1.4 Archaeology and figurines

Unfortunately, archaeological context has received only the most rudimentary attention in the study of Judean figurines. Most of the older works ignore figurine provenience or, at most, list the sites where figurines were found. Even scholars who might prefer to incorporate more precise context information have been frustrated by the lack of final publications for key sites. Nor has there been a concerted effort to compare and contrast the archaeological distribution of the different iconographic styles within the JPF corpus. Although more recent studies have improved in regard to figurine context, including John Holladay’s treatment of figurines in Israelite religion and Raz Kletter’s study of JPFs, their interpretations of archaeological deposition are still plagued by methodological difficulties.


1.4.1 Disposal contexts

Although archaeological context provides a wealth of data for the study of figurines, it must be interpreted carefully. As Schiffer has pointed out, most objects are found in disposal contexts rather than their context of use.\(^{50}\) Even when objects are retrieved from a floor surface, it is unlikely that they were dropped there during daily activity.\(^{51}\) For example, ceramic objects are frequently reused for other purposes after they are broken. Furthermore, people regularly clean and improve their domestic spaces, resulting in the relocation of trash. Moreover, the complexities of household cycle affect the deposition of materials, particularly in abandoned structures. Finally, natural forces like water run-off and scavenging animals, affect deposition as well. Thus, caution is necessary before placing too much weight on any given archaeological context in the interpretation of the materials found therein.

Unfortunately, this type of caution is either missing or inconsistently applied. For example, while Kletter claims to distinguish between use and disposal contexts, his analysis is simplistic and inconsistent. He notes that figurine fragments “indicate disposal patterns rather than patterns of use”\(^{52}\) but then continues by saying “still, even disposal

\(^{50}\) Michael B. Schiffer, *Formation Processes of the Archaeological Record* (Albuquerque, N.Mex.: University of New Mexico Press, 1987).


\(^{52}\) Kletter, *Judean Pillar-Figurines*, 47, 57.
patterns may be fruitful for the understanding of the JPFs.” Surprisingly, he omits any methodological discussion of what a disposal context consists of or what it might indicate. Given the complex process of interpretation for objects in fills and even those on floors, some further theoretical rigor is in order.

Kletter also emphasizes the disposal contexts of figurines in some circumstances and not others. For example, he stresses that loci appearing to contain groups of JPFs actually result from gradual accumulation rather than coterminous use. He even states that fragments “do not necessarily imply use-patterns.” Yet when Kletter discusses single JPF fragments found alone, he says “it seems that each JPF functioned separately…” Thus, when it comes to isolated fragments, Kletter assumes that the excavated context does represent the context of use.

In contrast, it is just as plausible that the figurines were originally used in groups and were disposed of singularly. Ultimately, archaeological context may imply very little about use context, whether the figurines are found together or separately. The inconsistency in Kletter’s analysis may be a side effect of his conclusion that all the figurines represent the same figure; he believes this claim is proven by the fact that figurines were not used in groups.

____________________

53 Ibid., 57.
54 Ibid., 64.
55 Ibid.
56 Ibid.
Holladay also over-simplifies archaeological context. As Kletter rightly observes, Holladay does not discuss whether any of the artifacts in his study reflect disposal or use contexts. Rather, he divides figurines into two different types of contexts—the “non-conformist” public space of Jerusalem Cave I and Samaria E 207, and the domestic contexts of Tell Beit Mirsim, Beer-sheba, Tell en Nasbeh, and Hazor. Concerning the “public” material, the loci are both complex. Samaria E 207, by Holladay’s own admission, was a trench cut outside the settlement. The finds were located in a fill totally separated from their original context. Thus to call the locus a sacral area could only be true in so much as the area served as a sacralized refuse pit. Further, Holladay also admits that only about three-quarters of the area was excavated and that the area was badly disturbed by later burials and quarrying; thus the finds do not even represent the entirety of the ancient debris.

Concerning Jerusalem Cave I, there are a myriad of difficulties with this area; and they are discussed in detail in Chapter 4. It is sufficient to note here that Holladay did not have any of the stratigraphic reports from the excavations. More importantly, as Kletter points out, Holladay does not discuss the fact that Cave I would be almost impossible to

57 Ibid.
58 Holladay, “Religion in Israel and Judah under the Monarchy,” 257.
59 Ibid., 20.
60 Ibid., 258.
61 Ibid., 257.
enter.⁶² In sum, while the deposits from Samaria and Jerusalem have some similar artifacts, they both appear to represent refuse areas rather than actual ritual space.

As to the domestic contexts for JPFs, Holladay likewise ignores formation processes. Of the four sites he claims to examine—Beer-sheba, Tell Beit Mirsim, Tell en Nasbeh, and Hazor—all of the “assemblages” are composed of multiple loci or multiple rooms (rather than multiple cultic artifacts found spatially associated in the same locus); and he offers no explanation of why those various loci or rooms should be combined together under the same date or in the same structure. He also assumes that all of these artifacts were the result of a second-story domestic shrine that fell through when the roof collapsed⁶³ but does not support this argument; for example, no artifacts were listed in association with stratigraphically preserved ceiling collapse. Nor does he give any consideration to the possibility that figurines associated with secondary collapse may have been moved by natural forces or that an abandoned building might become a dumping ground for surrounding houses.

1.4.2 Average context

Another problem with figurine studies focusing on archaeology is their uneven consideration of the different types of loci in which figurines are found and the

---

⁶² Kletter, *Judean Pillar-Figurines*, 63. For example, Holladay (“Religion in Israel and Judah under the Monarchy,” 281) includes Cave I in his discussion of cave shrines.

⁶³ Ibid., 278, 278 n. 113.
implications for figurine function and deposition. Furthermore, a small percentage of loci are used to explain the function of the entire figurine corpus. For example, from Kletter’s corpus of 854 figurines, only 255, or roughly thirty percent, have general site context. Of these 255, Kletter further narrows the number to 173, or around twenty percent, for which the general context can be known. He then states that 70 specimens, plus another 42 “doubtful” specimens come from domestic contexts, defined as houses, small cisterns, silos and pits, open courts, and casemate rooms in city walls. Of provenienced figurines, around forty percent of the certain specimens are domestic, or 65 percent when the doubtful specimens are added.

This final figure does look impressive; however, it is complicated by a number of factors. First, even if the larger number of 112 is accepted (secure plus doubtful domestic specimens), this only accounts for thirteen percent of the total corpus (854 fragments). Second, Kletter couches his conclusions in a number of caveats including the admission that “domestic contexts are by far the best represented in any excavation.” Thus the skew towards domestic contexts may be due to the large number of domestic contexts excavated. Kletter also mentions significant reservations about archaeologists’ ability to identify domestic or private loci. Third, Kletter’s catalogue does not include any of the

64 Kletter, Judean Pillar-Figurines, 57.
65 Ibid., 61.
66 Ibid.
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context information for two excavations with large numbers of figurines—Shiloh’s City of David excavations and Kenyon’s excavation of the extramural street adjacent to Jerusalem’s city wall. Additionally, his figurine count for other sites, such as Tell en Nasbeh and Gibeon, is incorrect.

Finally, Kletter combines all of the context information to produce one average context—the domestic unit. Unfortunately, the various sites in his study have significantly different distribution types, ranging from public buildings to water systems, from graves to caves, from houses to city streets. By averaging all of these contexts together to produce the most represented context type, Kletter glosses over the varying secondary disposal patterns. He does not consider the possibility that figurine disposal and function could vary on occasion or location.

Nor does he thoroughly investigate the archaeological deposition of molded heads versus pinched heads or take seriously any possible correlation between their differing manner of representation and differences in function. Though he separates the head types in his catalogue, he draws few conclusions about regional variability or chronology. Furthermore, he assumes that both styles functioned the same way, despite the fact that many of the contexts normally used to interpret figurines come from sites in the Shephelah or Negev where molded heads are much more common.

Holladay also uses a small number of contexts to interpret a wide-ranging corpus. Moreover, he does not distinguish between figurine styles from one nation-state to the next, let alone the different head types within Judah. First, he claims he will discuss four sites as examples of non-conformist worship in domestic spaces, yet his examples stress
Tell Beit Mirsim and Beersheba with some information about Hazor and nothing about Nasbeh, the site with the second largest figurine corpus in Judah. Even at Tell Beit Mirsim, 22 houses (out of 50) contained religious artifacts and only ten contained more than one artifact—constituting an assemblage—even if the artifacts from more than one room or locus are combined together. Thus, only twenty percent of the houses had a religious assemblage, even when defined by Holladay’s lax criteria. His interpretation of a small number of contexts forms the basis for his interpretation of the rest of the corpus, including figurines found outside of Judah, such as those in Israel.

Holladay also struggles to interpret figurine contexts in Judah because contexts often lack the cultic features that might help identify the figurines as cultic objects. Thus he first examines cult spaces with identifiable features, such as specialized architecture and particular spatial configurations. Unfortunately, only a small number of such spaces have been found in Judah; and those that do exist generally lack JPFs. Moreover, the two figurine contexts often interpreted as cultic deposits in Judah and Israel come from areas lacking cultic architecture—Jerusalem Cave I and Samaria E 207. Holladay even admits that these “stand significantly apart from all the other Judean and Israelite activity areas considered” because of their great numbers of figurines.  

68 Holladay, “Religion in Israel and Judah under the Monarchy,” 276-77.
69 Ibid., 278-79.
70 Ibid., 265.
To solve this problem Holladay lists the artifact types found within cultic centers and then assumes that these artifacts are cultic even when found in other spaces; however, to find a model cultic space with figurines, Holladay must travel outside of Judah to Ashdod and Sarepta. He thus stresses the cross-cultural definition of religious objects—if they are found in cultic space in Ashdod or Sarepta, they must retain the same function when used in Israel or Judah, even when found in other contexts. Of course, the problem Holladay then encounters, if his theory is correct, is that his non-conformist religion in Israel and Judah directly reflects the religion of the Phoenicians and the Philistines. Concerned that this would threaten the uniqueness of Israelite or Judean identity, he suggests, instead, a general process of cultural diffusion wherein Israel and Judah have their own version of these figurines with their own cults “which must be presumed to have been thought suitably ‘Israelite’ or ‘Judean.’” Unfortunately, his analysis is not specific enough to allow him to posit how these styles may have spread and the ways in which they were adapted in various regions.

Furthermore, Holladay’s interpretations of the Ashdod and Sarepta shrines are questionable. To begin with Ashdod, Holladay admits that no figurines, with the exception of one plaque figurine, were found in the sanctuary of Area D. In fact, Holladay says “the finds in the rooms and the putative favissa of the sanctuary were not

---
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as rich as the immediate neighborhood” but then proceeds to qualify this observation by claiming that a female plaque-type figurine found in the area is sufficient to associate the “general class” of items with corporate worship. In the end, none of the Ashdod figurines were actually found in the sanctuary, according to Holladay’s study, making it difficult to associate them with corporate worship at Ashdod, let alone in Israel or Judah.

Second, the figurines found in Sarepta were not naked with hands on their breasts; and many were holding objects. Thus, these figurines are typologically quite different from those found in Judah. Furthermore, the notion that Sarepta could be the base for cultural diffusion to Judah and Israel is also problematic. Holladay gives an eighth through seventh century date for the shrine, using only the preliminary excavation reports. In his 1988 work, Pritchard redates the shrine to the second half of the seventh century, making it difficult to argue that figurine form and meaning originated in this Phoenician cultic site and subsequently diffused to the south.

Ultimately, Holladay tries to identify shrine contexts in which figurines were found and then uses that data to interpret a corpus ranging from Phoenicia, Philistia, Israel, and Judah. Unfortunately, he is not able to explain how these styles might have been adapted and thus produces a picture of Judean religion that replicates that of

74 Ibid., 264.
75 Ibid., 264, 264 n. 76.
76 Ibid., 264-65.
77 James Bennet Pritchard, Sarepta 4: the Objects from Area II, X (The University Museum of the University of Pennsylvania Excavations at Sarafand, Lebanon, Beirut: Publications del’Université Libanaise, 1988), 54.
Philistia and Phoenicia. His best solution is to imply that some local adaptation must have existed but he is not able to explain why or in what ways the figurines responded to local custom.

1.4.3 Ethnoarchaeology and figurines

Another consistent feature of figurine studies is their reliance on ethnographic analogy (for more on this point, see Chapter 2). One of the primary advantages of ethnoarchaeological and ethnohistorical research is the development of archaeological interpretations informed by cultures standing closer to the subject of inquiry than to that of the researcher. Miriam T. Stark writes, “Archaeological interpretation is, by its very nature, dependent on inferential reasoning, and ethnoarchaeological data provide material for building stronger archaeological inferences than do commonsense explanations of material culture patterning”\textsuperscript{78} (emphasis mine). Thus, if inference is a necessary part of archaeological interpretation, it seems propitious to test the modern, western logic of the contemporary researcher by exposing his or her commonsense assumptions to information gleaned from sources closer to the historical period and geographic area under investigation.

This is not to claim naively that ethnographic or textual comparanda can easily construct a model to divulge exactly what happened in an ancient culture. Ann Stahl delineates the problematic assumptions undergirding positivist uses of comparanda in constructing interpretive models. All too frequently, sources are selected on the assumption that contemporary “base-line” societies are unchanging snapshots of a non-European, non-modern past and are thus fit to construct atemporal models. Subsequently, ancient cultures reconstructed by these models are depicted as static and unvarying.79

Examples of this type of ethnoarchaeological approach to figurines would include the studies of Peter Ucko80 and Mary Voigt.81 These studies attempt to isolate characteristics of figurine make, design, damage, and distribution in order to assess figurine function. As Alice Petty points out,82 Voigt relies on Ucko’s ethnographic and ethnohistorical sources, which are limited to a small number of early twentieth century


ethnographies of African cultures; and this fact calls into question the cross-cultural reliability of both studies.

Petty further notes that, as a result of the problems with Ucko’s sources, Voigt’s “function class profiles” include some categories that are vague and exceedingly broad. For example, Voigt’s “vehicles of magic” category consists of figurines that are usually small, portable, and made of clay, wax, or other organic substances and rarely metal. They can depict either humans or animals and they can be female, male, or sexless. They may be used individually or in groups and may be used over an extended period or deposited after a single ritual act. They are deposited in domestic structures, pits in open areas, bodies of water, or domestic debris. They either display usage and wear or they do not. In sum, what Voigt’s category suggests is that magical figurines consist of a very broad range of stylistic types found in any number of diverse locations. Thus, the breadth of the category may defeat the point of the inquiry, which is to enable archaeologists to use excavated figurine fragments and their archaeological context to construct a sound hypothesis about figurine function.

---


84 Petty, Bronze Age Anthropomorphic Figurines, 43, 48.

85 Voigt, Hajji Firuz Tepe, Iran, 190.
It is not that Voigt’s category is totally unhelpful. Meyers has shown that Voigt’s contrast between cultic figurines constructed with metals and magic figurines of clay could be quite instructive.\textsuperscript{86} Indeed, Voigt’s 1983 study has been influential in recent figurine studies,\textsuperscript{87} including the work of Raz Kletter, whose figurine catalogue has become the standard archaeological source text for interpretations of Judean figurines. Yet, while recognizing the importance of Voigt’s study, even Kletter admits the lack of clarity between and within Voigt’s categories.\textsuperscript{88} Bearing in mind the difficulties with Ucko’s and Voigt’s ethnographic sources, in the end the categories derived from general cross-cultural ethnographic comparanda either draw a picture of the ancient world that is static, as Stahl suggests, or that is so lacking in detail that the model’s usefulness is called into question. Meyers, who also relies upon Voigt’s criteria, observes that while ethnographic studies could help shed light on the function of JPFs, most analogies come from locations outside the Middle East and are of questionable relevancy.\textsuperscript{89}


\textsuperscript{87} Kletter, Judean Pillar-Figurines; Petty, Bronze Age Anthropomorphic Figurines; Michael David Press, “Philistine Figurines and Figurines in Philistia in the Iron Age” (Ph.D. diss., Harvard University, 2007), 5; Tuttle, “Nabataean Coroplastic Arts,” 244-45.

\textsuperscript{88} Kletter, Judean Pillar-Figurines, 21.

\textsuperscript{89} Meyers, “Terracottas without Texts,” 123. The fact that these ethnographic studies informed Voigt’s criteria, upon which Meyers leans heavily, largely escapes remark.
1.5 Archaeological method

1.5.1 Regional study of Jerusalem

Many of the theoretical problems in archaeological approaches to the interpretation of JPFs have resulted from the fact that the corpus under investigation was simply too large and unwieldy. By trying to track the archaeological context of fragments from all over Judah and even those outside of Judah, the particularities of archaeological distribution at a given site are synchronized and homogenized into the distribution patterns of Judah at large.

For this reason, the present study focuses on the archaeological context of figurines from one site—the southeastern hill of Jerusalem. Only once the archaeological profile for the figurines from these areas is understood does the study compare that ritual profile with other corpora. Thus, secondarily the depositional patterns from the southeastern hill are compared with figurines from other sites in Jerusalem and elsewhere in the hill country. Figurines from other regions of Judah are then compared in a general way to the Jerusalem corpus. Finally, the Jerusalem corpus is compared to figurine styles and related media in neighboring nations.

In fact, there are a number of reasons this more specific focus is justified. Jerusalem has produced the highest number of figurines in Judah, ca. 50% or more of the known corpus. Furthermore, the context information for two of the largest groups of figurines, which are both from Jerusalem, was unavailable when Kletter’s work was published. In fact, the stratigraphic report for the site with the largest number of figurines,
Shiloh’s City of David excavations, is still unpublished; though records were furnished to the author for this analysis.

Therein lies yet another reason the Jerusalem figurines deserve further attention. The unpublished reports from the City of David provide carefully recorded archaeological and stratigraphic contexts for the excavated figurines as well as all of the registered objects uncovered in each locus. Thus, this corpus has made it possible to track the registered finds uncovered in the same contexts as the figurines. In contrast, many excavation reports include the room number in which figurines were found but lack a description of the loci containing figurines, not to mention a complete list of registered objects.

Furthermore, as will be argued in Chapters 7 and 10, Jerusalem was at the center of the Judean political system by the end of the eighth century; and surrounding areas were defined by their relationship to the city. Given that Jerusalem was the locus of the state cult, Jerusalem’s figurines are paramount in the interpretation of figurine ritual in the Iron IIB-C.

Finally, petrographic analysis (Chapter 6) demonstrates that figurines were produced by local manufacturers guided by local stylistic and production conventions. Further, figurines were not usually traded from one city in Judah to another. Moreover, stylistic criteria, such as pinched versus molded heads, indicate varying preferences and manufacturing patterns from one region of Judah to another (Chapter 7). Thus, while the figurines partake in the larger Judean style, many of their ritual uses probably reflected local rather than regional practices.
1.5.2 Interpreting disposal patterns

For the purposes of this study, most of the contexts that produced figurines are considered disposal contexts rather than use contexts. Thus, while it is often possible to posit with relative surety that a figurine fragment resulted from activity occurring somewhere in the same building, installation, or area, it is not possible to prove that fragments were the result of activity taking place in a particular locus. At best, the statistical correlation between figurines and other objects found in the same loci may suggest certain items were disposed of together, though these figures are only significant for anthropomorphic figurines, pottery (which is endemic and thus probably non-indicative), and zoomorphic figurines (see Chapter 5). Otherwise figurines, like other types of domestic debris, are found in random locations throughout the areas. Furthermore, figurines associated with non-domestic contexts, such as Kenyon’s Cave I and the extra-mural street deposit, are likewise interpreted as disposal contexts.

By carefully tracing these archaeological and stratigraphic contexts it becomes possible to identify the nature of figurines as debris and evaluate the various interpretations such as household, cultic, or mercantile refuse. Furthermore, in order to identify these debris contexts, secondary loci (e.g., fill) are identified and analyzed separately from floor loci; and structures are always investigated to determine whether loci were open to random post-occupational debris accumulation. Where possible, the degree of preservation and extent of excavation of each locus is also taken into consideration.
Finally, after evaluating the nature of loci and buildings, the archaeological data are used to check a set of hypotheses normally applied to figurine function (Chapter 2). As is described in the following chapters, it is here assumed that certain types of ritual activity and symbolic representations would produce unique and identifiable types of disposal contexts. This methodology cannot establish unequivocally the exact function of a figurine. Depending upon the materials preserved in the archaeological record and recorded in excavation, archaeological analysis may not detect elements that may have been key to identifying figurine functions (as per Chapter 3). Nor can archaeological analysis rule out idiosyncratic ritual activities that do not abide by the general patterns of disposal. What it can do is rule out the likelihood of certain interpretations.

1.5.3 Fragments and figurines

A few issues concerning the relationship between figurine fragments and the number of figurines recovered at a site must be noted. First, given the low number of joins made in almost every excavation in Kletter’s study, it seems safe to assume that each fragment usually represents a different figurine. Even if some fragments may join with others, the low number would not significantly alter the total data.

Second, it is assumed that base and pillar fragments unattached to torsos come from female pillar figurines. Hypothetically, the columns and bases could have been used for bird figurines as well. Again, the relatively small number of bird figurines found throughout Judah suggests that even if the bird figurines were taken into consideration, they would not significantly alter the total numbers of pillar figurines.
Third, Kletter sometimes cites the small size of some pinched heads as evidence that the head belonged to a rider rather than a JPF. Unfortunately, while riders are usually smaller than the average JPF, the handmade JPFs can be quite small, so the size of the head does not necessarily indicate the type of figurine from which it came. As with the bird figurines, the smaller number of rider figurines would not alter the total number of JPFs in a significant way.

Finally, the largest problem with the fragmentary condition of the figurines is that it is impossible to know whether a figurine had a pinched head or a molded head when only a body, pillar, or base fragments remains. Occasionally, a clay tang may remain in a torso, indicating that the attached head was probably molded. Regardless of these difficulties, the differences between the head styles are significant. Because iconographic and artistic traditions change slowly and are governed by long-standing criteria these variations may indicate important attitudes and practices within the Judean community.

Despite these facts, the chronological ranges and functional differences of the two head styles have not been explored. Thus, the following study attempts to identify any potential patterns in their chronological and spatial deposition, chemical make-up, and iconographic antecedents. Admittedly, conclusions must be based on the preservation of head fragments, the type of loci in which they were found, and the quality of their publication at a given site. That having been said, the number of head fragments remaining at sites like the City of David and the quality of their publication still provide ample data to begin this type of analysis.
1.5.4 Text and archaeology

As was noted, ethnoarchaeological analogy can help curtail and inform modern interpretive paradigms applied to archaeological materials. It was also noted that the majority of figurine studies have relied upon ethnographic models built upon older ethnographic investigation that focused on cultures far removed from the ancient Near East. Furthermore, the level of analysis offered by these models is ambiguous at best. In contrast, the present study uses ritual texts from the Neo-Assyrian Empire to test whether modern interpretations of archaeological data constitute sound mid-range theory. The historical reliability and cultural dissemination of these ritual texts are evaluated in their own right prior to being compared with contemporary interpretations. Furthermore, the ritual logics implicit in the texts are investigated in detail to understand the rituals as they may have functioned in their own cultural milieu. Only after this detailed analysis are the texts used to test modern interpretations.

Neo-Assyrian texts have the added benefit of coming from a region that is geographically, temporally, and politically related to Iron II Judah. Not only may they help construct a localized model for figurine use in the Iron II Near East, but they can be used to construct a more specific set of criteria to relate figurine form and function than that in the Ucko/Voigt model.

1.6 Dissertation synopsis

In what follows, Chapter 2 analyzes major trends in the study of Judean figurines, including interpreting the figurines as goddesses, understanding them as elements of
popular religion used by the lower classes, and relegating them to female religion. The chapter demonstrates that, regardless of their differences, most interpreters begin with assumptions based upon figurine iconography, particularly the breasts, and only then take into account Israelite religion, biblical texts, and archaeology.

Chapter 3 then explores textual descriptions of figurine rituals from the ancient Near East, particularly those from the Neo-Assyrian Empire, demonstrating ways in which common scholarly assumptions about JPFs should not be taken as fact. Rather, the textual material suggests figurine rituals are much more complex than has been hypothesized and that the absence of accompanying ritual texts is a significant barrier to interpretation.

Chapters 4 and 5 focus on the archaeological context of the largest corpuses of figurines, those from Kenyon's excavations (Chapter 4) and Shiloh's excavations (Chapter 5) on the southeastern hill of Jerusalem. The detailed examination of the figurines’ archaeological contexts and depositional patterns suggests that the vast majority of figurines were found as random trash in domestic structures without any evidence for specialized deposition. Where these figurines have been attributed to cultic contexts, those contexts are thoroughly explored, suggesting a more likely interpretation is production, storage, or market debris. This material also demonstrates that figurines are found in areas associated with royal and temple elites, as well as those of non-elite citizens, that they are not associated with one domestic shrine area within the domestic units, and that they have no significant correlation with other artifacts often interpreted as indicators of women’s activity areas. Rather, the most significant correlation between
artifact types occurs between anthropomorphic and zoomorphic figurines, suggesting their depositional pattern together is not an accident of archaeological recovery but a side-effect of ritual disposal.

Chapter 6 describes a new petrographic study of the figurines from Shiloh’s excavations and also from Eilat Mazar’s excavations on the southeastern hill. This is the first study to examine a large sample size drawn from loci whose stratigraphy, registered objects, and architectural contexts are known. The study also tests various iconographic types to identify any differences in make, manufacture, and producers. The chapter draws implications for the provenience of Jerusalem figurines, the organization of their production, the relationship between figurine production and typology, spatial patterns, and chronological patterns in production technique.

To close the archaeological context portion of the dissertation, Chapter 7 summarizes the combined information from archaeological context, object distribution, and petrographic analysis for the southeastern hill and then compares the resulting picture of ritual activity to that in other areas of Jerusalem, the Judean hill country, and Judah at large. The chapter concludes that the dominant paradigms used to interpret figurines lack archaeological evidence, that the iconography of figurine form changes over time, and that the profile of figurine use in Jerusalem and the hill country differs significantly from that in surrounding areas within Judah.

Turning to the Hebrew Bible, Chapter 8 examines the significance of clay and image production in biblical texts; it provides a survey of clay terminology and also terms associated with idols and idol production. This survey proves that production from clay
was never prohibited in the Bible and that concerns over the production of idols focus almost exclusively on images made of stone, wood, and metal. It also identifies several properties attributed to clay as a production material, specifically its ability to bridge the gap between sacred and profane realms, making it a popular material for the construction of ritual objects used to transfer purity or impurity.

Chapter 9 returns to the iconography of the ancient Near East, investigating figurine elements, including clay composition, whitewash and paint, pillar bodies, breasts and gestures, and various head styles. Through stylistic analysis and comparative iconography, the chapter shows how many of these elements were associated with protection and healing. The chapter also accounts for the rise of the JPF style in Judah and Jerusalem and the significance of its regional adaptation. It also considers whether the separate figurine elements combine to represent a known female deity or whether the image’s ambiguity is paramount to its function and dissemination.

Finally, Chapter 10 locates the figurines in their socio-historic context within Iron II Judah, as a part of the Neo-Assyrian Empire. The chapter evaluates the nature of Judean-Assyrian relations as well as the likelihood that the Neo-Assyrian Empire provided the socio-economic and cultural context for the spread of figurine rituals associated with healing and protection. Finally, the chapter summarizes biblical depictions of healing rituals and the role of divine intermediaries in healing and protection to identify commonalities between the traditions preserved in these texts and the figurines’ iconographic features and archaeological contexts. The chapter closes with a final evaluation of the dominant interpretive paradigms in light of the evidence.
presented throughout the dissertation and a summary of figurine development and function as indicated by the data currently available.
CHAPTER 2: INTERPRETIVE TRENDS IN SCHOLARSHIP ON JUDEAN PILLAR FIGURINES

Several trends characterize scholarship on JPFs. The figurines are interpreted as goddesses, elements of “popular religion,” and aspects of “female religion.” These categories are often treated as discrete divisions; but they are actually permeable, and most interpreters engage all three categories at once. Furthermore, the common assumptions shared by the majority of interpreters stem from interpretations of the figurines’ breasts and their concomitant implications for the function and owners of the figurines. This chapter will review scholarship on JPFs—first investigating the role of the goddess interpretation (2.1), then proceeding to the popular religion interpretation (2.2), and ending with the female religion interpretation (2.3), with the intent of demonstrating that the common iconographic root behind most interpretations renders their similarity more compelling than any difference.

2.1 JPFs as goddesses

Although the connection between JPFs and goddesses has received well-deserved criticism, scholars have not focused myopically on deities as much as has sometimes been claimed.¹ This misconception results, in part, from the schematization of scholarship in Raz Kletter’s The Judean Pillar-Figurines and the Archaeology of Asherah. Kletter

¹ Meyers, “Terracottas without Texts,” 115-17.
divides the majority of scholarship under the rubrics of either the “Astarte” or “Asherah” Phase and then contrasts interpretations that focus on deities with those that focus on magical function.²

2.1.1 Astarte

According to Kletter, the period between World War I and World War II saw the rise of the “Astarte Phase” in JPF interpretation, lead primarily by W. F. Albright.³ Kletter claims that the dominant position characterizing this period associated several different figurine styles with the goddess Astarte, in part, because a clear distinction between plaque figurines and pillar figurines had not yet been made.⁴ Although some interpreters did conflate plaque and pillar figurine styles, leading them to associate the JPFs with Astarte, the situation is more complex than Kletter presents.

In older excavation reports the figurines were sometimes associated with Astarte because Albright labeled the apparent forerunners to the JPFs, the Tel Beit Mirsim Late Bronze plaque figurines, Astarte figurines.⁵ When he discusses the Iron II pillar figurines

---

² Kletter’s book, *The Judean Pillar-Figurines*, remains the only thorough archaeological investigation of JPFs and their context. As such, it provides the data and forms the basis for all subsequent figurine interpretations. Thus, the book’s influence warrants a thorough investigation of its accuracy. Furthermore, Kletter provides the most compendious list of interpreters who have studied figurines (up until 1995). As such, his depiction of scholarship is also influential and deserves reexamination.

³ Ibid., 10.

⁴ Ibid., 10-12.

he says, “This type of Astarte figurine unquestionably does portray a goddess, Ashtaroth as the *dea nutrix*, the protector of nursing mothers.”⁶ Some subsequent interpreters borrow part of Albright’s interpretation—that the figurines were associated with the goddess Astarte. However, they generally omit the rest of his formulation—that the Israelites did not understand the figurines as deities but used them, regardless of their iconographic associations, as general magical amulets.⁷ Apparently following Albright, the excavation report from Tell en Nasbeh claims the figurines represent Astarte or a *dea nutrix*,⁸ and the Lachish excavations describe the figurines as “generally identified with Astarte or Ashtoreth—queen of Heaven—as *dea nutrix*.”⁹

Several exceptions to the Astarte interpretation should be noted. First, not all scholars associated the figurines with Astarte. Pritchard resists any final identification of the figurines with any female deity.¹⁰ Further, both Pilz and Burrows mention Phoenician

---

⁶ Ibid., 121.

⁷ Ibid.


¹⁰ Pritchard, *Palestinian Figurines*, 85. Here Pritchard also mentions Anat and Asherah as candidates but likewise rejects any sure association between the figurines and either of these two deities. Despite including Pritchard in the Astarte Phase, Kletter concedes Pritchard does not finally draw any conclusions about the figurines and Astarte (Kletter, *Judean Pillar-Figurines*, 12).
Astarte as one possibility out of many. As has been argued, even Albright at Tell Beit Mirsim, McCowan at Tell en Nasbeh, and Tufnell at Lachish note Astarte alongside other possibilities and ultimately interpret the figurines as the *dea nutrix*.  

Second, the terminology for the figurines used in these earlier interpretations becomes particularly confusing. The initial association between the pillar figurines and Astarte was due, in part, to the large number of Cypriote figurines of the same general technological style already known and associated with the goddess. As a result, the term Astarte may describe a technological/iconographic style rather than the actual goddess represented by the figurine. It is thus possible for Albright to say, “This type of Astarte figurine unquestionably does portray a goddess, Ashtaroth.” Ergo, it is possible that an Astarte figurine does not represent Astarte but some other goddess. Eventually, scholars, like Holland, come to use the term “Astarte type figurine” without associating the pillar figurines with the deity Astarte at all.

---


12 Kletter cites a number of authors who use the term Astarte without reference to the actual deity, even though he initially includes some of those same authors (like Watzinger) in the Astarte Phase category, which identified the JPFs with the goddess Astarte (*Judean Pillar-Figurines*, 12, 75).

13 Ibid., 10.

14 Albright, *Archaeology of Palestine and the Bible*, 121.

Ultimately, none of these interpreters began with textual information about “fertile” or “nurturing” Astarte and then used that information to interpret the figurine iconography. Rather, they started with the female iconography and devised an interpretation of the figurines’ function as a *dea nutrix* that they then roughly associated with any number of female deities. As will be discussed further, the real commonality in the Astarte Phase interpretations is not identification with the goddess Astarte but the association between the figurine iconography, especially the breasts, and womankind’s functions of nurturing, lactation, mothering, and fertility.\(^{16}\)

### 2.1.2 Asherah

Kletter calls the period between 1975 and 1995 the Asherah Phase of research. There is little question that most interpreters have associated the pillar figurines with the goddess Asherah. Kletter’s overview admirably outlines various types of literature including dissertations, excavations, general overviews, iconographic investigations, archaeological studies, and feminist approaches.\(^{17}\) Nevertheless, his characterization of the Asherah Phase suffers from the same oversimplifications that plagued his discussion of the Astarte Phase.

---


The major figurine catalogue in the Asherah Phase was produced by James Engle, who claims that the JPFs were associated with Asherah primarily because she was the main goddess in the Hebrew Bible. For most other studies, this is also the justification for associating Asherah with the majority of female images from ancient Israel, including JPFs. Kletter’s position is similar in this regard. He settles on Asherah because “this is the simplest and most logical explanation.” In the same vein, Holladay says that “there is only one major goddess known to Judah during the later part of the Iron II period: the goddess Asherah/Asherata,” though he then goes on to say that the figurines are


19 Kletter, Judean Pillar-Figurines, 76. For example, Gösta Werner Ahlström, (“An Archaeological Picture of Iron Age Religions in Ancient Palestine,” StudOr 55 [1984]: 22) claims that the JPFs represent Asherah while the animal figurines represent Yahweh or Baal.

20 Kletter, Judean Pillar-Figurines, 81. Kletter suggests “explaining the JPFs as purely magical figures is not satisfactory, since it related only to their function, not to their meaning. In order to keep a purely magical explanation, one would have to assume that there was a very common magical figure in Judah that was not mentioned in the OT, and is not one of the known goddesses.” Thus, Kletter’s reasoning rests squarely on the fact that Asherah is mentioned in the Hebrew Bible. For further critique, see Meyers, “Terracottas without Texts,” 121-22. Kletter does not discuss the thoroughly-debated relationship between the biblical terms, the asherah, asherot, asherot, and asherim and a hypothesized Israelite goddess named Asherah. In order to argue that the pillar figurines are associated with this goddess one must first clarify the meaning of the biblical terminology. On this point see, Mark S. Smith, The Early History of God: Yahweh and the Other Deities in Ancient Israel (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2002), 119-33; John Day, Yahweh and the Gods and Goddesses of Canaan (JSOTSupp 265; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 42-48, 51; Ziony Zevit, The Religions of Ancient Israel: A Synthesis of Parallactic Approaches (London: Continuum, 2001), 650-51; Brian A. Mastin, “Yahweh's Asherah, Inclusive Monotheism and the Question of Dating,” in In Search of Pre-Exilic Israel (ed. John Day; London: Continuum, 2004), 326-51; William G. Dever, Did God Have a Wife?: Archaeology and Folk Religion in Ancient Israel (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2005), 196-208, 211-18; Saul M. Olyan, Asherah and the Cult of Yahweh in Israel (SBLMS 34; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988), 70-74; Steve A. Wiggins, A Reassessment of Asherah: With Further Considerations of the Goddess (Gorgias Ugaritic Studies 2; Piscataway, N.J.: Gorgias, 2007), 105-50; and especially Judith M. Hadley, The Cult of Asherah in Ancient Israel and Judah (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 54-83. In sum, despite inscriptive evidence and the biblical text, whether and to what extent Israelites worshiped the deity Asherah in Iron II Israel is still debated; and, until a clearer consensus emerges, little can be said about whether the JPFs represent the goddess Asherah as worshipped in Judah.
associated with the cult of the *dea nutrix*. Dever appears to make the same claim in his 2005 book, despite his admission that nowhere does the Bible mention the figurines let alone figurines in association with a goddess Asherah. He interprets the absence of reference to JPFs in the Bible as intentional suppression.

Beyond the simplistic equation “pillar figurine with breasts = female nurturing goddess = goddess in the Bible,” a few studies have attempted to associate the iconography of the pillar figurines with the characteristics of biblical Asherah. One such position claims the pillar bodies of the figurines were meant to represent trees or poles, thus making the pillar figurines similar to the *asherah* poles reported to have been chopped down in biblical cultic reforms. This would also tie the pillar figurines to sacred tree iconography within ancient Israel; the position is especially attractive because many scholars already associate the sacred tree with Asherah. Kletter correctly notes

---

21 Holladay, “Religion in Israel and Judah Under the Monarchy,” 278.

22 Dever, *Did God Have a Wife*, 194.


the deficiencies of this argument, not the least of which is the common use of pillar forms to create standing figurines in multiple cultures and time periods.\textsuperscript{25}

Another attempt to associate the figurines with known attributes of Asherah focuses on the breasts of the figurine. Because many interpreters assume that the breasts relate to nurturing or fertility, some of these interpreters turn to Ugaritic texts that describe Asherah as “creatress of the gods,” or “wet nurse of the gods.”\textsuperscript{26} Although Hadley hypothesizes that both plaque and pillar figurines could be associated with this aspect of Asherah, her final analysis of the pillar figurines, given their lack of divine implements and lack of identifying inscriptions, remains extremely tentative.\textsuperscript{27}

Despite these attempts to tie the figurines to characteristics of Asherah, there remains little in the iconography to associate the figurines with her known attributes. Even if one were to read the Winchester Stele’s \textit{Qodeshet} or \textit{Qudshu} as Asherah—thus far the only possible image labeled with the goddess’ name, the iconography includes accompanying implements, like snakes and plants, and often shows the deity standing on a lion or a horse;\textsuperscript{28} the qodeshet style figurines are not naked females with hands on their

\textsuperscript{25} Kletter, \textit{Judean Pillar-Figurines}, 76-77. See also, Steve A. Wiggins (\textit{Reassessment of Asherah}, 252, 268-69) who questions the strength of the evidence connecting the goddess Asherah and trees.

\textsuperscript{26} Hadley, \textit{Cult of Asherah}, 40-43; Engle, “Pillar Figurines of the Iron Age,” 106.

\textsuperscript{27} Hadley, \textit{Cult of Asherah}, 205. For a critique of scholars who use these passages to characterize Asherah as a mother goddess connected with a fertility cult see, Steve A. Wiggins, \textit{A Reassessment of Asherah}, 83-84. He claims that Athirat does possess a maternal aspect but that it is a reflection of her role as mother of the gods (ibid., 103).

\textsuperscript{28} Wiggins (ibid., 226-32) disagrees with scholars who associate the root \textit{qdš} with Asherah in Ugaritic literature and claims that no Ugaritic texts connect Asherah with snakes or plants that might undergird the iconography on the Winchester Stele. Thus, the interpretive move to associate all snakes and trees with
breasts. In fact, Miriam Tadmor distinguishes between plaque figurines of human naked women with hands at their side and plaque figurines of naked goddesses with implements and animals.  

Thus, the relevance of iconography or textual descriptions of Asherah seems questionable; neither texts nor known iconography constitute reliable data in scholarly interpretations that associate JPFs with the goddess. Instead, the reader is left to assume that scholars like Engle, Dever, and Kletter made a series of interpretations based on the figurines’ breasts. That is, they assume that the breasts are associated with fertility or nourishment, these concerns fall under the auspices of a female deity, the Bible provides reliable evidence about female deities in Iron II Israel, and the most likely choice is Asherah. One of the key points about this interpretive chain is that these scholars did not begin with information about Asherah as their guiding principle but with a logical inference about the function of the figurines based on the breasts, making the Asherah Phase very similar to the Astarte Phase. Kletter is aware of this fact when he says, “As a

Asherah is based, according to Wiggins, on the interpretation of the stele, which is itself based on shaky linguistic evidence for the connection between the Semitic root qdš and Asherah in a small number of Ugaritic texts. For the same opinion see Izak Cornelius, The Many Faces of the Goddess: The Iconography of the Syro-Palestinian Goddesses Anat, Astarte, Qedeshet, and Asherah, c. 1500-1000 BC (OBO 204; Fribourg: Academic Press, 2004), 95. For more on Qodeshet stelae, see Chapter 9.

29 Miriam Tadmor, “Female Cult Figurines in Late Canaan and Early Israel: Archaeological Evidence,” in Studies in the Period of David and Solomon and Other Essays: Papers Read at the International Symposium for Biblical Studies, Tokyo, 5-7 December, 1979 (ed. Tomoo Ishida; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1982), 161. In addition to the iconography, Tadmor notes that the “naked female with hands at sides” is not typically depicted in metal, but the female with implements and/or animals is found in metal. For more on Tadmor’s interpretation see Chapter 9.
matter of fact, Engle simply adopted the old view that figurines were cultic artifacts, and just changed their title from Astarte to Asherah.”

Although Kletter underemphasizes those interpreters who remained skeptical, several scholars in fact disagree with the Asherah hypothesis. Part of this oversight could be due to the fact that Kletter’s review was only able to cover material through 1995. That having been said, already in 1947, Prichard, who completed the first extensive study focusing on figurines, resists associating the figurines with any goddess, including Asherah. Holland also avoids any association between Asherah and the figurines, preferring to connect the figurines with a general fertility cult. He states, “It would be unwise at the present state of archaeological research in Palestine to demand more from the evidence presented here based upon the study of the Cave I artifacts and the allied comparative material from other Iron Age II sites in Palestine.” Thus, two of the major scholars working on the figurines refuse to connect the figurines with the goddess.

30 Kletter, Judean Pillar-Figurines, 17.


32 Pritchard, Palestinian Figurines, 85.


34 Technically Kletter (Judean Pillar-Figurines, 13-16) does not include Holland’s study in his Asherah Phase but in the section before, entitled “From World War II until 1975.” While Kletter briefly notes Holland’s conclusions about the figurines, he focuses on Holland’s typology. Thus, Holland’s interpretation, which does not associate the figurines with Asherah but with a general mother goddess, gets lost in the technical details. By bracketting out Holland’s thesis, Kletter glosses over Holland’s relatively careful skepticism. The fact that these brackets are superimposed and do not fit actual scholarly trends is demonstrated by the number of scholars within the “From World II until 1975” category who do discuss Asherah, such as William L. Reed, The Asherah in the Old Testament (Fort Worth, Tex.: Texas Christian
Even scholars who accept a possible association with Asherah sometimes do so with significant reservations. For example, in the Jewish Quarter excavation report Irit Yezerski and Hillel Geva say, “The common view is that the anthropomorphic female pillar figurines were produced for an official, domestic or magical cult and that they should be identified with the cult of the Asherah, though there is no conclusive evidence for this.” Another major excavation report, that of Franken and Steiner on the Kenyon excavations in Jerusalem, reads, “Asherah was related to the cult of Astarte, and the female figurines are often said to have been primitive representations of this deity; they could, however, as well simply have been primitive representations of those women whose families or husbands came to the cave to find help in case of severe illness of the


woman or problems with childbirth.” Franken and Steiner then connect Asherah with the bird pillar figurines rather than the female figurines. Gilbert-Peretz, in the City of David excavation report, also ignores Asherah, favoring the more general view that the figurines express popular Judean beliefs. Thus, some of the most recent excavation reports dealing with figurines (and all of the reports from Jerusalem) also avoid associating the figurines with Asherah.

Further, many scholars who study ancient Near Eastern goddesses have questioned the identification of JPFs with Asherah. Tikva Frymer-Kensky prefers to think of each figurine, not as a goddess, but as “a tangible prayer for fertility and nourishment.” Judith Hadley suggests that although JPFs might be smaller copies of asherah poles, it is impossible to determine whether the figurines represent a deity or which deity. More importantly, she says “there is no evidence, however, to suggest that these pillar figurines are the objects to which the Chronicler refers as ‘asherim.’” Both

---

36 Franken and Steiner, “Conclusions,” 128.


38 Tikva S. Frymer-Kensky, In the Wake of the Goddesses: Women, Culture and the Biblical Transformation of Pagan Myth (New York: Macmillan, Free Press, 1992), 159. It should be noted that Dever (Did God Have a Wife, 207) cites this particular passage as evidence that Frymer-Kensky, “connects the female figurines with the veneration of Asherah.” Dever’s interpretation of Frymer-Kensky is unsupportable and fundamentally misunderstands the points she makes in the passage.

39 Hadley, Cult of Asherah, 205. Hadley is not saying that the figurines could not be connected with an Iron II Israelite goddess but that the terminology in the biblical text, particularly asherim, is impossible to connect with the figurines.
Hadley and Frymer-Kensky posit the plausibility of an Asherah cult in ancient Israel but question the relationship between the goddess and the JPF iconography.

Finally, a number of scholars who specialize in religion in the Old Testament/Hebrew Bible have resisted the equation between Asherah and the pillar figurines. Meyers, in her most recent work on the JPFs, suggests that the materials out of which the figurines are made and their iconographic style preclude the possibility that the figurines are Asherah, or any goddess. Rather, they are manipulatable magical objects.40 Zevit argues that some figurines could be goddesses but some were not and that the meaning of a figurine was dependent on the particular ritual need of the moment.41 Further, neither Day nor Smith discusses the figurines in their works on Israelite religion, despite the fact that they do discuss the goddess Asherah.42 Also in his discussion of Asherah, Rainer Albertz warns that “no consensus has yet been reached for the classification and interpretation of the ‘Astarte figures.’”43

40 Meyers, “Terracottas without Texts,” 126.
41 Zevit, Religions of Ancient Israel, 274.
43 Rainer Albertz, A History of Israelite Religion in the Old Testament Period. Volume 1: From the Beginnings to the End of the Monarchy (Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox, 1994), 87 n.114. Although Dever (Did God Have a Wife, 202) says that Albertz connects the figurines with the cult of Asherah, Albertz (A History of Israelite Religion Vol 1, 86-87) actually mentions the figurines in his general discussion of a goddess, which he suggests could include Asherah, Astarte, or Ishtar. He even admits that it is “not yet certain that all types of these representations must be interpreted as goddesses.” This is in contrast to his more recent position that the figurines represent a divine being, probably Asherah, the mother goddess. See Rainer Albertz, “Family Religion in Ancient Israel and its Surroundings,” in Household and Family Religion in Antiquity (ed. John Bodel and Saul M. Olyan; Malden, Mass.: Blackwell, 2008), 96.
In the end, the Asherah Phase includes many scholars who do not interpret the JPFs as Asherah, and this continues to be the case from 1995 until the present.\textsuperscript{44} Several key studies in Israelite religion have avoided any simple association between the figurines and the goddess. More telling, major studies that focus on the deity Asherah, including those optimistic about iconographic depictions of the goddess, do not unequivocally connect the pillar figurines with the deity. What many scholars do share, whether they associate the figurines with Asherah, Astarte, or no deity at all, is an interpretive focus on the breasts of the figurines and, concomitantly, the figurines’ role in fertility and/or nourishment.

2.1.3 Goddesses versus magic

Not only does Kletter’s study give the impression that most interpreters focus on the deities purportedly represented by the figurines but also that those who do so avoid discussion of the figurines’ magical function.\textsuperscript{45} Indeed, Kletter explicitly equates magic with function when he says “explaining the figurines as magical figures,” “relates only to their function, not to their meaning.”\textsuperscript{46} Finally, Kletter claims that scholarship from the 1980s and 1990s abandoned the magic explanation for the goddess Asherah,\textsuperscript{47} further

\textsuperscript{44} For an extensive list of interpreters, cited by Kletter in his Asherah Phase who do not associate the figurines with Asherah, see above.

\textsuperscript{45} Kletter, \textit{Judean Pillar-Figurines}, 77, 80-81.

\textsuperscript{46} Ibid., 81.

\textsuperscript{47} Ibid., 77.
undergirding his distinction between those who study the figurines’ meaning as deities and those who study the figurines’ function.

Kletter’s analysis undergirds a false dichotomy between meaning and magical function, otherwise known as belief verse practice, thought verse action, or even religion verse magic. Although Kletter includes a brief overview of the modern study of magic, he offers no working definition for his own interpretation (that the figurines are good magic) other than a brief citation of Robert Ritner’s work on Egyptian magic. In actuality, there is little distinction between Kletter’s interpretation of supernatural magic and that of most interpreters who might categorize JPFs as magic. Even in recent scholarship, the combination of magical function with divine representation appears in the work of Zevit, who suggests that the figurines could represent deities as the need dictated but were used to manipulate or supplicate, and of Dever, who argues that the figurines were talismans to secure Asherah’s favor. Ultimately, Kletter divides scholarship into two trends—that which identifies the figurines with magical function and that which identifies the figurines with the goddesses—in order to make his own


51 Zevit, Religions of Ancient Israel, 274.

52 Dever, Did God Have a Wife, 194.
claim seem more original, namely—that the figurines are both magical and representations of biblical Asherah.  

### 2.1.4 Humans versus goddesses

A related false dichotomy is the belief that the figurines must either represent deities or humans. In her earlier work, Meyers posits that the figurines were not divine but that they may represent female human petitioners instead.  

Franken and Steiner also propose that figurines represent female human supplicants.  

Van der Toorn comes to a similar conclusion, suggesting that the cheapness of the clay figurines prevents them from representing deities. He then tentatively argues that the figurines represent humans and were given as votives to Asherah.  

Many interpreters believe that these two options—either deity or human worshipper—are the only plausible ones. Part of the reason for this dichotomy is that

---


55 Franken and Steiner, “Conclusions,” 128.

56 Karel van der Toorn, “Israelite Figurines: A View from the Texts,” in Sacred Time, Sacred Place: Archaeology and the Religion of Israel (ed. Barry M. Gittlen; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2002), 56, 58, 62. Kletter (*Judean Pillar-Figurines*, 73-74) says that “the idea that the JPFs represented mortal women has been almost completely ignored.” Although it is less prevalent than the goddess interpretation, Kletter’s claim is not exactly accurate nor is this putative minority position unimportant.
interpreters assume the figurines are associated with a high goddess mentioned in the textual record, rather than a lower-level deity.  

In his work on Israelite religion, Mark Smith outlines the various levels of deities, which he calls “structures of divinity,” in both ancient Ugaritic and Israelite texts. Smith divides the pantheon into three or four hierarchical levels and indicates that some of these divine or semi-divine agents receive very little textual attention. Similarly, Wiggins notes the Ugaritic pantheon is more complex than the Anat, Asherah, Astarte triad implies. Finally, in his essay on Israelite iconography, Theodore Lewis cites KTU 1.16-5.25-30, which describes El “pinching off some clay” and forming the healing goddess, “Shatiqatu.” This minor textual description provides little information about the goddess, but KTU 1.16-5.25-30 comes closer to describing a clay female image used to help heal and protect than do any of the texts describing the main Ugaritic goddesses.

57 An exception is the possibility that Asherah is a “mediatrix of Yhwh” as mentioned by Albertz, “Family Religion in Ancient Israel,” 96. He bases this interpretation on the Khirbet el-Qom inscription, which states, “Blessed was Uriyahu by Yhwh; and from his enemies through his Asherah he has rescued him.” Albertz also mentions Asherah’s “interceding role” in Ugaritic literature (ibid., 96 n. 56).


59 Wiggins, A Reassessment of Asherah, 230. Wiggins points out these three goddesses are not the only options at Ugarit. In fact Shapshu, the sun goddess, plays a far greater role in the Ugaritic texts than Astarte, one of the three goddesses always mentioned in connection with female iconography. Wiggins makes an important point. Many goddesses are attested at Ugarit, and thus the preference for one goddess more than another seems to be a modern convention. For the JPFs, the choice of Asherah over other deities, like Shapshu, is based on the related terms in the Bible more so than on any information from Ugarit or early Canaanite religion.

(see Chapter 9 for more on this passage). The text supports Smith’s argument that many deities arise and disappear depending on the textual circumstance; ancient pantheons across the Near East were probably more complex and fluid than might be imagined.

Rather than suggest that JPFs represent spiritual entities of lower divine status, most deity interpretations associate JPFs with high deities of the pantheon. As already suggested, those interpretations are problematic when considered in light of the JPFs’ lack of iconographic elements or the presence of certain technological characteristics, like poorly-levigated clay construction. As a result, the possibility that clay representations might be associated with lower-level supernatural entities is entirely ignored and the history of scholarship is schematized into those who support the high goddess interpretation and those who support the human votive interpretation.61

In sum, while the goddess interpretation remains widespread, scholarship has never focused on goddesses to the exclusion of the figurines’ function. That is not to say that the criticism of this paradigm is undeserved. As has been shown, the general lack of evidence connecting the figurines with major female deities remains a significant stumbling block. At the same time, mischaracterizing the complexity of these

---

interpretations is also problematic. For most of these theories, from Albright to Dever, interpreters focus on the iconography of the figurines and their possible function in order to surmise the most likely deities associated with the image. Overlooking this fact masks the overarching similarities between interpretations throughout the history of scholarship. Regardless of whether interpreters associate the figurines with deities, they focus on the figurines’ breasts and their implications for figurine function.

2.2 JPFs as popular religion

Almost all interpreters connect the figurines with popular religion whether or not they also connect them with a goddess. These scholars often take into account the archaeological context of the figurines, their technological characteristics, and the Hebrew Bible; their work is generally based on assumptions about Israelite religion and ancient iconography. In most cases the figurines are interpreted as heterodox in contrast with a hypothesized Yahweh-alone orthodoxy practiced by the elite in Jerusalem.

2.2.1 Definitions of popular religion

The fairly ambiguous term popular religion has been defined in a number of ways, but a general schematization of most of the scholarship on figurines is as follows. In its most obvious sense, popular religion is that which is done by the majority of the people. A corollary to this understanding is the assumption that the majority of the people were separated by their socio-economic status from a smaller elite, who are defined as those
persons garnering wealth and/or power. The elite would include both the government officials and officiates of the state-sponsored religion, as well as a smaller percentage of the well-to-do non-royal, non-priestly population. A corollary of this supposed dichotomy is that the religious beliefs and practices of the average inhabitant may be in conflict with the beliefs and practices of the elite. While these conflicts could include differences over the appropriate deities worshipped, or the appropriate method of worshipping the elite’s deity, conflict could also arise over the place of worship. If the location of popular worship is outside the officially endorsed religious space, then it may take place in any number of locations, including the house or family land.  

62 This is not to suggest that this means of understanding popular and elite religion is appropriate, only that it characterizes a large number of figurine interpretations, as will be shown. In actuality, scholars studying religion in ancient Israel define these levels of religion in multiple ways. Patrick D. Miller, Jr., (The Religion of Ancient Israel [Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox, 2000], 62-80) creates two different schematizations, “orthodox, heterodox, and syncretistic” and “family, local/regional, and state.” In most cases the family and local/regional overlap with the heterodox category. Alternatively, Albertz (A History of Israelite Religion Vol 1, 19) defines “the people” as society as a whole and then associates the “official Yahweh religion” with “the political,” understood as the people or the state. In between these two foci Albertz places the local or village community. Activities attributed to the family in Albertz schematization are often associated by other commentators with popular religion, making it likely that Albertz’s family category is similar to what most interpreters mean by popular religion, though in a far more developed sense. Dever’s division between “popular” or “folk” religion and “state” religion is the most simplistic of these categorizations, suggesting that popular religion includes all activities that were not institutionalized orthodoxy (William Dever, What Did the Biblical Writers Know and When Did They Know It (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2001), 196). Holladay (“Religion in Israel and Judah under the Monarchy,” 269) also seems to divide Israelite religion into institutional orthodoxy and “nonconformist religion” defined as the religion used to “remedy perceived deficiencies in the established religion.” Later he contrasts this nonconformist religion with the “aniconic shrine- and sanctuary-centered worship” of the “officially established, hierarchically organized state religion” (ibid., 281). Clearly “nonconformist religion” is another name for what other scholars have called “popular religion.” In Karen van der Toorn (Family Religion in Babylonia, Syria, and Israel:Continuity and Change in the Forms of Religious Life [Leiden: Brill, 1996], 4) “family religion” seems to mean the same thing as popular religion when he says, “In view of the contents of the religious life of the common man and woman in Babylon, Syria and Israel, ‘family religion’ seems to be its most appropriate designation.” For a general critique of various popular religion models in biblical studies see J. Berlinerblau, “The ‘Popular Religion’ Paradigm in Old Testament Research: A Sociological Critique,” ISOT 60 (1993): 3-26; more recently, see Francesca Stavrakopoulou, “‘Popular’ Religion and ‘Official’ Religion: Practice, Perception, Portrayal,” in Religious Diversity in Ancient Israel and Judah (ed. 88
In figurine studies, this particular scenario often serves as a rubric superimposed on biblical texts. For example, studies often assume that the religion of the elite was practiced by king and priest, and sometimes prophet, largely in the temple in Jerusalem. Frequently, the religion of the elite is interpreted through the lens of the Deuteronomistic redactors, characterizing it as a Jerusalem-centered, aniconic, Yahweh-alone cult. Some scholars claim that the elite were in conflict with the general public who chose to worship other deities by non-sanctioned means in unregulated space. The scheme equates elite religion with orthodox pro-Yahwism and popular religion with heterodoxy. 63

The problem is that the religion of the elite is more complicated than this simplistic distinction implies. Even according to the Hebrew Bible, the elite religion of the time of Solomon (1 Kgs 11:1-13) or Manasseh (2 Kgs 21; 2 Chr 33:1-9) included all manner of non-Yahwistic practices such as the worship of other deities, worship practices like standing stones and asherim, and sacred space outside of the Jerusalem temple. In this scenario it is entirely possible that what is normally thought of as popular religion


63 Kletter (Judean Pillar-Figurines, 26-27) also says that most of the studies that deal with the figurines as popular religion define popular or common religion in opposition to official religion, which was taken to mean institutionalized Yahwism. Thus popular religion entails any practice opposite of the official Yahwism as advocated by the authors of the Hebrew Bible. Unfortunately, Kletter devotes considerably less attention to the popular religion interpretation than is due. He further claims that the popular religion interpretation became widespread only in the last ten years. The following review of scholarship will show that this is decidedly untrue.
and elite religion were very similar. The tables turn during the reign of Hezekiah (2 Kgs 18:1-6; 2 Chr 29-31) or Josiah (2 Kgs 22-23; 2 Chr 34-35) during which time the Bible characterizes elite religion by the worship of Yahweh alone through prescribed ritual encounters centered in the Jerusalem temple. If the Hebrew Bible is taken at face value, these reform practices would be in contrast with a popular religion that worshipped many deities through any number of rituals in spaces outside the Jerusalem temple.

The point is that the distinction between elite and popular religion is far from static or fixed, even in biblical texts. The Bible does not portray a homogenous elite religion. For example, the priest and prophet Jeremiah found himself in constant conflict with other elites. If the biblical record is to be trusted, for the vast majority of the Iron II the elite religion worshipped many deities, indulged in numerous ritual manipulations, and did so in multiple locations throughout the area; all regardless of what the Deuteronomistic redactors thought about it.

64 Mark S Smith, “Review Article of The Religions of Ancient Israel: A Synthesis of Parallactic Approaches (Ziony Zevit),” Maarav 11/2 (2004): 145-218. In his critique of Zevit on the Ajrud pithoi and other inscriptions, Smith notes that all the sites in question probably represent the religion of the “well-to-do” in the eighth century. This suggests that the worship of “Asherah,” and Yahweh outside the Jerusalem temple, if that is how the inscriptions should be read, was not confined to lower class members of Judean society. Rather, Smith’s point is that because of the archaeological context, many of these finds come from more elite contexts. See also, Göste Werner Ahlström (Royal Administration and National Religion in Ancient Palestine [Leiden: Brill, 1982], 42-43) who connects Kuntillet Ajrud with other fortress shrines, like Arad, suggesting a connection between “military defense and national religion,” and Mastin (“Yahweh’s Asherah,” 336) who connects the Ajrud site with the worship of well-to-do males.

Similarly, there was not one homogenous popular religion but multiple practices that varied by sub-region, family unit, and personal need. The complex variations of religious life allow for countless types of relationships between the elite and the popular practices at different times, ranging from extremely similar to diametrically opposed. Thus, any practice associated with ritual manipulation and/or divine beings cannot necessarily be categorized as either elite religion or popular, for those terms do not represent a meaningful dichotomy.

2.2.2 Figurines in popular religion

Regardless of the theoretical pitfalls, scholars who study JPFs have largely followed the traditional view that equates elite religion with pro-Yahwistic orthodoxy and popular religion with heterodoxy. Both the Jewish Quarter excavations and the City of

---

66 Rainer Albertz’s work on Israelite religion argues for multiple shifts in popular or family religion. Albertz (ibid., 34) claims that in early family religion Israelites worshipped household gods, whereas family religion under the late monarchy adopted the worship of Yahweh as well as syncretistic practices from the outside influence of Assyrian cults (ibid., 186-88). Albertz (ibid., 195) hypothesizes that during the time of Zephaniah, the poor people of the land were actually more faithful to Yahweh than the elite families and royal families in Jerusalem. Finally, Albertz (ibid., 210-16) believes that a large part of the Deuteronomic reform movement of the seventh century targeted the syncretistic inroads in family religion, trying to make private and family religion more “Yahwistic.”

67 Zevit (Religions of Ancient Israel, 688) claims to take this polyvalence into consideration. See, Smith (“Review Article,” 158), however, who counters that Zevit’s work, despite its claims to the contrary, “offers a relatively static picture of a single—though not monolithic—Israelite entity, despite the word ‘religions’ in the title.”

68 For example, Miller (Religion of Ancient Israel, 52-53) divides Israelite religion into orthodox, heterodox, and syncretistic Yahwism, putting the figurines in the heterodox category. In Miller’s categorization much of the family and local and regional cults fell into the heterodox category as well.
David excavations relegate the figurines to the realm of popular religion in general.⁶⁹ According to Franken and Steiner, “Fertility and prosperity which is closely related to fertility, were the preoccupation of the peasants and lower class town people, but in a different way than the role which fertility and prosperity played in the state religion. They were expressions of popular values which were sometimes different from or even opposed to the values of the state and its officials.” They conclude that the majority of people using Cave I in Jerusalem (interpreted as a cultic site) were “convinced henotheists.”⁷⁰ However, they offer no reason for why these figurines should be understood as popular other than an assumption that the figurines represent practices incommensurate with Yahwism.

More specifically, as discussed above, many scholars interpret the figurines as a deity other than Yahweh, whom they assume was the only sanctioned deity in ancient Israel. As such, the figurines represent henotheistic practice. These opinions include scholars who posit the existence of a syncretistic Yahwism as well as those who suppose that the worship of Yahweh precluded the worship of other gods. Pritchard suggests that the people of Gibeon were loyal to Yahweh (as evidenced by their theorphoric names) but they “may not have been entirely orthodox in their religious practices.” He bases this interpretation on the presence of figurines in the water system, which he connects with

---


⁷⁰ Franken and Steiner, “Conclusions,” 128.
“pagan” practices.⁷¹ Here Pritchard defines orthodoxy as the sole worship of Yahweh, though he allows for a syncretism which was not entirely disloyal. Kenyon’s interpretation is on the other end of the spectrum. After interpreting the pillar figurines with “well-accentuated breasts” as evidence of a fertility cult, Kenyon says, “The association of these female figurines with a fertility cult, abhorrent to the worshippers of Yahweh, is very obvious.”⁷² Thus Kenyon’s understanding of Israelite religion places Yahweh-alone worshippers in direct opposition to anyone engaging in a fertility cult.

In addition to considering the Hebrew Bible, scholars have always noted the archaeological provenience of the figurines in both houses and public space. Assuming that the figurines must be related to some form of religion or cult, excavators then assume that the presence of figurines in an archaeological context securely identify that context as cultic space. Because the figurines all come from spaces outside of the Jerusalem temple, all figurine contexts are, by definition, popular, non-orthodox religious spaces. According to McCowan at Tell en Nasbeh, “The wide distribution of figurine heads of various types throughout the city area seems to indicate that they were distinctly household icons, or amulets, to be used quite apart from, possibly even as a substitute for, the religious festivities of any sanctuary which may have existed.”⁷³ Though admitting

---


⁷³ McCowan, Tell en-Nasbeh, 245.
the general paucity of evidence for religious activity at the site, McCowan proceeds to connect the figurines with Astarte worship as denounced in the book of Jeremiah. More will be said about the “household” context for figurines below.

Also regarding Tell en Nasbeh, Jeff Zorn assumes that the presence of figurines, in addition to a skull and a hand-burnished stand fragment, indicates one of the site’s rooms may have been cultic. In a similar, though more extreme vain, Nadelman claims that the figurines found in the Temple Mount excavations, “are perhaps identifiable as teraphim (2 Kgs 23.24) or other types of niddah ‘filthiness’ (2 Chron 29.5) mentioned as being worshipped instead of the Israelites’ God.” Perhaps the most discussed case is that of Cave I in the Kenyon Jerusalem excavations. Basing their understanding of Cave I on Holland’s work, Franken and Steiner argue that the figurines found in the cave help identify it as a non-temple, religious context for probable henotheists. Holladay applies the same criteria to almost all of the sites in his study of Israelite religion, as does Daviau for the sites in Jordan.

74 Ibid., 248.
78 Franken and Steiner, “Conclusions,” 128. See also, Dever, Did God Have a Wife, 55.
Because the figurines are either interpreted as deities or associated with non-Yahwistic rituals and because the figurines are frequently found broken, many interpreters tie them to the iconoclastic reforms in 2 Kgs/2 Chr. A number of scholars—including Pritchard at Gibeon, Yizerski and Geva at the Jewish Quarter, and Nadelman at the Ophel—assume that the figurines were broken intentionally and typically associate those breaks with the Josianic reform. Tufnell assumes that the figurines at Lachish had to predate the Josianic reform, Engle argues that the figurines were copies of the wooden asherah taken out of the temple by Josiah, and Uehlinger notes that the association with Josiah is weak but that he can offer no better suggestion. Finally, while Zevit does not necessarily suggest a strong connection with Josianic reform, he does present the possibility that the figurines were referenced as gillulim or “dungballs” in Michael Weigl; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), 203. This is not to say that Holladay and Daviau ignore other objects found with the pillar figurines, but rather that their primary designation of cultic areas, especially domestic structures, appears to rest on the presence of figurines. For a critique of Holiday’s position see Chapter 1. Daviau, by her own admission, has even further difficulty because many of the other objects identified as diagnostic for religious activity by Holladay (on whose work Daviau’s analysis rests) were not found at Tell Jawa (Daviau, “Family Religion,” 203).


82 Tufnell, Lachish 3, 181.

83 Engle, “Pillar Figurines of the Iron Age,” 52.

84 Uehlinger, “Anthropomorphic Cult Statuary,” 133.
Ezekiel and that the commonness of the figurines, particularly at Nasbeh, implies that they were part of a private or individual cult.85

2.2.3 Figurines as cheap clay objects

A corollary to the popular religion argument is that the cheap technological properties of the figurines indicate they belong to the realm of popular rather than elite religion. McCowan claims that “votive objects are either conventional mass products, in the case of the Astarte heads, or the crude extemporizations of artless and unskilled fingers, as seen in the bird-faced figurines and the small stands.” He then asks whether “local worship in ancient Hebrew cities was largely the work of the uninstructed, perhaps chiefly of the women?”86 Judith Hadley, following Elizabeth Bloch-Smith, also suggests that the “bodies were hand-made, possibly even by the person for whom the figurine was meant, which would explain the crude manufacture.”87 This association between the figurines and popular religion implies that the figurines were not elite objects.88

More recent scholars also note the JPFs inexpensive technology and sometimes crude form but have not moved far from the conclusions of earlier interpreters. Based on

85 Zevit, Religions of Ancient Israel, 273, 562.
86 McCowan, Tell en-Nasbeh, 248.
88 For more see Kletter, Judean Pillar-Figurines, 49-50. Kletter (ibid., 61) says, “Still, the obvious conclusion is that JPFs were not expensive objects, and that they were used by the population as a whole (or, by the so called common people).”
the ethnoarchaeological work of Peter Ucko and Mary Voigt, some commentators have argued that the clay figurines could not represent deities, or if they did, they were also associated with magic, rather than the institutional cultic implements. While the method of proving this argument may be more sophisticated, the conclusions are consistent with older scholarship on JPFs. None of the scholars working with JPFs identify the figurines as cult images from major institutional shrines. Rather they are considered cheap copies of actual cult images. What Voigt’s criteria actually address is the way a given figurine may have been used or disposed of, not the identity of the figurine itself. Nor do her criteria totally preclude the possibility that the figurines represent deities, only that they were used as main cultic figures in shrines, a point made by earlier interpreters as well. Thus, almost all interpreters associate the figurines with non-temple worship. The main distinction between the two treatments of technological characteristics is that, unlike earlier scholars who used the cheap clay make-up to hypothesize about the social level of the people using the figurines, more recent work has largely avoided this topic.

89 Ucko, *Anthropomorphic Figurines of Predynastic Egypt and Neolithic Crete*; ibid., “Interpretation of Prehistoric Anthropomorphic Figurines,” 38-54; Voigt, *Hajji Firuz Tepe, Iran*, 186-95; Voigt, “Çatal Hoyük in Context,” 253-93. Note that in this last work, Voigt explicitly deems the clay, wax, or organic substances out of which magic figurines are made as cheap. Confusingly, she also includes wood, which is earlier associated solely with cultic figurines (Voigt, “Çatal Hoyük,” 264).


92 For example, Engle, “Pillar Figurines of the Iron Age,” 52 and Hadley, *Cult of Asherah*, 205.

2.2.4 Figurines and the state

Although the popular religion interpretation has been the most prevalent, a small number of scholars have argued that figurines must be associated with state control. Kletter claims that because the figurines represented Asherah, who was a part of the official Yahwistic religion, the figurines could not be part of a popular cult in opposition to official Israelite religion. Ahlström makes this point already in 1982, when he observes the large number of figurines from Jerusalem, which he connects with the center of Israelite religion. He further suggests the possibility that a number of government employees, whom he considers “representatives of the nation’s political and religious system,” probably lived in Jerusalem. Albertz says that goddess worship, possibly associated with figurines, cannot be dismissed as popular piety. Finally, Ryan Byrne considers the JPFs part of the state’s attempt to encourage repopulation of desolated regions after Sennacherib’s invasion, as does Richard Hess.

Overall, regardless of the theoretical difficulties plaguing many interpretations of figurines as popular religion, this perspective has colored past scholarship and continues as a dominant paradigm. The varying permutations of the theory depend on the

---

94 Kletter, Judean Pillar Figurines, 81.
95 Ahlström, Royal Administration, 82-83
96 Albertz, A History of Israelite Religion Vol 1, 87.
interpreter’s definition of popular religion, reliance on biblical texts (particularly the Deuteronomistic accounts), understanding of figurines excavated from non-temple spaces, and opinion of the figurines’ crude manufacture. Fortunately, some scholars have resisted a simplistic version of popular religion as applied to the figurines, taking seriously the complex nature of Israelite religion, the predominance of figurines in the state capital, and the potential role of goddesses in the Israelite pantheon.

2.3 JPFs as female religion

Figurines are typically associated with females in the family because of assumptions regarding the iconographic representation of breasts. Noting the size of the breasts, scholars consistently suggest that females owned the figurines and used them to address reproductive concerns, such as fertility, female health, and child mortality. Secondarily, some scholars have commented on the domestic contexts of the figurines, associating them with female space or family religion and attempting to undergird predetermined interpretations based on iconography.99

99 This is not to advocate for “family religion” as an appropriate or accurate category of analysis, only to suggest it is a common paradigm in figurines studies. For a critique of the way scholarship has conflated family religion (that done by family members wherever they happen to be) and household religion (that done by persons associated with the house as an architectural unit regardless of their biological relation) see Susan Ackerman, “Household Religion, Family Religion, and Women’s Religion in Ancient Israel,” in Household and Family Religion in Antiquity (ed. John Bodel and Saul M. Olyan; Malden, Mass.: 2008), 127-28. For a helpful summary of scholarly positions on household, family, official and popular religion see Olyan, “Family Religion in Israel and the Wider Levant,” 113-16. Olyan favors the term family religion.
The popular religion and female religion interpretations often overlap. Several scholars assume that popular practice, by definition, includes female activity, especially that involving fertility. For example, Dever argues that a constituent part of folk religion (versus state religion) is the inclusion of women as otherwise disenfranchised ritual agents; he specifically mentions female rituals for children and childbirth.\textsuperscript{100} Because he believes that the figurines fall into the realm of fertility or petitioning for general bounty, by necessity, they fall under the realm of folk religion, as practiced by the family.\textsuperscript{101} Likewise, Miller, at least in part, identifies women’s religion with heterodox or syncretistic practice and then connects the figurines with women.\textsuperscript{102} According to Miller, apart from the issue of whether the figurines can be associated with a known goddess, it is “certainly possible” that the figurines were associated with fertility, childbirth and nurturing; in this regard he notes the figurines’ hands on their breasts.\textsuperscript{103} Holladay also defines his nonconformist religion group not only as those who believe that the established religion “fails to recognize or worship certain aspects of the divine world” but also as those who had “restricted access to significant aspects of the cultus,” including women.\textsuperscript{104}

\textsuperscript{100} Dever, \textit{What Did the Biblical Writers Know}, 196. The same set of distinctions between State Religion and Folk Religion are found in Dever’s later book (Dever, \textit{Did God Have a Wife}, 5-6).

\textsuperscript{101} Ibid., 187, 194.

\textsuperscript{102} Miller, \textit{Religion of Ancient Israel}, 38-40.

\textsuperscript{103} Ibid., 37.

\textsuperscript{104} Holladay, “Religion in Israel and Judah under the Monarchy,” 269. See also, Phyllis Bird, “The Place of Women in the Israelite Cultus,” in \textit{Ancient Israelite Religion: Essays in Honor of Frank Moore Cross} (ed. 100
In addition to identifying who was using the figurines, scholars advocating a female religion interpretation must also identify what the figurines were used for. Both of these interpretive moves have been based, almost exclusively, on the iconography of the figurines. Early interpreters like Albright, associate the figurines with fertility due to the figurines’ breasts, saying, “The breasts are always very large and prominent, and the woman places her hands under them, as if presenting them to a nursing infant.”

Concerning the Gibeon figurines and their proposed function, Pritchard says, “Perhaps the suggestion that they were charms used by women to assure success in childbirth and in the rearing of the child through the crucial months of nursing is the most convincing.” Kenyon describes the torsos of the Jerusalem figurines as having “well-accentuated breasts;” she links them to a fertility cult on the basis of iconographic similarity with the seventh-millennium B.C.E. Neolithic Jericho figurines.

More recent scholarship follows the same lines. Franken and Steiner posit one of the functions of the figurines was supplication for success in childbirth and female

---


105 Albright, *Archaeology of Palestine and the Bible*, 121. See also Kletter, *Judean Pillar-Figurines*, 10, for Macalister at Gezer.


health, Frymer-Kensky calls them “tangible prayer[s] for fertility and nourishment,” Hadley suggests the exaggerated breasts emphasize nurturing, and Meyers hypothesizes that the figurines are associated with lactation and reproductive success, concerns central to women. Most other interpreters also focus on the breasts of the figurines and their association with suckling or fertility and thus with female users. In both his overview of scholarship and his small section entitled “Mother Goddess, Fertility Goddess, Nurturing Goddess and Naked Goddess” Kletter refers to many scholars who make this association. However the fact that this interpretive paradigm does not figure more prominently in his own analysis of scholarship is puzzling in light of the overwhelming amount of scholarly attention garnered by the figurines’ breasts. Furthermore, Kletter himself suggests that the Asherah figurines function as a figure that “bestowed plenty, especially in the domain of female lives.”

108 Franken and Steiner, “Conclusions,” 128.

109 Frymer-Kensky, In the Wake of the Goddess, 159.

110 Hadley, Cult of Asherah, 205.


113 Kletter, Judean Pillar-Figurines, 10-12, 14-15, 18-20, 22-24, 74-75.

114 Ibid., 81.
Some interpreters have emphasized the lactation aspect of the breasts, more so than their general role in fertility. Engle suggests:

If this is a proper characterization of Asherah, then the buxom pillar figurines of Iron Age Israel should probably be seen more as representations of a goddess who is a mature lady, content to contribute to the nurture of her offspring and family, than as representations of a stereotype nude young fertility-sex goddess. Perhaps the exaggerated breasts were more a symbol of age, stability, and motherhood, hence of caring and sharing, than a symbol of teasing, erotic sensual pleasure, hence of short lived indulgence.  

Bloch-Smith also associates the figurines with lactation, saying, “The prominent breasts of both the molded head and beak-face types suggest that the figurine’s symbolic function was to beseech adequate lactation to sustain newborns and infants.” Following Albright, Dever claims that the figurines “emphasized the breasts, so much so that the eye is inevitably drawn there (there being nothing else to see),” eventually concluding that “the female figurines were connected principally through not exclusively with reproduction.” Somewhat amusingly, Dever contrasts the Canaanite nude plaque figurines, which he calls the “lascivious courtesan of the gods,” with the Israelite pillar figurines, which he suggests are “much more chaste” in portraying the deity as a nursing mother. Regardless of whether the interpreter believes the figurines are part of fertility

\[115\] Engle, “Pillar Figurines of the Iron Age,” 114.  
\[117\] Dever, Did God Have a Wife, 187.  
\[118\] Ibid., 194.  
\[119\] Ibid., 187.
rites or strictly relate to lactation, the breasts remain at the center of the interpretive focus.  

More recent scholarship also includes a focus on the domestic context of many figurines. Early excavators, such as McCowan at Tell en Nasbeh, were well aware of the figurines domestic contexts. Perhaps the domestic context received little attention in early scholarship because relatively few domiciles were excavated, published, and highlighted. As more domestic units became known, or at least emphasized, the association between JPFs and domestic structures increased. For example, in his influential essay on Israelite religion, Holladay discusses figurines in his section on domestic contexts, as does Daviau in her essay on Jordanian figurines and domestic cult.

Understanding the figurines as cultic objects and recognizing their location in domestic structures leads most interpreters to suggest that the contexts in which the figurines are found reflect use (rather than random disposal) in household shrines. For example, a single figurine head was found in the back of a four-room house at Tell Halif, along with an incense stand and limestone blocks; Borowski identifies the space as a

See also, Keel and Uehlinger, Gods, Goddesses, and Images of Gods, 332-33.

For more on the tenuous relationship between domestic structures and archaeological deposits see Chapter 1.

McCowan, Tell en-Nasbeh, 245.

Holladay, “Religion in Israel and Judah under the Monarchy,” 275-80.

domestic shrine.\(^{125}\) He then discusses the household shrine in light of Hezekiah’s reforms, expecting that the household activity should be problematic for the state sponsored Yahwism. Yezerski and Geva associate the figurines from the Jewish Quarter with a household-based popular cult,\(^{126}\) presumably following Kletter, who argues that most of the provenienced figurines come from the “domestic realm.”\(^{127}\)

Nevertheless, it is important to note that context has remained largely secondary to iconographic-based interpretations. Interpreters have associated the figurines with women, popular religion, and fertility and the family regardless of the archaeological context. This is still the case. For example, Ryan Byrne interprets the figurines as fertility and fecundity inducing tools, though he argues against the sole association between the figurines and domestic units.\(^{128}\) Even Kletter appears to consider his own context data in need of iconographic emendation when he states, “The function of the Asherah figurines
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\(^{126}\) Yezerski and Geva, “Iron Age II Clay Figurines,” 67.

\(^{127}\) Kletter, *Judean Pillar-Figurines*, 62. Kletter does couch this conclusion in a number of caveats, including the relatively small number of figurines recorded from discernible contexts, the problems distinguishing between one context and another, and the difficulty deciding whether certain contexts are domestic or not (see Chapter 1). Cf. with Meyers (“Terracottas without Texts,” 121) who says “virtually all of the JPFs come from household contexts.” While Kletter does place the majority of the provenienced figurines in the domestic category, this is only a very small percentage of the entirety of Kletter’s corpus. Also depending on Kletter’s data see Mastin (“Yahweh’s Asherah,” 335-37) who, with some reservation, notes the similarities between Kletter’s household context for the figurines and the biblical description of worship in private houses.

was possibly as a protecting figure in domestic houses, more likely a figure which bestowed ‘plenty’ especially in the domain of female lives (but not necessarily used by women only).” The association with “plenty” and “female lives” rests on little more than the iconography of the figurine, regardless of the context.

That having been said, Kletter does allow for the possibility of non-female users. Nor is he alone in this suggestion. Moorey argues that the figurines were used by females “in as much as they were concerned about the entire family,” and he claims that the figurines were not for individual women but families and communities. Finally, Zevit says that evidence for the exclusivity of fertility concerns is wanting, suggesting instead that the figurines might be used for any type of ritual need.

2.4 Conclusion

The interpretation of JPFs includes multiple perspectives. Some scholars attempt to associate the figurines with deities, like Astarte or Asherah; and others identify them with human supplicants or consider them magical implements. Some interpreters address the archaeological context of the figurines and others the technological characteristics. Certain authors focus on the figurines and their relationship to biblical texts, while others

129 Kletter, Judean Pillar-Figurines, 81.
130 Ibid., 75.
use the Hebrew Bible only to set the backdrop for the socio-religious world of Iron II Judah. Many interpreters portray the figurines as part of popular and family religion, while others prefer to place the figurines in the realm of state or official religion. Furthermore, infinite and varying combinations of all these elements are possible.

Despite these differences, almost every interpreter emphasizes the iconography of the figurines, specifically the breasts. Scholars who posit an association with goddesses frequently call that goddess a *dea nutrix* or nurturing/fertility goddess, based primarily on their assumptions about the figurines’ breasts and thus the gender of the deity invoked and the particular concerns brought before that deity. The association with popular rather than official Yahwism is largely based on either the identification of the figurines with a goddess or the association between the figurines and a fertility cult assumed to be abhorrent to proper Yahwism. Regardless of whether the figurines are understood as deities or as humans, the identification of who used the figurines and for what purpose depends largely on the presence of breasts on the figurines but also, although far less frequently, on the figurines’ presence in domestic structures.

In the final analysis, JPF scholarship as a whole is concerned with the function of the figurines; and the majority position, that the figurines were used to induce fertility and/or nourishment and were used primarily by women, is based on iconography. Scholars offer this opinion whether or not they try to identify the figurines as a goddess or a human. Several reasons can be suggested for the fact that scholarship has moved little beyond this point: simplifications of earlier scholars’ work, the general dearth of textual information about the figurines, and modern interpretive assumptions about
ancient iconography and its relationship to the function of figurines and the people who may have used them. The last of these problems has been exacerbated by scholars’ sole reliance on biblical texts.
CHAPTER 3: NEO-ASSYRIAN FIGURINE RITUALS AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL INTERPRETATION

A key component of traditional figurine studies is the examination of similar artifacts from elsewhere in the ancient Near East. These works often investigate comparable iconographic styles and production techniques; but, in the case of JPFs, studies do not normally include any serious examination of the ritual texts from these cultures. Instead, archaeologists and biblical scholars rely upon reconstructions of biblical texts, models derived from ethnographic analogy, or simple common sense.

Fortunately, several Neo-Assyrian ritual texts not only mention clay figurines but also provide information about the use of figurines in curative and protective rituals. These rituals can be used to examine the validity of common assumptions about figurines, including statuettes in Iron II Judah. This chapter first (3.1) briefly outlines the methodology for applying Neo-Assyrian texts to the interpretation of Iron II Judean figurines. It then (3.2) reviews figurine studies that have mentioned these texts and (3.3) summarizes Anatolian and Egyptian texts describing figurines. Next, (3.4) the chapter examines the historical accuracy of the Neo-Assyrian texts and (3.5) summarizes the various figurine texts from Neo-Assyrian Mesopotamia. Finally, (3.6) it focuses on texts that describe anti-witchcraft rituals, magico-medical ritual texts for the expulsion of ghosts, and texts describing the creation of apotropaic household guardians. This information is then used to test the validity of certain interpretive inferences applied to clay figurines, such as the humans or deities that the figurines represent, the level of
religion to which they belong, the socio-economic status of their owners, and their place in the domestic unit.

3.1 Using and applying Neo-Assyrian texts to Iron II Judean figurines

The following chapter will focus on Neo-Assyrian textual descriptions of clay figurines, using them to help interpret the Judean corpus. Thus, it is important to begin by recognizing the mistakes regularly made by scholars who use Near Eastern texts to interpret Israelite religion. Biblical scholars have justified their use of ancient Near Eastern texts by claiming that the ancient world’s religious practices and beliefs were conservative by nature. Thus, some modern interpreters feel free to use information from various millennia and multiple Near Eastern cultures to explain missing or cryptic elements of Israelite religion.¹ Depending on the goal of research, similarities may be

---

¹ This justification applies to older works like that of Yehezkiel Kaufmann (*The Religion of Israel: From its Beginnings to the Babylonian Exile* [trans. Moshe Greenberg; New York: Schocken Books, 1972], 7), who uses ancient Near Eastern texts as well as anthropology to describe pre-Mosaic religion, as well as quite recent writing, such as Jacob Milgrom (*Leviticus 1-16: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* [AB 3; New York: Doubleday, 1991], 932-33) whose three-volume commentary reads like a compendium of ancient Near Eastern texts and religion.
highlighted to “flesh out” unclear details in Israelite religion. Conversely, differences may be accentuated to distinguish Israel from her pagan neighbors.

Theories that stress the conservative nature of ancient Near Eastern religion are actually relying upon a perceived cultural continuum that stretches across time and space. Despite its continued resonance, this theoretical paradigm is not new. The cultural continuum model has prompted theories of religion from the universal continuum of religious belief in E. B. Tylor and James Frazer to Günkel’s “universal history of Religion.” Using the same temporal and cultural continuum, Emile Durkheim attempts

---

2 A fairly recent example is the work on cult of the dead by Theodore Lewis. Although aware of the fact that Israelites borrowed certain Canaanite features and rejected others, nowhere does his text include any argument for the connection between Ugaritic texts and Late Bronze Canaanite religion in Palestine, nor does he explain how the Israelites may have come into contact with any of these conceptions concerning the “cult of the dead.” Lewis uses Ugaritic texts and biblical texts interchangeably, justified by the linguistic continuity between cognate languages. Theordore Lewis, *Cult of the Dead in Ancient Israel and Ugarit* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989), 1, 43-45. See also Bloch-Smith, *Judaite Burial Practices*, 109-32.


4 For an explicit statement about “cultural continuity” as the basis for comparison see, Karel van der Toorn, *Family Religion in Babylonia, Syria, and Israel*, 4-6. Although van der Toorn is aware that Babylon, Syria, and Israel must have distinctive traits, he gives no other justification for comparing and compiling the three distinct cultures and time periods except a cultural continuum.


to discover the elementary components of all “religious” life. Furthermore, the cultural-continuum model, based on linguistic cognates, manifests itself in Max Müller and the search for the Indo-European origins of modern European nation-states. Admittedly, these early scholars utilized an excessively broad range of time and space. They believed that all religion could be fitted to an evolutionary scheme, which allowed them to compare vastly disparate sources without consideration of their geographic or temporal context.

In biblical studies, the Pan-Babylonian school, or “myth and ritual” school, limited their work to a smaller geographic range and based their comparisons on linguistic cognates; but they, too, posited a cultural continuum reaching across miles and millennia. Despite these deficiencies, J. Z. Smith credits this school with seeing “the

---


10 The Pan-Babylonian School, as represented in Friedrich Delitzsch, utilized comparative mythology, similar in fashion to that of Frazer and/or Max Müller. There was a move away from this approach in the 1920s, as B. Landsberger, “advocated the perception of the Babylonian world through a study of its own language and the categories inherent in it.” See Richard Hess, “One Hundred Fifty Years of Comparative Studies on Genesis 1-11: An Overview,” in *I Studied Inscriptions From Before the Flood: Ancient Near Eastern, Literary, and Linguistic Approaches to Genesis 1-11* (ed. Richard Hess and David Toshio Tsumura; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1994). Thus, in the field of Assyriology scholars began to distance themselves from the assumption that a common Semitic world view existed for East and West Semitic peoples in the ancient Near East. Hess (“One Hundred and Fifty Years,” 9-10) continues, however, to explain that while this was an important step in Assyriology, many biblical scholars continued to stress the shared features.
need to ground comparison and patterns in a historical process.”¹¹ They did not merely posit a general cultural conservatism but actually attempted to explain the diffusion of cultural influences in the history of the ancient Near East.

Regardless of their attempts, the myth and ritual school was unable to construct a convincing historical argument; and scholars eventually abandoned the hypothesized dispersion of Babylonian culture. Nevertheless, interpreters continue to use Mesopotamian texts to reconstruct the religion of Israel. Few studies identify the historical circumstances that account for the way Israelites may have come into contact with the concepts and practices embedded in other ancient Near Eastern texts. Even less consideration is given to whether those ancient Near Eastern texts actually reflect the beliefs and practices of people living where the texts originated.

As described in Chapter 9, the interpretation of figurine iconography falls prey to the cultural conservatism model. Smith describes the logic behind this paradigm when he states “[f]or, as practiced by scholarship, comparison has been chiefly an affair of the recollection of similarity,” and continuing, “[i]t is a process of working from a psychological association to an historical one; it is to assert that similarity and contiguity have causal effect.”¹² Smith is suggesting that a surface similarity between two geographically contiguous cultures could be due to chance rather than a common cause or


genetic relationship. For example, the presence of the iconographic design “hands on breasts” in multiple time periods and locations may be caused by any number of factors that remain to be proven. The similarity of objects’ design is not enough to ascertain the nature of their relationship.

The religious conservatism paradigm takes the relationship between similarity and causality for granted. In other words, scholars assume that the same iconographic style is understood the same way over thousands of years and across multiple cultures. This assumption is never argued nor proven but taken as fact. It takes for granted that a “spirit of the age” existed in which people shared a collective way of thinking about religion. The danger is that, instead of paying attention to specificity and particularity—the possibility that a potter could use similar iconographic types for different reasons, that a symbol could be divorced from its meaning in other settings, that individuals in the same context could relate differently to the same image—scholars inadvertently posit broad similarities that match predetermined notions about “mentalities of periods of history.”

Because comparison has been based on a cultural conservatism paradigm, particularly in the study of figurine iconography, it is important to clarify how comparison in the present study differs. The Neo-Assyrian textual corpus can be brought to bear on interpretations of JPFs in two ways. First, there is a historical and temporal relationship between the two cultures. The Neo-Assyrian texts in question all date to the

ninth through the sixth centuries B.C.E., making them coterminous with the Judean figurines. They also come from an empire that had political control over Judah as well as the majority of Judah’s neighbors (see Chapter 10 for more on this point). Coincidentally, the rise of Judean figurines corresponds with the time when Judah is under Assyrian domination and, conversely, prior to that point figurines had not been pervasive since the end of the Late Bronze Age. Finally, these texts describe figurines made with the same technological characteristics (clay composition) as those in the southern kingdom.

This is not to downplay the differences. Most of the texts come from collections in large Mesopotamian urban centers, a far cry from the most developed city in Judah—Jerusalem—let alone the smaller towns in the Judean hinterland. Obviously the temple complexes in Mesopotamia were more developed than any religious institutions in southern Israel. The texts come from a dominant imperial power rather than a small state on the fringes of the international scene. The Neo-Assyrian figurines described in this chapter are primarily male and/or *mischwesen*. Thus, they do not share the same iconographic style as figurines of Iron II Judah.

These differences must be taken into consideration in any historical argument that uses the Assyrian texts to interpret JPFs, however, this is not the limit of the texts’ usefulness. A second option is to use the texts to test assumptions made by modern interpreters about ancient figurines. As was demonstrated in Chapter 2, most modern interpretations rest on logical inferences applied to figurine iconography, including interpretations made on the basis of the figurines’ breasts, the technological quality of the statuettes, and the gender of the images. The interpretive logic rests on several
hypothetical connections. Interpreters assume that figurine design indicates figurine function, that the design contains information about the people using figurines, that technological quality indicates the socio-economic status of the owners, and that the location of figurine fragments indicate the level of religious activity in which the figurines were used (public/private, orthodox/heterodox, etc.).

These inferences should be tested by the ancient material; but because the Hebrew Bible does not describe clay figurines, it does not provide the needed system of checks and balances. The coterminous Neo-Assyrian texts provide a way to test the validity of the modern hypotheses. In light of the ancient texts some of the inferences will remain unchallenged. Alternatively, many inferences will prove to be false or, at best, unsupportable because the design element, clay property, or location is nonindicative.

3.2 Scholarly treatment of ancient Near Eastern texts describing figurines

This study is not the first to consider Mesopotamian figurine ritual texts. Kletter’s 1996 work devotes a short section to Mesopotamian texts, including several of those discussed below.14 Kletter does not enter into a full investigation of these texts, concluding, instead, that they are of limited value. In his view, the sources may provide some insight into JPF function as “good” magic, but they do not provide any understanding of the figurine’s “meaning.” Ultimately, he insists that the figurines are

14 Kletter, Judean Pillar-Figurines, 70-71.
magical and that they must represent the deity Asherah because she is mentioned in the Hebrew Bible, but he gives little consideration to this putative association between the figurines, the goddess Asherah, and the biblical terminology that may be associated with her. The by-product of his biblo-centeric interpretation, however, is that he abandons any in-depth consideration of the only group of coterminous texts that do describe clay figurine rituals.

In her monograph on Syrian Bronze Age figurines, Alice Petty pays more attention to the first millennium figurine texts. She outlines both the sympathetic and apotropaic uses of figurines in various Assyrian and Babylonian sources. Unfortunately, the figurines she is studying date to a much earlier period and thus limit the extent to which she can use these texts for the interpretation of her corpus.

Finally, Karel van der Toorn’s essay on JPFs is full of allusions to ancient Mesopotamian texts. His conclusions are vague, but he seems to suggest that the figurines were human votives for the goddess Asherah rather than representations of deities. He believes the cheapness of the clay JPFs indicates that they could not have represented divine figures. This conclusion is strange in light of the fact that van der Toorn cites Mesopotamian texts describing the clay production of lower-level

---

15 Ibid., 80-81.
18 Ibid., 58, 62.
19 Ibid., 56, 58.
supernatural creatures. Further, although van der Toorn concedes that no figurines in Israel are demonstrably votives, he proceeds with this argument regardless.\(^{20}\) So, while van der Toorn is aware of the Mesopotamian material and brings it to bear on JPFs in a limited way, he does not investigate the texts in detail nor take their content into account.

As Theodore Lewis has noted, there is no biblical prohibition against the construction of clay images.\(^{21}\) In fact, the Bible lacks any reference to clay figurines (for more on this point, see Chapter 9). This fact has been ignored by most interpreters for two reasons. First, they have assumed, based on the JPF design, that the figurines depict goddesses. Textual interpretation is then targeted at identifying the most likely goddess in the Bible or other ancient Near Eastern texts.\(^{22}\) Second, interpreters have focused on the naked female iconographic type and therefore primarily compare JPFs with other naked female goddesses.\(^{23}\) As a result, non-female clay figurines are ignored; but, if comparison is made on the basis of technological style rather than iconographic similarity, the Neo-Assyrian ritual texts from the ninth through sixth centuries B.C.E. take on increased significance.

\[^{20}\text{Ibid., 59.}\]
\[^{21}\text{Lewis, “Syro-Palestinian Iconography and Divine Images,” 87.}\]
\[^{22}\text{Kletter, Judean Pillar-Figurines, 73-76, 81. For authors who consistently associated the figurines with goddesses see ibid., 16-27.}\]
\[^{23}\text{For a few of many examples see ibid., 23-24 where Kletter discusses the “Iconographic School.”}\]
3.3 Overview of texts in Anatolia and Egypt

The present focus on Mesopotamian texts deserves clarification, for they are not the only texts that refer to clay images in magico-ritual contexts. For example, human and animal clay models were used for many purposes according to Hittite ritual texts, including effigies of divine, demonic, or human actors. There are two reasons that the Hittite texts are less suitable for comparison with Judean practices. The first is chronological: the Hittite texts are much earlier than the JPFs. Second, much of the material in the Hittite corpus is related to that of Mesopotamia, either historically or topically, and thus adds little new information to the Mesopotamian material.

Another group of texts come from Pharaonic Egypt. Elizabeth Waraksa has associated several Egyptian terms with female figurines, including two spells recited to repel poisonous snakes and stomach trouble. She claims that the second spell is meant to transfer stomach pain onto a female clay figurine of Isis. Although interesting, the relevance of this material to Judean figurines is questionable. In her dissertation she cites only two spells in all of Egyptian spell literature, the first of which has an unknown provenience and dates to the First Intermediate period, making it of limited use in the


25 Ibid., 13.

eighth through sixth centuries. Moreover, the linguistic evidence from the first spell is somewhat problematic. The second of her examples, a spell against stomach pain, is more applicable, since it is a mixture of Middle and Late Egyptian and actually contains the word “image.” Still, the main part of the text dates to the second millennium, and the general paucity of evidence is troublesome.

There is, however, better attested evidence for the use of non-female or non-clay figurines, including human and demonic execration figurines and substitutionary animal figu...
figurines.\textsuperscript{32} Egyptian magicians who presided over these rituals were associated with the
temple as “lector priests” employed by the temple to work in the Houses of Life where
the transmission of protective rituals took place,\textsuperscript{33} as priests of the god of magic, Heka,\textsuperscript{34}
as priests of the goddess Sekhmet,\textsuperscript{35} and as doctor, scorpion charmer, or amulet man.\textsuperscript{36}
Indeed, Pinch claims that these titles can be used interchangeably.\textsuperscript{37}

While the Hittite and Egyptian texts do not provide either compendious or directly
applicable resources for understanding eighth through sixth century Judean clay
figurines, the references in those two bodies of literature do set the scene for the

\textsuperscript{32} Ritner, \textit{Mechanics of Ancient Egyptian Magical Practice}, 147 n.663. In general, it appears that wax
figurines are far more common than their clay counterpart (ibid., 150 n. 679, 185-86 and Pinch, \textit{Magic in
Ancient Egypt}, 87). See further M. J. Raven, \textit{Wax in Egyptian Magic and Symbolism} (Oudheidkundige
Mededelingen uit het Rijksmuseum van Oudheden te Leiden 64; Leiden: Rijksmuseum van Oudheden,
1983). For an example of clay zoomorphic figurines see Leitz’s (\textit{Magical and Medical Papyri}, 70)
Incantation 32 (=Wreszinski Incantation 44) which uses an “ibis of clay” placed in the opening of a wound
to prevent bleeding. For more spells with clay and wax animal figurines, see Peter F. Dorman, \textit{Faces in
Clay: Techniques, Imagery, and Allusion in a Corpus of Ceramic Sculpture from Ancient Egypt} (Münchner

\textsuperscript{33} Pinch, \textit{Magic}, 52.

\textsuperscript{34} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{35} Ibid., 53.

\textsuperscript{36} Ibid., 55-56. Supporting the position that all magic was performed by the “scribally-trained priesthood”
see Robert K. Ritner, “The Religious, Social, and Legal Parameters of Traditional Egyptian Magic,” in
\textit{Ancient Magic Ritual Power} (Religions in the Graeco-Roman World 129; ed. Marvin Meyer and Paul

\textsuperscript{37} Ibid., 56. Pinch also states that women may have played magical roles, but they are not well attested in
the texts. Pinch’s arguments must be used with caution, however, because of the lack of chronological
specificity in much of her work. While it is sometimes possible to identify the date of her source texts, it is
frequently indeterminable. More, Egyptian “periods” may span several centuries. For example, the Third
Intermediate period can range from the eleventh through the seventh centuries and the Late period covers
the seventh through the fourth centuries (depending on the author). Thus, even when a text is dated to a
period in Egyptian history, it is frequently difficult to synchronize that text with the eighth through the sixth
centuries in Judah.
following discussion. The fact that clay figurines “figure” in the ritual texts of multiple ancient Near Eastern cultures provides an important resource for the study of Judean figurines. Not only are clay figurines common in the archaeological record of the ancient Near East, but they also appear in texts about sympathetic and apotropaic rites in those same cultures over a wide range of time.

3.4 Historical validity of the Neo-Assyrian texts

The Neo-Assyrian ritual texts are extensive and their ritual scope all-encompassing. These facts, however, do not necessarily make the documents reliable witnesses to the ritual life of Neo-Assyrian Mesopotamia, let alone to that of Judah. Thus, it is useful to consider the texts using the criteria that Raymond Wood suggests for assessing the credibility of historical documents in his essay, “Ethnohistory and Historical Method.” These include (3.4.1) an author’s temporal proximity to an event, (3.4.2) the purpose of the document, its intended audience, and the competence of the author, (3.4.3) and how the document relates to the “prevailing ideology of the period of its composition.”

3.4.1 Authorship and temporal proximity

The question of authorship and temporal proximity is important. Scholars have commonly interpreted the Neo-Assyrian texts as mere copies of Old Babylonian or Kassite originals. For example, in her edition of the Mesopotamian Šurpu incantations and rituals, Erica Reiner states that although the texts date to the time of Assurbanipal or Tiglath Pileser I, they must be copies of an original Old Babylonian text. She further writes, “There is reason to assume that most of the main literary works originated, or were given their final form, in the Kassite period, and Šurpu should not be an exception.” Were this the case, it could be argued that the recovered texts reflect only an archaizing tendency in imperial scholarship, with little connection to life in the ninth through the sixth centuries.

In contrast, both Joann Scurlock and Tzvi Abusch claim that the Neo-Assyrian texts are important reflections of Neo-Assyrian attitudes and praxis. For several reasons these texts should be considered witnesses to life in Mesopotamian cities in the Iron II. First, whether or not the texts were copied from older originals, they betray the interests and concerns of those who copied them. Second, the various rituals are mentioned in

41 Figurines were certainly used prior to the ninth century B.C.E. For example, one ritual from the Middle Babylonian period excavated at Boğazköy instructs a figurine or doll of reed, wood, and fabric to be made in order to marry her to a ghost responsible for disease. This is quite similar to a few other “hand of ghost” figurine texts (see below). See Walter Farber, “How to Marry a Disease: Epidemics, Contagion, and a
Neo-Assyrian correspondence, thus attesting to active practice during the period. For example, a letter between the exorcist Nabû-nādin-šumi and Esarhaddon in 670 B.C.E. discusses in some length the series Maqlû, an extended anti-witchcraft ritual.³² Third, many of these texts were included in the exorcist’s professional manual, otherwise known as the “vademecum of the exorcist” discovered at Aššur (KAR 44 11b). This text mentions multiple figurine rituals, such as bīt mēseri, a ritual involving clay figurines in the healing of a sick man.³³ Finally, actual figurines matching the types described in the šep lemutti and bīt mēseri texts have been recovered from ninth through sixth century loci at many sites, including Aššur, Nimrud, Nineveh, Kish, Ur, and Babylon.³⁴ Thus,}

---


³³ Ibid., 105.

³⁴ For the earliest argument connecting excavated figurines with these rituals, see C. Leonard Woolley, “Babylonian Prophylactic Figures,” JRAS 3 (1926), 689-713. More recently, see Nakamura, “Dedicating Magic,” 14. For more on the figurines, see Nakamura, “Mastering Matters,” 18-45; Anthony Green, “Neo-Assyrian Apotropaic Figures,” 87-96. The distinctive style and archaeological distribution of these figurines was recognized by Ellis in his study of foundation deposits; see Richard S. Ellis, Foundation Deposits in Ancient Mesopotamia (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1968), 164. Contra Wiggermann, Nakamura, and Green, who connect the clay figurines with KAR 298 (šep lemutti), van Buren claims that the figurine distribution differed from the text and thus did not reflect actual implementation of the apotropaic text. She does admit the text and the figurines share stylistic designs. See Elizabeth Douglas Van Buren, Foundation Figurines and Offerings (Berlin: Hans Schoetz and Co. G. M. B. H., Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1931), 46. Van Buren’s argument is based on the fact that the figurines are often
despite any similarity to or dependence upon earlier texts, the rituals were surely practiced in the Neo-Assyrian period, at the time when Judah was under the domination of the Neo-Assyrian Empire.

3.4.2 Purpose of the document, intended audience, and competence of the author

Most of the following texts were written by and for an educated, professional audience. They are associated with the āšipu or mašmašu, variously translated as “exorcist,” “conjuror,” or “magician,” and perhaps also, according to Scurlock, “healer.”45 According to Frederick Cryer, the āšipu was probably “a common designation for a number of priests whose essential function was the cure of the sick and the warding

found in sealed boxes made of clay bricks, which is not prescribed in any of the apotropaic ritual texts. While this is generally true, Green, “Neo-Assyrian Apotropaic Figures,” 89 cites a large deposit of figurines excavated at Fort Shalmaneser at Nimrud that were not contained in boxes. Wiggermann’s suggestion (Mesopotamian Protective Spirits, 99-101, 147-52), echoed by Nakamura (“Dedicating Magic,” 21), is that one should not expect to discover exact correlations between the ritual texts and the archaeological record; the minor divergences between the two do not erase the significant similarities in design as well as proscribed location at doors, corners, gates, and courtyards. For more on the creative freedom in implementation of apotropaic rituals, see Ellis, “Trouble with ‘Hairies’,” 164-65.

45 JoAnn Scurlock, “Physician, Exorcist, Conjuror, Magician: A Tale of Two Healing Professionals,” in Mesopotamian Magic: Textual, Historical, and Interpretative Perspectives (ed. Tzvi Abusch and Karel van der Toorn; Groningen: Styx, 1999), 69. Scholars have not always agreed that the Sumerian mašmašu and the Akkadian āšipu refer to the same job. For the background of this debate as well as an extensive overview of Neo-Assyrian literature that proves that the terms are equivalent see Jean, Magie Néo-Assyrienne en contexte, 5-53. Here Jean considers lexical lists, hymns, mythic texts, comical texts, annals, and letters, concluding that the āšipu performed a broad range of tasks in the Neo-Assyrian period, including magic, medicine, purification rituals, and scribal activity and that many tasks were associated with the temple or the king.
off of untoward portents." Further, it is likely that the work of the diviner, bārû, and that of the āšipu overlapped or that the āšipu eventually took over most of the divinatory functions of the bārû.

It should be emphasized that the āšipu was a type of priest. For example, one of the copies of šep lemutti ina bīt amēli parāsu, or “to block the entry of enemy into someone’s house,” was found in the house of the āšipu of the temple of Aššur. In fact, most of the ritual texts discussed below come from the same context, including (though certainly not limited to) the following: the cleansing of the mouth (mēs pi), evil demons (utukkū lemnūtu), enclosure house (bīt mēseri), burning (maqlû), burning (šurpu), sexual potency (ŠÀ.ZI.GA), Lamaštu, to calm a baby (LÚ.TUR.ḪUN.GÁ), entry of the enemy


47 Scurlock, “Physician, Exorcist, Conjurer, Magician,” 77

48 Cryer, *Divination in Ancient Israel*, 163 following Leo A. Oppenheim, “Divination and Celestial Observation in the Last Assyrian Empire,” *Centaurus* 14 (1969): 100. Compare with Jean (*Magie Néo-Assyrienne en contexte*, 149), who claims that the presence of divination texts in the library of the exorcists in Aššur was the result of interdisciplinary curiosity.

49 Wiggermann, *Mesopotamian Protective Spirits*, 41, 91. See also G. van Driel, *The Cult of Aššur* (Assen, the Netherlands: Royal VanGorcum Ltd, 1969), 181. Jean (*Magie Néo-Assyrienne en contexte*, 139-143) warns that the title of LÚ.MAŠ.MAŠ É—Aššur, or “exorcist of the temple of Aššur” occurs only here in the literature and thus the title may be idiosyncratic. At the same time, she still associates the exorcists with temple service based on other evidence including, lexical lists, letters, and ritual functions associated with cult images and animal sacrifice. For an alternate perspective see Simo Parpola, *Letters from Assyrian Scholars to the Kings*, 10-11. Parpola claims that while some evidence connects the exorcists with the temple, they should not be understood strictly as “priests” as they do not regularly officiate in the temples.
(šep lemutti), and NAM.BÚR.BI incantations.\textsuperscript{50} According to Pedersén, the library represents the activities of a family of exorcists associated with the temple.\textsuperscript{51}

Scurlock argues that the names followed by the job title “āšipu” in the colophon of exorcist documents indicate both the owner of the texts as well as the writer.\textsuperscript{52} The āšipu were responsible for copying the texts and, according to Abusch, continually reshaping the incantations and rituals, thus accounting for the myriad of variations between ritual tablets.\textsuperscript{53} The authors were certainly competent professionals, schooled in a complex literary tradition. Further, the similarities between the letters describing exorcists’ activities and the ritual texts from ancient libraries seems to indicate that the ritual texts do relate to some aspect of lived ritual practice.

3.4.3 Prevailing ideology

The issue of “prevailing ideology” means identifying to which segment of the population these texts apply. Are they the product of a small minority with little influence on the worldview of the general population or do they reflect more widespread practices?

\textsuperscript{50} Olof Pedersén, \textit{Archives and Libraries in the City of Assur} (Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis. Studia Semitica Upsaliensia 8; Uppsala, Sweden: Almqvist and Wiksell, 1986), 48-49. Pedersén includes a list of at least 35 different types of texts in the library.

\textsuperscript{51} Ibid., 58.

\textsuperscript{52} Scurlock, “Physician, Exorcist, Conjurer, Magician,” 74.

\textsuperscript{53} Abusch, \textit{Mesopotamian Witchcraft}, 10-11.
Although the textual evidence indicates that the rituals were performed for the king\textsuperscript{54} and that the āšipu worked for the temple, the relationship between the āšipu and the city’s non-royal inhabitants remains to be proven. As will be explained, because many of these rituals are expensive and complicated, the ability of poor populations to access the exorcist’s services has been questioned.\textsuperscript{55}

While admitting the paucity of evidence for the exorcist’s private clientele, Cryer points out that the kit required by rituals like the NAM.BÚ.R.BI (rituals for protection and defense against evil) presuppose transportable cultic equipment for use outside fixed temple space. He further argues that texts like the series of diagnostic omens explicitly state, “when the exorcist goes to the patient’s house.”\textsuperscript{56} These phrases regularly occur in protective rituals like bīt mēseri and šep lemutti, suggesting that the exorcists did, in fact, make house calls.

\textsuperscript{54} Cryer, \textit{Divination in Ancient Israel}, 163 n.2.

\textsuperscript{55} Wiggermann, \textit{Mesopotamian Protective Spirits}, 92 and Abusch, \textit{Mesopotamian Witchcraft}, 5, 8 n.12. These arguments can be quite problematic. For example, Abusch cites Oppenheim as his model for establishing an early folk tradition behind the finished text of Maqlû (ibid., 2 n.3). Oppenheim speculatively claims that early divinatory omen texts directly reflect a folkloric tradition of the individual, which he negatively contrasts with the highly-esteemed and learned tradition of the official diviner; see A. Leo Oppenheim, \textit{Ancient Mesopotamia: Portrait of a Dead Civilization}, (rev. ed.; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1977), 226. See also Cryer, \textit{Divination in Ancient Israel}, 129-32. As for Wiggermann, (\textit{Mesopotamian Protective Spirits}, 92), he cites a number of smaller texts that all contain the phrase šep lemutti; but only two actually appear to include figurines.

\textsuperscript{56} Cryer, \textit{Divination in Ancient Israel}, 207 n.4. Jean (\textit{Magie Néo-Assyrienne en contexte}, 184) also mentions this text, which is from \textit{Traité de Diagnostics et Pronostics médicaux}, abbreviated TDP or referred to in English as the Akkadian Diagnostic Handbook. She warns that the corpus was originally composed before the Neo-Assyrian period and may reflect the exorcists’ situation prior to their newfound popularity with the royal court. At the same time, Jean cites no evidence that exorcists stopped functioning in non-royal public life.
A further illustration of this point is the distribution of text types in Aššur. If the āšipu only served the temple officials and kings, the libraries associated with the temple and the palace would have large concentrations of ritual texts. In actuality, the number of rituals texts involving figurines present in the library and temple are dwarfed by those in the exorcist house library.\(^{57}\) Furthermore, the fact that the āšipu appear to be the main stewards of their own professional texts may indicate some autonomy, as agents of the temple, but ones who can exercise their arts outside of its walls. Finally, the āšipu have a house of their own in the city; they do not reside in the palace as might be expected if they only served the royal family.\(^{58}\)

Of further interest is the fact that the libraries of other private houses at Aššur contain a small number of texts overlapping with those in the exorcist’s house,\(^{59}\) whereas the archives do not.\(^{60}\) At first glance it seems that this is the sought-after connection between ordinary people and the āšipu, but Pedersén notes that these private libraries

\(^{57}\) Compare Pedersén, *Archives and Libraries*, 19 for the temple library with ibid., 77-78 for the prince’s palace library.

\(^{58}\) Jean, *Magie Néo-Assyrienne en contexte*, 192. According to Jean (ibid., 193), the exorcists at Nineveh also lived in the city and could own fields and property outside the city.

\(^{59}\) Pedersén, *Archives and Libraries*, 30, 81-85. Jean (*Magie Néo-Assyrienne en contexte*, 154, 164) also compares the exorcists’ library with the other private libraries, noting the overlap in certain texts. Further, she compares the exorcists’ library with libraries outside of Aššur, both those associated with exorcists and those that were not. She claims that the contents of the libraries are not enough, in and of themselves, to identify the owner’s profession but that there is a relationship between known exorcists from various time periods and the texts that they seemed to collect.

\(^{60}\) Pedersén, *Archives and Libraries*, Archives 9-35.
belong to households probably affiliated with the Aššur temple.\textsuperscript{61} Obviously, houses that contain either libraries or archives hardly represent the lowest stratum of society. It is also notable that the archives, which are more plentiful than the libraries and which are found in houses dispersed throughout the excavated area, do not tend to contain ritual texts. Thus, either the exorcists were the sole caretakers of ritual for the non-temple affiliated inhabitants, or the rituals performed by private individuals were not preserved in textual form. Ultimately, although the socio-economic status of the clients is not emphasized in the texts, it seems probable that the exorcists served large segments of society, not only the royal house.\textsuperscript{62} The main cause of doubt is not evidence to the contrary, but a lack of extant evidence, save that of correspondence between the royal house and the exorcists.

### 3.5 Neo-Assyrian texts describing figurine rituals

Before analyzing three specific Neo-Assyrian texts, it would be beneficial to situate these texts in the larger Neo-Assyrian collection of texts that mention figurines. Quite a few texts describe the use of figurines in rituals. Cynthia Jean mentions two different war rituals involving figurines. One (K 6207 + K 6225) calls for the production

\textsuperscript{61} Ibid., 144-5. See also Van Driel (\textit{Cult of Aššur}, 181), who warns that the affiliations between the exorcists, the singers, the scribes, and the temple, though probable, cannot be absolutely certain.

\textsuperscript{62} Abusch, \textit{Mesopotamian Witchcraft}, 5. Abusch argues that the majority of the clients were private but from the upper classes and central administration. Jean also points out the dearth of evidence for private functions of the exorcist; but she does include the petition of Urad-Gula, which refers to an “exorcist of the province” whom the king employed and a prayer to Marduk that mentions the exorcist walking in the street with the ecstatic and the serpent charmer (\textit{Magie Néo-Assyrienne en contexte}, 184).
of a figurine of the enemy in a sympathetic ritual, and the other (Sm 295) notes the
collection of apotropaic lion statuettes and armed figures made of cornel wood.\textsuperscript{63} Also
in war, Ik-Teshub, the king of Shrubia, creates a statue of himself and requests
Esarhaddon transfer the blame of Ik-Teshub onto the statue in order to save Shrubia from
Esarhaddon’s siege.\textsuperscript{64} Additionally, Jean includes three letters that mention apotropaic or
substitutionary figurines.\textsuperscript{65}

The ritual texts ŠÂ.ZI.GA, used to cure impotence and increase sexual potency,
also describe figurine rituals. This corpus is addressed solely to men, though certain
treatments may involve both partners. Other than the occasional mention of witchcraft,
the causes of impotence are often lacking.\textsuperscript{66} Although some of the incantations, which
come both from the Assurbanipal library in Nineveh and the House of the Exorcist at
Aššur, could date to the Old Babylonian period, almost all of the texts are Neo-Assyrian
or Neo-Babylonian.\textsuperscript{67}

\textsuperscript{63} Ibid., 93. In both cases the ritual is performed on behalf of the king.

\textsuperscript{64} Erle Leichty, “Esarhaddon’s ‘Letter to the Gods,’” in \textit{Ah, Assyria…: Studies in Assyro-Syrian History and
Ancient Near Eastern Historiography Presented to Hayim Tadmor} (Scripta Hierosolimitana 33; ed.
Mordechai Cogan and Israel Eph’al; Jerusalem: Magnes and the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1991),
53-54. Leichty is citing K.2852+.

\textsuperscript{65} Jean, \textit{Magie Néo-Assyrienne en contexte}, 106. Cited from Simo Parpola, \textit{Letters from Assyrian and
Babylonian Scholars} (SAA 10; Helsinki: Helsinki University Press, 1993), 263:5, 275 r. 5, 296 r. 3-7.

\textsuperscript{66} Robert D. Biggs, \textit{ŠÂ.ZI.GA: Ancient Mesopotamian Potency Incantations} (Locust Valley, N.Y.: J. J.

\textsuperscript{67} Biggs, \textit{ŠÂ.ZI.GA}, 6.
Figurine texts are not common in the ŠÀ.ZI.GA rituals, but they do occur. For example, Text 11:22-24 requires two figurines each of tallow, wax, bitumen, gypsum, dough, and cedar to be burned before Ištar.\textsuperscript{68} Text 27:6-10 describes a figurine of a man and a woman made of dough and potter’s clay being placed one on top of the other at the man’s head and then placed near a pig. If the pig approaches the cause of the problem is the anger of Ištar and, if not, the cause is witchcraft.\textsuperscript{69} Biggs also includes a love ritual in which a figurine of the desired woman is fashioned from clay located on the banks of the Tigris and the Euphrates. Her name is written on the figurine’s left hip and the figurine is buried in the West Gate (Text KAR 61:11-18).\textsuperscript{70} Similar rituals involve a figurine of sheep fat (Text KAR 69:17), and one made of clay mixed with bitumen (Text KAR 69:25-27) and then buried.\textsuperscript{71}

Other texts may have contained figurine rituals but the ritual instructions (often listed on a separate tablet) are missing. This is the case for the canonical Utukkū Lemnūtu incantations to protect against demons. These incantation texts mention the use of the drum, the scapegoat, the magic flour circle, and the covering of doorposts with bitumen

\textsuperscript{68} Ibid., 28.

\textsuperscript{69} Ibid., 46. See also Text KUB 37 89:3’ which mentions a figurine (NU) of a man and a woman (Biggs, ŠÀ.ZI.GA, 61). Biggs believes this is a love ritual rather than a ŠÀ.ZI.GA. Also Text STT 280, column iii:45-46 mentions a figurine of a man and a woman, but the following lines are broken (Biggs, ŠÀ.ZI.GA, 67).

\textsuperscript{70} Ibid., 70.

\textsuperscript{71} Ibid., 74.
and gypsum; but they say very little about figurines. Only Tablet 12:120-53 mentions statues of the seven sages (material unspecified) and two wrestlers of bitumen that are to be stationed around the patient’s head, along with a scapegoat. The tablet also includes instructions to encircle the man and cover the outside gate of the temple with “liquid extract of dark clay” (Tablet 12:92-94), suggesting that clay, even in its unmolded form, had apotropaic qualities. Interestingly, Geller notes that Tablets 12-16 differ considerably from the earlier incantation tablets and suggests that many of the rituals mentioned therein are newer elements, with more emphasis placed on ritual instruments and ingredients than in the previous tablets. Also, although Tablets 3-8 have known Old Babylonian forerunners, this does not appear to be the case with Tablets 9-16, raising the possibility that these rituals are original to the Neo-Assyrian period.

The rituals from the series bit rimki, which are intended to purify the king and protect him from various forms of evil, also include figurines. During the ritual the king enters a series of houses or rooms and ritually washes, often over a sympathetic figurine.

73 Ibid., 240-41.  
74 Ibid., xvii.  
75 Ibid., xi, xv.  
76 Geller (ibid., xi) warns that older manuscripts are only sporadically attested, thus rightly pointing out the weakness of arguments from silence. However, the lack of Old Babylonian manuscripts for Tablet 12 (the figurine ritual) coupled with the fact that the character of Tablets 12-16 differs from that of Tablets 3-8 is more than an argument from silence.
Kh 338:1-5 has the king wash over “an image of the enemy,” lines 6-9 mention an image of the sorcerer, lines 10-14 include “the image of the substitute”, 15-19 include “crossed images,” 20-26 describe an image of the curse or oath goddess to be buried in the corner of the wall, 27-35 dictate wax images of a sorcerer or sorceress be sealed and buried, and 36-42 possibly allude to the image of a spirit (text broken). The text also accuses the sorceress of making an image of the king. Læssøe aruges that the ritual, with some apparent Hittite forerunners, dates almost exclusively to the Neo-Assyrian period, though perhaps borrowing incantations and prayers from Sumerian, Babylonian, and Assyrian sources.

Another important series utilizing figurines are the NAM.BUR.BI rituals, which are incantations to protect against the evil predicted by omens. Richard Caplice dates the texts, most of which come from Nineveh and Aššur, between the late eighth and late sixth centuries B.C.E. The rituals can require anywhere from a few hours to many days, and they target specific omens as well as lists of general evils. Most of the rituals use the

77 Jørgen Læssøe, Studies on the Assyrian Ritual and Series bit rimki (Copenhagen: Bianco Lunos Bogtrykkeri A/S, 1955), 29. This phrase is restored by Læssøe from another text, Rit. 26, iv 70 ff.

78 Ibid., 31.

79 Ibid., 37-45, esp. 45 line 17 has based this text on a number of duplicates of the incantation referred to in lines 7-8 in Kh. 338.

80 Ibid., 90-93.


82 Ibid., 8-9.
figurines as substitution for the omens. The coming evil is transferred to the figurines, which are then disposed in the river or, less frequently, sealed in clay.\textsuperscript{83} The rituals are accompanied by prayers to a number of deities, especially Šamaš, Ea, and Assaluhī.\textsuperscript{84} Stefan Maul argues that the predominance of Šamaš as god of judgment in these rituals and the disposing of substitutes in the river amounts to a ritual reenactment of the Mesopotamian river ordeal in which the substitute omen is tried and found guilty.\textsuperscript{85}

Several of the NAM.BUR.BI rituals published by Maul involve figurines. They include three bird omens,\textsuperscript{86} two snake omens,\textsuperscript{87} two lizard omens,\textsuperscript{88} two dog omens,\textsuperscript{89} one badger omen,\textsuperscript{90} one wild cat omen,\textsuperscript{91} one ant omen,\textsuperscript{92} two sorcerer/ess omens,\textsuperscript{93} two universal omens (unspecified evil or unknown cause of evil),\textsuperscript{94} and raw clay is used in

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{83} Ibid., 11.
\item \textsuperscript{84} Ibid., 12.
\item \textsuperscript{85} Stefan M. Maul, Zukunftsbewältigung: Eine Untersuchung altorientalischen Denkens anhand der babylonisch-assyrischen Löserituale (Namburbi) (Mainz am Rhein: Verlag Philipp von Zabern, 1994), 88.
\item \textsuperscript{86} Ibid., 246, 254, 262.
\item \textsuperscript{87} Ibid., 274, 299.
\item \textsuperscript{88} Ibid., 308-10.
\item \textsuperscript{89} Ibid., 320, 321.
\item \textsuperscript{90} Ibid., 327.
\item \textsuperscript{91} Ibid., 335.
\item \textsuperscript{92} Ibid., 353.
\item \textsuperscript{93} Ibid., 450, 451.
\item \textsuperscript{94} Ibid., 491, 504.
\end{itemize}
one sky omen. In almost every case the text specifies a figure of clay, and in one case the ritual instructs the exorcist to first purify the clay pit. Figurines are sometimes clothed or decorated with manes of hair or painted spots, and they are always used sympathetically to transfer the portended evil from the human to the substitute. The figurines are almost always sent down the river, though in a few cases they could be buried or thrown out in the steppe.

Many types of NAM.BUR.BI rituals do not include figurines, but the most interesting omission is that there are no figurines in the rituals associated with the omen series Šumma Izbu, evils portended by malformed human and animal infants. In Maul’s example of a Šumma Izbu NAM.BUR.BI the substitutionary figure is the actual misbirth itself, which is then thrown in the river. Erle Leichty suggests that a more common means of averting evils predicted by Šumma Izbu was through recitation of apotropaic

---

95 Ibid., 457.
96 Ibid., 491.
97 Ibid., 46-47.
98 Ibid., 254, 451.
99 Ibid., 327.
100 These include Maul’s scorpion omens, mushroom infestation, field and garden omens, evil announced by house and domestic tools, omens during sleep, omens announced by an accident with a carriage of a prince or king, omens portended by a child born in the month of Nisan, the omen of two separate people brought together (husband and wife who had to live apart), evil resulting if a man had sexual intercourse with a goat, evil from not obeying cultic rules properly or failure in a ritual, omens revealed in a sacrificial performance, and lightening.
101 Ibid., 343.
prayer. Another interesting omission is the lack of figurines in any of the LÚ.TUR ḤUN.GÁ, or incantations to quiet a baby. Although this could be due to lack of preservation, in Walter Farber’s fairly extensive section on related rituals no figurines are mentioned, although there are two rituals requiring inscribed clay cylinder seals. The fact that little evidence exists to connect Neo-Assyrian figurines with mothers or children is very interesting in light of the plethora of figurine rituals used to avert other types of evil or protect the house. According to Leichty, the Šumma Izbu omens, which deal in


103 Walter Farber, *Schlaf, Kindchen, Schlaf! Mesopotamische Baby-Beschworungen und -Rituale* (Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1989), 117, 129. Both Text 41 and 46 are rituals against the demon Lamaštu and come from the Magico-medical text corpus.

104 See also Stol’s study on birth in Babylon, where he describes remedies for infertility or difficult birth, as practiced on the female. They are limited to herbs, amulets, and incantations (Marten Stol, *Birth in Babylonia and the Bible: Its Mediterranean Setting* [Cuneiform Monograph Series 14; Groningen: Styx, 2000], 35-37). In agreement, see also JoAnn Scurlock, “Baby-Snatching Demons, Restless Souls, and the Dangers of Childbirth: Medico-Magical Means of Dealing with Some of the Perils of Motherhood,” *Incognita* 2 (1991): 137-85. One ritual text from Uruk involves figurines, though they are meant to represent a possible sorcerer and sorceress responsible for the patient’s repeated miscarriages. The extensive ritual involves multiple steps including the production of amulets, the use of animal remains associated with the unborn fetus, the abandonment of materials at the crossroads, purification at the river, transference of the curse onto a potter’s oven, addressing a date palm, removal of garments, crawling under pregnant animals, and the production of two figurines from dough and the “water of her labor pains,” as well as many prayers and incense offerings to various deities. For this interpretation of the text see JoAnn Scurlock, “Translating Transfers in Ancient Mesopotamia,” in *Magic and Ritual in the Ancient World* (Religions in the Graeco-Roman World 141; ed. Paul Mirecki and Marvin Meyer; Leiden: Brill, 2002), 215-23. The text in question is SpTU 5. The general omission of figurines may not be unique to Mesopotamia. Borghouts (*Magical Texts*, 12-13) summarizes the birth texts in Papyrus Leiden I 348. While a female figurine may be alluded to in one ritual to cure stomach pain, none of the rituals to accelerate a difficult birth mention the use of female figurines. Out of seven such rituals, multiple gods are invoked, including Hathor, Isis, Thoth, Horus, Re, Aton, Shu, and Hapi. The only clay figurines proscribed occur in two different texts that call for clay images of the god Bes (Spell 30 and 31). This is also the case in Leitz’s study of magical and medical New Kingdom papyri. None of the incantations to protect pregnant women involve figurines (Leitz, *Magical and Medical Papyri*, 67-70; Incantations 25-30), nor does Incantation 33 for the “conjunction of the womb” (ibid., 71). For a summary of protective rituals for mother and child see Gay Robins, *Women in Ancient Egypt* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1993), 78-88. The texts cited here also lack mention of female figurines, favoring instead the use of amulets and knots. In contrast, Geraldine Pinch (*Votive Offerings to Hathor* [Oxford: Griffith Institute, Ashmolean Museum, 1993], 199)
realms modern interpreters associate with women’s concerns, were not necessarily or
even primarily connected with the women or children. For example, the portended good
or evil in birth omens is targeted against the owner of the house, flock, or herd, rather
than the mother or the newborn.

To summarize, most of the texts described here mention sympathetic figurines
used to remove present or portended evil from a human, with a few figurines functioning
apotropaically. In every ritual the figurines represent humans, animals, or spirits but

attempts to connect five female figurines (non-terracotta) found at the thirteenth dynasty tomb of the
magician at the Ramasseum with spells from the same tomb that describe child birth and labor. Both the
archaeological context and the textual evidence are more complex than Pinch presupposes. Gardiner notes
that the objects, including the texts, were found in a heap in the middle of the shaft, rather than in their
original location. The texts were uncovered in a wooden box in that same context. On the condition of the
texts, Gardiner notes that the papyri were in very bad condition and three-fourths of their substance was
already gone. See Alan Gardiner, ed., The Ramesseum Papyri: Plates (Oxford: Griffith Institute, University
Press, 1955), 1. There was also a rumor that the papyri fell out of the box while it was being hoisted up
from the shaft (ibid., 7). In addition to the problematic condition of the surviving papyri, the readable
sections contained many different types of spells, despite that fact that Pinch mentions only those
associated with pregnancy, childbirth, and young children. Of the seventeen papyri, only P.Ram.IV focuses
on spells associated with procreation, pregnancy, birth, and newborns. Given the fragmentary nature of
several of the texts, it is certainly possible that more spells took up these concerns; but this fact cannot be
taken for granted. P.Ram.V deals with multiple medical concerns, like muscular and rheumatic troubles.
P.Ram.VIII contains a spell for head injury. P.Ram.IX and X discuss snakes (ibid., 9-16). This suggests
that issues related to childbirth and childcare were simply one of several concerns of the magician.
Moreover, the texts that do describe child birth and child care do not mention female figurines, though
other images are occasionally described. On these texts, see John. W. B. Barns, ed., Five Ramneseum
Papyri (Oxford: Griffith Institute, University Press, 1956), 16-27. In P.Ram.III (which primarily describes
other disorders, like eye problems and burns) a “painted nestling swallow” is used as a substitute for the
thirst of an infant upon receiving bad breastmilk; a wooden falcon is also prepared and painted (ibid., 22-
23). The main text mentioned by Pinch, P.Ram.IV, also describes very few images, the most comparable
being an “image of a child” that is used with fumigants to identify whether the mother will “bear well” or
“bear ill.” Still, the phrase “image of a child” is a reconstruction (ibid., 24-27). Finally, even Greek
magical rituals designed to combat child-killing demons also appear to focus on the use of herbs, amulets,
stones, animal remains, and incantations. See Sarah Iles Johnston, “Defining the Dreadful: Remarks on the
Greek Child-Killing Demon,” in Ancient Magic and Ritual Power (Religions in the Graeco-Roman World

105 Leichty, Omen Series, 3.
never high deities. The rituals are, however, always accompanied by prayers and incantations addressed to high deities, particularly Šamaš, Ea, and Marduk or Asalluḥi, and occasionally Ištar. In almost all cases the rituals also contain instructions for offerings made to these deities and involve beer libations, flour, and occasional animal sacrifices. The rituals tend to lack details about the design of the figurines, though occasionally they supply materials and a few physical details. In most cases the figurines are thrown into the river or burned, but sometimes they are buried. While the various figurine texts contain a wide range of concerns, none specifically include gestation, birth, or children. Together, these ninth through sixth century texts provide a general backdrop for understanding the following three text groups, which will be considered in more detail.

3.6 Comparison of anti-witchcraft rituals, magico-medical means of treating ghost induced illnesses, and rituals for the installation of protective spirits

Three sets of texts preserve rituals in which the figurines feature prominently throughout the entire ceremony; and these texts include details about the figurine make, the ceremony, the deities involved, and figurine placement or discard at the end of the ritual. The sets of ritual texts are (3.6.1) anti-witchcraft texts, particularly *Maqlû,*\(^{106}\)

---

(3.6.2) magico-medical texts associated with ghosts and demons,\textsuperscript{107} and (3.6.3) texts describing Mesopotamian protective spirits.\textsuperscript{108} Discussion of these texts will focus on the causes of evil, the ritual actors, the role of divinities, the resources required by the rituals, the design of the figurines, and the placement of the figurines at the end of the ritual. By comparing and contrasting these three types of texts certain patterns emerge that can be used to test modern interpretations of figurines in general and interpretations of JPFs in particular.

3.6.1 Anti-witchcraft series: \textit{Maqlû}

3.6.1.1 Cause of evil

According to Zvi Abusch, \textit{Maqlû} rituals were intended to combat evil caused by male or female witches (\textit{kaššâpu/kaššaptu}).\textsuperscript{109} He argues that the text has a long and highly-edited history, meaning that individual incantations may have had a life of their own before incorporation into the extant text.\textsuperscript{110} Still, even Abusch’s reconstructed earlier versions attribute evil to “witches;” and he claims that witchcraft becomes a primary

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{107} Scurlock, \textit{Magico-Medical}, Texts 10-16, 115, 119-20, 131, 218-21, 226, 228, 229-32.}

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{108} Wiggermann, \textit{Mesopotamian Protective Spirits}, Text I and Text II.}

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{109} Abusch, \textit{Mesopotamian Witchcraft}, 7.}

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{110} Ibid., 114-15.}
cause of evil in the first millennium, with the rise of cosmopolitan centers under Assyrian imperial influence.\footnote{Ibid., 51.}

However, incantations in Maqlû also target antagonists other than the witch. For example, I 135-143 states, “I raise up the torch and burn the statues of the demon, the spirit the lurker, the ghost, … and any evil that seizes mankind.”\footnote{Ibid., 17. Tablet and line numbers are based on Gerhard Meier, Die assyrische Beschwörungssammlung Maqlû (Berlin: Den Herausgeber der Beihefte zum Archiv für Orientforschung and Dr. Ernst F. Weidner, 1937).} Abusch suggests that exorcists associated witchcraft with the Netherworld, ghosts, demons and general evil in order to bring the witch under the sovereignty of the exorcist.\footnote{Abusch, Mesopotamian Witchcraft, 76-78.} Thus, witchcraft was simply grafted on to the already well-formed list of evils to which misfortune could be attributed.

3.6.1.2 Ritual agents

The ritual agents in these texts include the āšipu, or exorcist, and the patient. The patient, in theory, could include any private individual, although, according to Abusch, the Maqlû texts, as they stand, preserve a ritual performed for the upper class.\footnote{Ibid., 5.} Although Abusch hypothesizes that persons who could not access or afford an official exorcist might have performed magic on their own behalf, his evidence of this practice
remains thin and unconvincing.\textsuperscript{115} What his evidence does support is that rituals had a role for both exorcist and lay person.

### 3.6.1.3 Deities and resources

The exorcists do not work through their own power; all of the major incantations and rituals address Šamaš, Ea, Asalluḫi, Nuska, Girra, or a host of other deities. The ritual cycle in \textit{Maqlû}, in its present form, lasts one evening and the following morning, and requires many different resources, such as offerings and fumigants. The text stipulates all manner of rituals, including incense burning, applying salve and oil, protective flour circles, sacrifices, washing in pure water, creating amulets, and destroying images.\textsuperscript{116} Thus, the patient, sometimes even the king, must have been wealthy enough to afford the materials for the full cycle of rituals.\textsuperscript{117}

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{115} Ibid., 8 n. 12. Most of Abusch’s argument for simple magic performed by non-specialists is plagued by lack of evidence. He notes the possibility that witches could have been hired to perform white magic but that the tradition was reworked by learned exorcists and given its present negative overtone (ibid., 9-14). Unfortunately, no texts actually preserve such a positive tradition; and Abusch can only work backward from the present negative texts, creating a hypothetical history of editorial redaction. The possibility that people, other than official agents, performed figurine ritual services is not problematic; but it is not well supported by the evidence.
  \item \textsuperscript{116} Ibid., 288-89.
  \item \textsuperscript{117} Ibid., 288.
\end{itemize}
3.6.1.4 Figurine make and design

Maqlû mentions many different types of images; and, as in other texts, the term used to refer to a figurine is ṣalmū.\(^{118}\) The texts mention images of fat (lipî) (IX 28), copper (siparri) (IX 29), dough (līši) (IX 89), clay (tīṭi) (IX: 32), tarmarisk (bīni) and cedar (erēnî) (IX 38-39), a substitute (nigsagîlê) (IX 163-164), wax (iškûri) (IX 43),\(^{119}\) flour (qēmi) (IX 158), bitumen (iṭṭî) and sesame hulls (kuspî) (IX 33-34). Without a specific term for figurine the context dictates how the image is formed. For example, the image of flour is not molded but drawn.\(^{120}\) Rather than proposing structural reasons to explain the choice of materials used in any one part of the ceremony, Abusch suggests that the materials used to make the images may have been dictated by word play with the accompanying incantations.\(^{121}\) The text does not include any description of how the various images were created or their design.

---


\(^{119}\) Note that Meier’s text is at slight variance with Abusch, reading dâkî instead of iškûri (Meier, assyriche Beschwörungssammlung Maqlû , 59); but Meier agrees with Abusch’s translation, translating the term “Wachsfigur.”

\(^{120}\) Abusch, Mesopotamian Witchcraft, 186.

\(^{121}\) Ibid., 208.
3.6.1.5 Placement

Many of the rituals in the *Maqlû* cycle dictate the total destruction of witch images through burning. A broken and very tentative reading of the ritual following the third Šamaš incantation may describe the burying of a clay statue,\textsuperscript{122} but the overwhelming point of the ceremony is total incineration. Included in the cycle are several types of figurine manipulation. Some of the rituals within the text specify that the clay representations of witch and warlock should be lifted before Šamaš, for judgment (I 73-121). Images are to be bound, set on a brazier, and ignited by a torch (I 122-143; IX 23ff). The brazier with the figurines is stirred (V 95-103). Water is poured on the witch and warlock (V 118-138), a mountain stone is placed on the brazier (V 156-165), a circle of flour is laid down (V 166-184), and the remains are disposed of (V 156-184; IX 91-94).

The burning of figurines is not unique to the *Maqlû* cycle. Abusch cites many other rituals against witchcraft, including KAR 80, which details the burning of witch and warlock images.\textsuperscript{123} He contrasts this practice with the disposal of ghost representations, which are regularly buried.\textsuperscript{124} Other than burning, representations in *Maqlû* are washed away with water or eaten by dogs. Interestingly, while Tablet IX preserves apotropaic rites performed at key moments in the *Maqlû* cycle, none involve figurines but rather

\textsuperscript{122} Ibid., 72 n.19.

\textsuperscript{123} Ibid., 122-23.

\textsuperscript{124} Ibid., 229.
expulsions (“Evil demon to your step”) and circling the entrances with flour (IX 95-98, 148-149, 191-192). The salient point is that none of these rituals would be visible in the archaeological record.

3.6.2 Magico-medical texts dealing with ghosts and demons

3.6.2.1 Cause of evil

These texts all attribute the symptoms of the client/patient to “hand of ghost.” Of Scurlock’s corpus of 352 prescriptions, 21 involve figurines, which are used to counter symptoms caused by “hand of ghost” (13/21 figurines texts) and to destroy or banish the ghosts themselves (7/21 figurine texts). Some of the texts include the phrase “hand of Ishtar,” but the causal agent that must be confronted is still the ghost or demon who has manipulated the deity. Most important, while these texts do include ghosts, the evil is not limited to ghosts but can also include “anything evil” and various sorts of demons. Even the subcategory “ghost” is highly varied and might include buried or unburied dead people, family ghosts, or nameless ghosts. In the figurine texts all of these causes of evil are often listed together.

---

125 Ibid., 101-2. Thus, figurine rituals are not the only, or even the most common, form of apotropaic rituals.

126 Scurlock, Magico-Medical, 8-10.

127 Ibid., 191.

128 Ibid., 199. Elsewhere Scurlock has shown that rituals involving the dead, including those that incorporate figurines of the dead, may take place during the annual festivals of the dead. She suggests some of these private rituals to expel illness are secondarily appended to the normal public rites, assumed to be
3.6.2.2 Ritual agents

According to Scurlock, the “hand of ghost” texts were often performed by the āšipu; and the āšipu usually administered the ritual while the patient and the āšipu shared the incantations. Further, the āšipu was responsible for all initial preparations, including libations, purifying the clay pit, laying out objects, helping the patient to ready himself, making the offerings to gods and family ghosts, and making, dressing, manipulating and burying figurines.

3.6.2.3 Deities and resources

While some of the rituals address the afflicting ghost directly, almost all of the figurine texts invoke multiple deities, especially Ea, Šamaš, and Asalluḫi. The association between the figurines and Šamaš dictated that many of the figurine burials took place in the late afternoon when the god could deliver the ghosts back to the Netherworld. Scurlock notes that the recitations involving deities, which include all the figurine rituals, more effective during the yearly festivals. Scurlock, “Magical Uses of Ancient Mesopotamian Festivals of the Dead,” 93-96, 107.

Ibid., 3.


Ibid., 43.

Ibid., 21.
were accompanied by meat sacrifices; and both sacrifices and deities appear in the most “expensive” rituals—those of the figurines. Many of the figurine rituals require a long list of resources including, flour, water, clay from a potter’s pit, altars, censers with incense, honey, ghee, dates, ritual vessels, and beer. The purification or purchase of the clay alone can require silver, gold, copper, tin, bronze, lapis lazuli, carnelian, and various types of stone.

3.6.2.4 Figurine make and design

Unlike the Maqlû series, the “hand of ghost” texts sometimes refer directly to construction techniques for the figurines. Several of the texts mention the clay pit, which had to be purified for anywhere from one night to three days. The purification took place via precious metals and offerings or flour thrown into the pit (though in one text the source of the figurine was not clay but dirt gathered from various locations). The clay could be mixed with other ingredients, such as wax, fat, ox blood, flour, donkey

---

133 Ibid., 40-41.
134 Ibid., 206-7, 210, 358, 314, 519, 534, 544.
135 Ibid., 346.
136 Ibid., 34.
137 Ibid., 49.
138 Ibid., 534.
urine, reed, straw, excrement, or wood.139 Some texts also describe figurines of tamarisk or reed.140

The figurines could represent any number of agents including a ghost, a dead person, a fate demon, sickness, or general evil. Most of these texts exclude witchcraft, but where witchcraft is mentioned the figurine represents the witch. Many of the rituals required the use of only one figurine, though a few require multiple figurines for the same ritual.141 The texts often instruct that the name of the figurine be written on the left shoulder; as Scurlock points out, that name is not a personal name but a job description, such as “ghost who is persecuting PN.”142 Figurines were also often dressed in makeshift garments and given accompanying articles like carnelian necklaces, spindles, cloth, pins, golden reeds, gold staffs, copper axes, lead water pipes, and ox horns.143 An important point is that these articles were not depicted as part of the figurine design but rather accompanied the figurine. These accompanying articles reflect the purpose of the figurine. For example, figurines representing dead people are given provisions such as

---

139 Ibid., 49.
140 Ibid., 54-55.
141 Ibid., 49.
142 Ibid.
143 Ibid., 50.
barley, gruel, groats, beerbread, malt porridge, hot broth, beer and water, \textsuperscript{144} even bed frames and chairs; \textsuperscript{145} and they are sent back to the underworld.

While considerably more detailed than the \textit{Maqlû} series, the “hand of ghost” texts do not usually give specific details about the figurine’s actual design. Occasionally the texts demand that foreign objects like a dog’s tooth, goat hair, or tree peg be inserted in the figurine to prevent the ghost from returning. Similarly, a few texts say that the hands of the figurine should cover its orifices or that its feet should be twisted. \textsuperscript{146}

\textbf{3.6.2.5 Placement}

The majority of the figurine texts outline procedures for burying the figurine to return the ghost to the underworld or to rectify an improper burial. \textsuperscript{147} Burial techniques range from burial in a jar, copper cup, or gazelle horn, to interment in pits in the steppe, canal banks, under the shade of plants, holes, drainage openings, or family tombs. \textsuperscript{148} A few texts specify the construction of a reed vessel and the figurines appear to be set afloat down the river. \textsuperscript{149} Of course, some texts do not preserve directions about the final placement of the figurine. In general, none of these figurines are burned, in contrast to the

\textsuperscript{144} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{145} Ibid., 52-53.
\textsuperscript{146} Ibid., 50-51.
\textsuperscript{147} Ibid., 50.
\textsuperscript{148} Ibid., 51.
\textsuperscript{149} Ibid., 538, 539.
Maqlû series; and while figurines tend to be buried, which would be identifiable in the archaeological record, they are often buried in remote locations. Still, figurines placed in tombs or in city spaces, like drainage ditches or pits, might be recoverable.

3.6.3 Protective spirits

3.6.3.1 Cause of evil

Wiggermann’s study focuses on the šep lemutti ina bīt amēli parāsu texts ("to block the entry of the enemy in someone’s house"), comparing them with related apotropaic texts. Similar to the “hand of ghost” texts, Wiggermann’s Text I lists a number of evil sources including, evil spirits, constables, gods, deputies, Lamaštu, or Lilîtu, Handmaid-of-Lilû, Hand-of-god, Hand-of-a-goddess, and Fallen-down-from-Heaven; and it continues to include abstracts like Death, Burning, and Scorching. It also covers all types of ghosts, plague, disease, damage or loss, and so on. In sum, the enumerated evils take up twenty lines of text (Text I:1-20).\(^{150}\) Conspicuously absent is any mention of witch or warlock. Further, instead of only curing the byproducts of ghosts or demons, as in the “hand of ghost” texts, or the effects of witchcraft, the ritual seems to prevent any of these evils from entering someone’s house again. Thus, while apotropaism is a part of the other two kinds of ritual texts, it seems to be foregrounded in šep lemutti.\(^{151}\)

\(^{150}\) Wiggermann, Mesopotamian Protective Spirits, 7.

\(^{151}\) Ibid., 92-93. Wiggermann stresses that the purpose of the ritual is not only apotropaic, since some of the evils listed were already occurring and needed to be expelled.
3.6.3.2 Ritual agents

Wiggermann does not discuss the role of ritual agents in the texts. Wiggermann’s Text II, a variant version of šep lemutti, was written by Kiṣir-Aššur, the exorcist of the temple of Aššur at the time of Ashurbanipal, and the third text, bīt mēserī, also comes from the “almanac of the exorcist” at Aššur. Wiggermann’s default position is that the ritual was conducted by an official exorcist. 152

Whether the figurines were constructed by the exorcist is more difficult to determine. The figurines normally associated with this ritual are moldmade and standardized (see above) making it unlikely that they were produced on the spot by a non-professional rather than a potter or ceramics specialist. That having been said, the instruction for the figurines of cornel wood, tamarisk, and clay all begin with the phrase “when you build” (ta-ban-nu-ú; I:28, 67, 144), which seems to imply the exorcist constructs the images. Following this introduction, the ritual commands the exorcist to chop down the wood or procure clay from a clay pit and take it to the city (I:44, 88, 168-169); but no instruction on forming the figurines out of the wood or clay is ever given. Rather, the figurines are described almost as if they were already formed.

The next instructions for the exorcist involve writing names on the figurines, placing figurines on pedestals, or painting figurines. For each type of figurine, the sections end with the refrain DÙ-uš, or “you shall make” (I:65, 105, 114, 123, 133, 142,

152 Ibid., 41.
and the transitional statement “as soon as you have manufactured these statues,” “with appropriate care” or *tuk-ti-nu-û* (I:143; paralleled by preparing the ritual materials with appropriate care in I:246) separates the sections describing wood and clay figurines. After all the images have been procured, the entire production is then referred to elliptically by the phrase “as soon as this you have done,” or *GIM an-na-a te-te-epšû* (I:206); and in the remaining text both types of statues are referred to by the phrase “as many as you have made,” or *ma-la DÛ-šû* (I:207, 230). Thus, the majority of these phrases occur as framing or structuring passages rather than as strict instructions pertaining to production steps.

The general lack of direct instructions in the figurine construction sections should be contrasted with the numerous direct commands for the exorcist during the other rituals (I:230-349). Furthermore, the verbs found in the above passages are complicated. The word *banû* also refers to the construction of figurines in *Maqlû*, but elsewhere it can be used to describe actions that are commanded or funded by one party but carried out by someone else. Likewise, the word *epēšu* can refer either to the actual person who constructs an image or to a person who commissions the construction of an image. For example, RA 44 30:44 mentions an image for the temple which the king *made*; and one of the Gula votive dog figurines was inscribed with the message, “I *made* and dedicated

---

153 The Sumerian sign *DÛ* can refer to either Akkadian *banû* or *epēšu*. The additional –*uš* makes clear that the intended word is the imperative *epuš*.

154 *CAD* 2: 84-85.
this clay dog.”\textsuperscript{155} Given the present state of the text, both options must remain open. Either the exorcist constructed the images himself or, more likely, the figurines were constructed by more trained hands under the direction or patronage of the exorcist.

### 3.6.3.3 Deities and resources

Like the other two textual corpuses, šep lemutti invokes deities at various moments of the ritual; the deities include Ea, Marduk, and Šamaš (Text I:158-160)\textsuperscript{156} as well as Kusu and Ningirim (Text I:242).\textsuperscript{157} In addition and unlike the other two text groups, šep lemutti includes a whole host of lesser deities such as Sebettu (Text I:88), Lugalgirra (Text I:97), Meslamtaea (Text I:124),\textsuperscript{158} and Narudda (Text I:138).\textsuperscript{159} As in the other texts, the main gods are not depicted in the ritual; but these other deities are described very carefully and are taxonomically differentiated from the other creatures by being made of tamarisk, clothed with metals, and called “creatures of heaven” (Text I:143).\textsuperscript{160}

\textsuperscript{155} CAD 4: 200.

\textsuperscript{156} Wiggermann, \textit{Mesopotamian Protective Spirits}, 13.

\textsuperscript{157} Ibid., 17.

\textsuperscript{158} Ibid., 11.

\textsuperscript{159} Ibid., 13. Nerudda deserves note. She appears to be the only female deity in the group and the only one lacking the horns of divinity. She also lacks the girdle and bronze of the other deities (ibid., 47-48, note 7.7). Further, the translation of her implement, \textit{timbūtu}, is unsecure. Wiggermann suggests “harp” but states that the object that Narudda holds is really unidentified. Nor can he offer a reason for her inclusion in the ritual, other than the fact that she is the sister of the Sebettu (ibid., 62).

\textsuperscript{160} Ibid., 13.
Also like the other two text groups the šep lemutti would require significant resources, as a ritual which lasts five days and requires cornel wood, gold axe, silver saw, censer and incense, water, bread, animal sacrifices, dates, fine meal, cakes of syrup and butter, ritual vessels, beer, various kinds of grains and lentils, and flour—and all this at multiple offerings throughout the cycle.\(^{161}\) These resources are in addition to the metal trappings for the god figurines.\(^{162}\) More, like the “hand of ghost” texts, the clay pit is presented with offerings including censers, water, silver, gold, carnelian, stones, and beer (Text I:145-157).\(^{163}\)

### 3.6.3.4 Figurine make and design

In addition to the “sons of heaven” made of tamarisk, there are two more classes of figurines. The first is the seven figures of *apkallū*, defined as sages or exorcists,\(^{164}\) made from cornel wood. Each sage represents a different city.\(^{165}\) All the sages look alike; but, as in the “hand of ghost texts,” the individual designations for each figurine are written on the shoulder. This seems to occur after they are painted in different colors;

\(^{161}\) Ibid., 9, 13, 17, 18.

\(^{162}\) Ibid., 11-13.

\(^{163}\) Ibid., 13.

\(^{164}\) Ibid., 96.

\(^{165}\) These seven figures are problematic because they are separated from both the section describing tamarisk deities and the section describing semi-divine clay creatures. They are not made of tamarisk or overlaid with metal, as are the deities, but nor are they made of clay (ibid., 65). Wiggermann (ibid., 46, note 1.1) argues that they are human not divine.
however, the text is unclear. These figurines are structurally separated from the following series titled “the sons of heaven.”

Following “the sons of heaven,” the text describes the construction of a third class of figurines—the clay statues, “creatures of Apsû.” As in the “hand of ghost” texts, the clay bed is purified and the clay is pinched off. It appears that the clay is then taken to the city (Text I:169) where the figurines are formed. These clay figurines include seven bird apkallū, seven fish apkallū, and two of the following: “Hairies,” Viper, Furious-Snake, Big-Weather-Beast, Mad-Lions, Bison, Scorpion-Man, Lion-Man, Lulal, Latarak, Fish-Man, and Carp-Goat. The ritual also requires ten dogs, all painted different colors with their names written on their shoulder (lines 184-205). Unlike the Maqlû text and

---

166 Ibid., 7-9.

167 Ibid., 60 confirms the distinction between the tamarisk as material for the god figurines versus the clay figurines.

168 Ibid., 14-15. Wiggermann (ibid., 27) reconstructs Text I:167 “I mix their clay with water before you at the bank of the river” but provides no evidence upon which this reconstruction is based, other than the probability that the missing section includes a further step in figurine production. Without any evidence, the reconstruction cannot be taken seriously. In contrast, the instructions to go to the city after pinching off the clay in Text I:169 are reconstructed based on the parallel phrase in Text I:44 and 88 which occurs after procuring the raw materials for other groups of figurines. Because this phrase always precedes the specific instructions about figurine design, it seems reasonable to conclude that the figurines of varying types were not constructed where the resources were procured but that the resources were brought into the city where the figurines were prepared.

169 Wiggermann’s Text I is emended to state that the bird apkallū are made of clay mixed with wax. The variant is present in Text II, but not in Text I, which only refers to the clay (ibid., 27).

170 Ibid., 15.
most of the “hand of ghost” texts, this ritual is very specific about the production of the figurines, including their implements and the details of their painting.  

### 3.6.3.5 Placement

Wiggermann’s Text I is broken after the final incantation, but Text II, which describes the same ritual, includes an inventory of figurines that specifies the burial locations of the figurines in the domestic structure. Although there are minor variations between the two texts, the similarities are much more striking, suggesting that the burial instructions in the second text are probably similar to those missing from the first. These instructions place the armed gods, the *ugallū*, and the dogs in the outer gate of the house, the *apkallū* in the private rooms, and the monsters, *lahmu*, Lula, and Latarak in the rest of the house (information incomplete). In this case, none of the figurines are burnt; and they are buried in the domestic structure rather than in remote locations.

---

171 It appears that almost all the figurines were carefully painted and that significant details of their identification were included in paint and in accompanying implements of different materials. Wiggermann (ibid., 55) warns against associating the colored paint solely with clothing, saying that it “seems improbably that all difference of coloration can be reduced to a single value for each color.”

172 Ibid., 46. Text II is an excerpt from the same ritual as Text I but includes an inventory of figurines at the end.

173 Ibid., 87-90. Differences include the sequence of statues, degree of detail about the purification of the house, inscriptions on the figurines, the inclusion of certain incantations, total number of statues, and extra short incantations added to the end of Text II.

174 Ibid., 58.

175 Ibid., 65.

176 Ibid., 86.
Within that structure, they are not limited to one part of the domestic unit but permeate throughout.

### 3.6.4 Summary of Neo-Assyrian texts and concomitant challenges to figurine interpretation

In considering the similarities and differences between the text groups, it should first be noted that the forms of the three corpuses vary. The “hand of ghost” rituals are smaller, individual ritual texts, excerpted from larger compilations. Thus they show the greatest variety. The originally separate rituals of the *Maqlû* texts also vary but have been combined and edited as individual parts of a larger, more unified cycle. Finally, the *šep lemutti* texts are the most homogenous, being few in number and describing the same ritual.

Despite the structural differences, all three texts share certain features. First, although they all invoke deities in their incantations, images of those deities are never made. In the case of *Maqlû*, this is understandable because the images, including the figurines, exclusively represent the human or the witch. In “hand of ghost” texts, this is also the case, with figurines representing the patient, the ghost/dead, or sickness. However, the *šep lemutti* texts do describe the creation of divine beings in tamarisk and semi-divine beings in clay. Despite that fact, the same set of high deities (Šamaš, Ea, Asalluḫi), though frequently invoked, are never depicted in wood or clay. More, the *šep lemutti* texts actually make a technological distinction between “sons of heaven” made of tamarisk and “sons of Apsû” made of clay. Finally, in contrast with Mesopotamian texts
describing the creation and installation of major cultic images, nowhere are the figurines described as born or self-created; there is no attempt to mask the role of human craftsmen.\footnote{Victor Avigdor Hurowitz, “The Mesopotamian God Image, from Womb to Tomb,” JAOS 123 (2003): 147-57. This is not to downplay the fact that the clay pit is tied to the divine and primordial world prior to pinching off the clay for the figurines. On this point see Victor Avigdor Hurowitz, “What Goes in Is What Comes Out: Materials for Creating Cult Statues,” in Text, Artifact, and Image: Revealing Ancient Israelite Religion (Brown Judaic Studies 346; ed. Gary Beckman and Theodore J. Lewis; Providence, R.I.: Brown Judaic Studies, 2006), 14-15. Still, as Winter argues, both Sumerian and Akkadian literature makes a distinction between “cult paraphernalia, stone stelae, and protective stone gateway lions” which are “made” versus stone images of human or divine figures which are “born.” See Irene J. Winter, “‘Idols of the King’: Royal Images as Recipients of Ritual Action in Ancient Mesopotamia,” in On Art in the Ancient Near East. Volume 2. From the Third Millennium B.C.E. (Culture and History of the Ancient Near East 34.2; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 174; repr. from Journal of Ritual Studies 6 (1996): 13-42.}

It is therefore possible that higher level deities are not depicted in clay.\footnote{For an example of a lower-level guardian/minister to the gods made of clay see Hurowitz, “What Goes In,” 14-15. In this case, he is citing a text detailing the founding of a new temple. As part of the preparations clay figurines of the god Ninšubur are constructed as part of the foundation rite. The text preserves a similar ritual for the purification of the clay pit as those already described above. Black and Green (Gods, Demons, and Symbols, 141 Fig. 116) also cite a clay example from a brick box in the Neo-Babylonian period from the foundations of the temple of Ninhursaga at Kiš.}

Furthermore, a clay figurine does not necessarily represent the primary object of worship, regardless of whether it depicts a deity or a human, since the accompanying prayers target the main members of the pantheon, not the figurine. Thus, the figurines are not in competition with the high deities nor do they challenge their supremacy. Further, divine beings or human worshippers are not the only two options for figurative representations, as both semi-divine beings and humans are depicted to guard the house.

Second, all three corpora require considerable resources for their rituals. This does not eliminate the possibility for shorter, less expensive rituals. Maqlû contains separate rituals that are linked in the text but could have been performed separately. Thus,
a person might not have needed enough resources for two days of repeated ritual but only enough resources for one ritual act. Wiggermann also notes the existence of a few figurine ritual texts that involve less complicated procedures and that may reflect less serious situations. Regardless, even when taken as individual ritual ceremonies, each appears to have been quite expensive. For example, the “hand of ghost” rituals are a random selection of shorter figurine rituals and are among the costliest of Scurlock’s 352 text corpus.

It is possible, then, that figurine related rituals required more resources than did other types of curative and protective measures. If so, the technological and artistic properties of extant figurines would not indicate the socio-economic status of their owners. Despite the long list of necessary materials, the only items from clay figurine rituals remaining in the archaeological record would be the clay figurines themselves. Thus, any interpretive reasoning that rests on figurines alone is only observing a small part of the ritual and cannot claim that the “cheap” production style of the figurines indicates the socio-economic status of their producers or owners.

Furthermore, in the case of many figurine rituals, including several from the “hand of ghost” texts, the šep lemutti texts, and the general NAM.BÚR.BI texts, the list of threatening evils is quite extensive and includes very dramatic and pressing

---

179 Ibid., 92.

concerns, perhaps suggesting that the patient had first attempted other, less costly methods (incantations, stone amulets, oils, and herbal remedies) to cure and protect, which had failed. In this case, a clay figurine could come from a non-elite family but would be used less often than other procedures and only in the most dire circumstances.

Third, in all three corpora the primary ritual agent is the āšipu, a state-sponsored priest associated, in many cases, with main temples in large cities. Although other forms of curative or apotropaic rituals may have been performed outside of cities with different ritual agents, clay figurines do not, by definition, stand outside the realm of state power or official religion. Similarly, it cannot automatically be claimed that the concerns represented in figurine rituals were dealt with only in the family sphere or only in private settings.

The three corpora are thus similar with respect to deities, resources, and ritual agents; but they also differ in their causes of the evil, figurine placement, and figurine make and design. Maqlû texts primarily associate the figurines with witches and occasionally with the patient, and in all cases the evil-causing agent is primarily the witch with secondary associations to various Netherworld creatures. Conversely, the “hand of ghost” texts and the šep lemutti texts exclude witchcraft almost entirely. That having been said, in all three cases the list of evils is quite extensive. Because these evils encompass dangers to the entire family and do not list specific members of the household, it is impossible to claim that clay figurines were used by only part of the family or for the concerns of only some of its members.
Significantly, the main difference between the placement of figurines in the *Maqlû* cycle and that of the other two text groups is the total destruction of images through burning in the anti-witchcraft texts. Thus it may be reasonable to assume that where figurines survive in the archaeological record they do not usually represent protection from witchcraft, since the anti-witchcraft rituals destroy the figurines. Further, while both “hand of ghost” and *šep lemutti* texts mandate the burial of figurines, the “hand of ghost” texts do so outside of settlements.

Additionally, the texts in which figurines are used in sympathetic rituals, like the NAM.BUR.BI, some “hand of ghost” texts, and *bīt mēseri*, often instruct that the figurines be placed in the river. Therefore figurines found inside domestic units are probably not the remains of sympathetic rituals which seem to require the destruction or banishment of the substitution; more likely, they represent a combination of exorcist and apotropaic rituals. Moreover, it should also be noted that the only figurines to undergo ritual burning are the *Maqlû* figurines, which would no longer exist in the archaeological record; and none of the other figurines are ritually broken or defaced, despite the fragmentary nature of actual figurine finds. In the end, there is no Neo-Assyrian textual evidence for intentionally defacing or breaking figurines with the exception of those used to combat witches. Finally, figurines could be found in context with other cultic objects like amulets, altars, or incense stands; this would not necessarily indicate a permanent cultic niche or a favissa since all of the rituals use cultic equipment but none are associated with one stationary household shrine nor reflect ritualized deactivation and disposal of cultic implements.
One more variation lies in the amount of information provided in the description of figurines. Šep lemutti describes in great detail the manufacture and design of its figurines, “hand of ghost” gives some detail, and Maqlû gives almost none. Further, the rituals differ as to who the figurines represent. Šep lemutti clay figurines are all semi-divine beings, or extraordinary humans protecting the patient from the evil, while the other two texts describe figurines representing either the human patient or evil forces, be it demons, demonized witches, or ghosts. In addition, šep lemutti prescribes a rather standardized homogenous set of materials for figurine production, while the other two texts describe a wide variety of materials from which the images are made. Thus, it would be possible to hypothesize that small clay figurines utilizing a highly standardized image and clay composition do not necessarily represent human petitioners, human ancestors, or high deities but protective images designed to expel present harm and guard against future evil.

Also significant in this regard, both šep lemutti as well as the “hand of ghost” texts instruct that accompanying implements, paint, or inscriptions should be included as keys to the figurines’ purpose. Even in the case of Maqlû, the specific material chosen for a figurine may depend on wordplay with accompanying incantations. Where only the
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181 Wiggermann, Mesopotamian Protective Spirits, 89 seems to think that Text I:156-157 “and so, in the morning before Šamaš, I pinch off the clay of NN son of NN; may it be profitable, may what I do prosper” refers to an additional figurine of the sick person. Wiggermann only mentions this in passing and does not develop the argument. Contra Wiggermann, it is possible that this is simply a dedicatory prayer over the clay bed (as no figures of clay have yet been made) on behalf of the patient. No words for image are used in these lines, in sharp contrast to the figurine sections, and no further mention is made of any human substitutionary figurine, though all the other figurines are mentioned several times. More, Text II omits this phrase all together.
figurine survives, it is possible that other objects (no longer discernible to the archaeologist) may have been included to specify the figurine’s purpose. Thus, archaeologists may not have all the materials they need to identify the figurine’s identity or function.

Finally, the logic behind protective figurine form does not appear to be dictated by the specific concerns of the patient but by the efficacy of a set of recognizable apotropaic elements. Even where figurines are used sympathetically, they do not depict the actual ailment or concern but the agent responsible for realized or portended evil. The figurine designs and accompanying implements are included because of their ability to drive away all manner of evil not because they depict one specific problem.

Although there are known protective symbols designed to guard against specific evils, this is not often the case; it would not be discernible in the figurines themselves and can be understood only from information in the extant texts. Given that fact, such a position cannot be the prima facie starting point for interpreting figurines lacking accompanying textual evidence. For example, it would be preposterous to assume that fish apkallū figurines were used to ensure the safety of real men wearing fish costumes,
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182 According to Black and Green, the main protection against Lamaštu was the use of either stone or clay Pazuzu amulets, often inscribed, to be worn by mothers during labor. See Jeremy Black and Anthony Green, Gods, Demons and Symbols of Ancient Mesopotamia: An Illustrated Dictionary (Austin, Tex.: University of Texas Press, 1992), 116. In Heeßel’s study of Pazuzu texts and amulets there is no explicit mention of protecting mother and child but only general evils like sickness (Text CTN IV/115, 1-10) and protection for all inhabitants of the house. See Nils P. Heeßel, Pazuzu: Archäologische und philologische Studien zu einem altorientalischen Dämon (Ancient Magic and Divination 4; Leiden: Brill, 2002), 44-46, 73, 103-13.
to encourage the fertility of the fish population, or to protect humans from man-eating fish. Clearly, it is problematic to hypothesize about the specific population that utilized a figurine or to discern that population’s unique concerns on the basis of the figurine’s design or properties.

### 3.7 Conclusions

This investigation of ancient Near Eastern texts has shown that clay figurines are not mentioned in connection with major cult images but rather with sympathetic, exorcistic, and protective rituals. More specifically, Neo-Assyrian texts, coterminous with excavated clay figurines from throughout the empire, provide a wealth of information about figurine style, production, and use. While the particularities of individual ritual needs and archaeological preservation will never provide an exact correlation between text and artifact, it is reasonable to take these Neo-Assyrian documents as reflections of regular ritual practices and logics, and thus, as witnesses to ritual activity in the ninth through sixth centuries B.C.E.

These ritual texts facilitate an appraisal of modern assumptions and inferences used to interpret clay figurines, especially those reviewed in Chapter 2.\(^{183}\) The main points of contestation can be summarized as follows:

---

\(^{183}\) For “figurines as goddesses” see 2.1, for “figurines as ‘popular religion’” see 2.2, for “figurines as cheap objects” see 2.2.3, and for “figurines as ‘female religion’” see 2.3.
• Figurines as gods/goddesses or votives
Interpreters cannot assume that clay anthropomorphic images represent high deities, that they depict the main object of the ritual worship or supplication, or that they are human votives.

• Figurines as popular religion
Interpreters cannot assume clay figurines were used only by popular levels of society, that they stand outside the realm of state religion, that they were broken for ritual or iconoclastic reasons, or that their presence in a locus is an indicator of heterodox cult space

• Figurines as cheap objects
Interpreters cannot assume knowledge of the owner’s socio-economic standing based on the figurine style and technological consistency nor can they assume that figurines were cheap objects used once per short ritual and for mundane concerns

• Figurines as female religion
Interpreters cannot assume that figurines were used only in the household sphere or in permanent household niches, that they were only used by specific members of the household, or that the design was dictated by the population using the figurines or their specific concerns

With respect to the JPFs, the Neo-Assyrian texts cannot be used to recreate, ipso facto, Judean ritual use of clay figurines. For example, the fact that Neo-Assyrian figurines were important parts of temple-sanctioned religious activity does not imply that
the same was true in southern Israel. Neither do the texts completely exclude certain reconstructions of Judean figurine use. The texts may, however, help construct a model to test the probability of certain explanations. Most importantly, the texts show that modern interpreters cannot assume, without evidence, that clay figurines in Judah were part of a heterodox religious movement or that they were owned by women or were used solely for women’s concerns.

Claims about figurine meaning and function based on commonsense or guesswork are not justifiable. Further, because the Judean figurines are not mentioned in the Hebrew Bible, interpretations of those figurines regularly rely upon modern inference and, secondarily, archaeological record. Unfortunately, the former, rather than the latter, has dominated scholarship on these artifacts. Ultimately, only by bringing together the textual evidence for clay figurines with the archaeological context of figurines and their physical properties can a serious interpretive strategy be formed.
CHAPTER 4: KENYON’S JERUSALEM

From 1961 through 1967 Kathleen Kenyon excavated several areas throughout Jerusalem. Although the excavated areas lacked broad horizontal exposure and contained few Iron II domestic structures, Kenyon’s work produced one of the largest groups of anthropomorphic pillar figurine fragments known at that time, ca. 144 pieces.¹ Even today, this figure has been exceeded only by the number of figurines from Shiloh’s excavations in Jerusalem (ca. 240 pieces). Obviously, ignoring the Kenyon corpus would skew any interpretation of Judean anthropomorphic statuary.

The large number of figurines recovered by Kenyon’s excavations came from three important Iron II contexts—Cave I, an extramural city street, and a small group of domestic buildings (Buildings 1-7). Close examination of these contexts reveals two dominant depositional patterns, neither of which clearly reflects formal cultic space. Further, the archaeological contexts suggest a shift in figurine production style from the eighth to the sixth centuries. In order to identify these depositional patterns and to study the chronological shift in production technique, this chapter first addresses the challenges in using the Kenyon data (4.1). It then investigates the stratigraphic context and artifact deposition of the Cave I deposit (4.2), the extra-mural street deposit (4.3), and Buildings 1-7 (4.4). The conclusion (4.5) proposes that the best interpretation of the Kenyon deposits is that they are either storage-market debris or domestic garbage with a marked

¹ This number omits identifiable horse and rider fragments.
shift in popularity from molded heads toward pinched heads from the eighth century to the sixth century.

4.1 Challenges in using the Kenyon data

A few factors hinder the interpretation of the data from Kenyon’s Jerusalem excavations. First, the Kenyon data are published in a number of different, and sometimes differing, sources. Tom Holland published all of Kenyon’s figurines; but, while his dissertation describes the figurine design and clay properties, it does not include exact archaeological provenience. In a separate article, Holland includes very general context information for the Cave I figurines. Raz Kletter attempted to update the provenience data but with only limited success. An appendix of figurines, complete with soil layer numbers, was published in Volume III of the Kenyon Excavations; but the author was not able to correlate this list with that of Holland. Nor does this appendix provide enough

---

2 Holland, “Typological and Archaeological Study of Human and Animal Representations.”


information to clearly relate their figurines to Holland’s descriptions. Thus pinched heads, molded heads, and body fragments can be related to soil layers; but in most cases Holland’s more complete descriptions of figurine design and clay properties cannot be taken into account.

A second problem is deciding which figurines should be considered JPFs. Kletter’s catalogue omits some of the figurines in Holland’s study on this basis. For example, Kletter rejects 4 of Holland’s 55 pinched heads because they do not resemble typical JPFs. Their designs vary, containing applied pellet eyes or incised features; and they may be male.6 Kletter does not consistently reject all potential male figurines, however. According to Holland, 2 more pinched heads possessed beards,7 though in these cases Kletter labels them JPFs. Thus, Kletter’s exclusion of certain pieces in the Holland corpus appears somewhat arbitrary. Not that Holland’s study was without mistakes. For example, two of Holland’s fragments are placed in the pinched head category but do not contain a head; and Kletter relocates them to the body fragment category.8 As for molded


heads, Kletter rejects 7 of Holland’s 19 molded heads primarily because the fragments were difficult to discern in the photographs but also because some of their typological features differ from JPF molded heads. Kletter does the same for 1 body fragment. He also omits all of the bell-shaped torso fragments appearing in Holland’s typology.

Kletter’s methodology is problematic because he removes variation from the Jerusalem corpus by excluding all figurine types that do not match his standardized version of JPFs. While the JPF iconographic type is clearly the most dominant, the other figurine variations deserve to be noted. Such figurines are sometimes preserved in Iron


Kletter omits these from his “figurines with molded face and hollow, wheel-made body,” which he does include in his JPF count. This separation seems to be problematic because there is every possibility these figurines’ heads would have been molded.


Age contexts suggesting that these variants cannot be explained as later styles; thus, they should not be eliminated.\(^\text{12}\) Because of these theoretical disadvantages and because the Jerusalem excavation reports refer to Holland’s typology, Holland’s more inclusive system is favored.

A third problem stems from the information about context, for not all the locations that Kenyon excavated have been published. She worked in at least seventeen different areas throughout the city and only about half thus far have been published. Luckily, most of the unpublished areas have few Iron Age occupation levels; and the figurines from these areas were found in fill for later construction. This supposition is supported in two ways. First, Holland notes that the figurines were very numerous in the Iron Age levels of Cave I, in Field A, Square XXVI, and Trench I Squares I to XV;\(^\text{13}\) and these stratigraphic reports have been published.\(^\text{14}\) Second, although Holland also

\(^\text{12}\) E.g., Holland, “Typological and Archaeological Study of Human and Animal Representations,” A.XII.g.1/Kletter, Judean Pillar-Figurines, Appendix 5, 5.1.4.6). Unlike the seated female figurine which is clearly from a later context, at least one of these figurines was found in an Iron Age context and cannot be dismissed as a later style.

\(^\text{13}\) Holland, “Study of Palestinian Iron Age Baked Clay Figurines” 169.

mentions figurines from other areas,\textsuperscript{15} Kenyon’s descriptions of these areas,\textsuperscript{16} as well as more recent publications,\textsuperscript{17} make it clear that these figurines primarily result from later, often imported fill, rather than Iron Age occupational debris.

The final problem with the Kenyon publications is that Kenyon did not publish the materials herself nor were they published close to the time of excavation. Franken and Steiner note several impediments to their interpretation of Kenyon’s work including the great distances between excavation areas, the varying quality of supervisor reports, the loss of crucial plans and sections, and the inadmissibility of certain stratigraphic contexts.\textsuperscript{18} Franken also struggled with Kenyon’s system of recording pottery.\textsuperscript{19} Because

\textsuperscript{15} Holland, “Study of Palestinian Iron Age Baked Clay Figurines,” 169. Site L from the Armenian Garden, Trench C in the Old City, F south of the Pool of Siloam, H northeast of Trench I, K north of the Pool of Siloam, M northwest of H, and S south of the southern wall of the Temple platform.

\textsuperscript{16} Kenyon (Digging Up Jerusalem, 151) says that Trench C contained Byzantine and Roman buildings on top of a “tremendous fill” from the seventh century B.C.E. and first century C.E. standing on top of a seventh century quarry. Kenyon connects the fill with Hadrian’s Aeolia Capitolina. She says that area F had no occupation before the first century C.E. (ibid., 27), area H was badly disturbed by Byzantine and Arab foundation walls and cisterns (ibid., 25-26), area K had only one or two pockets of Iron Age pottery in rock crevices and was heavily quarried (ibid., 28), area M was quarried in the Roman period with the first surviving houses in the Byzantine period (ibid., 27-28), and Area S consisted of Byzantine material with spare material in upper levels (ibid., 192).

\textsuperscript{17} Tushingham (Excavations in Jerusalem, Figs. 4:13; 6:12, 14; 9:8, 9,11,10,12; 12:12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19 ) shows that all figurine fragments in area L came from fill and that most of the figurines were found in fills IAc or IAd associated with the Hellenistic and Roman period construction (ibid., 21). Furthermore, in the latest published volume, Kay Prag (Excavations by K. M. Kenyon in Jerusalem 1961-1967: Volume 5: Discoveries in Hellenistic to Ottoman Jerusalem: Centenary Volume: Kathleen M. Kenyon 1906-1978 [Oxford: Council for British Research in the Levant and Oxbow Books, 2008], 469) summarizes the Iron II sherds from many of the Byzantine-Ottoman areas, including sites V, E, D.I, D.II, B, G-J, and S and says that there were fewer Iron age sherds where Roman and Byzantine quarrying was intense, that much of the Iron Age sherds present were imported fills or slope wash, and that even where Iron age occupation may have existed the later periods have obliterated all but a few minor sherd pockets.

\textsuperscript{18} Franken and Steiner, “Introduction,” 1.
part of the pottery was discarded during excavation, Franken was able to analyze pottery only from Field A, Squares XXII +XXVIII and XXVI. Fortunately, XXVI is where the two most important figurine contexts are located.

Compiling the number of figurines from Holland’s catalogue, Kletter’s catalogue, and the Jerusalem excavation reports yields the following quantities. Holland lists 55 pinched heads from Jerusalem. Eight are in area L and 7 are definitely in Area A. Once

---


21 Boas-Vedder, “Appendix I” 122-26 is somewhat problematic because there is no standard terminology. For example, the texts may say either “female torso” or “torso of woman.” Sometimes the meaning of the nomenclature is unclear. For example, three heads are called “human heads” rather than “female heads” or “head, pinched face.” Because the text is more consistent in its designation of “head, pinched face” the three “human heads” are here understood as molded heads. This is further supported by the fact that Margreet L. Steiner (“Stratigraphical Analysis, Architecture and Objects of the Phases,” in Excavations in Jerusalem 1961-1967: Volume 2: The Iron Age Extramural Quarter on the South-East Hill [ed. Hendricus J. Franken and Margreet L. Steiner; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990], 56) lists pinched heads and human heads (rather than molded heads or female heads) in her description of the street deposit. Furthermore, the appendix also uses the terms “part of human torso” or “human torso” (5 fragments) in addition to “female torso.” While it is theoretically possible that these torsos could refer to horse and rider figurines, rider fragments are usually identified. Here it is assumed that these torso fragments come from pillar figurines but no longer preserve the breasts or come from lower portions of the pillar. This assumption is undergirded by Kletter who, in his catalogue, positively identifies Reg. 3341 “Part of Human Torso” with Holland, “Typological and Archaeological Study of Human and Animal Representations,” B.VII.7/Kletter, Judean Pillar-Figurines, Appendix 5, 5.1.2.2, described by Holland as part of a wheel made body with hands supporting the breasts.

the known figurines from Area A are subtracted from the published number in the Jerusalem excavation reports, 12 are unaccounted for. After these 12 are subtracted from Holland’s list, 28 pinched heads remain unprovenienced and could come from any of the other areas in Kenyon’s excavation, or 51% of the total pinched heads (see Appendix A: Table 1 and 2).

Holland lists 19 molded heads, with 4 known from Area A, leaving another 6 that must be from Iron Age loci in Area A, as listed in the Boas-Vedder appendix, with a remainder of 9 molded heads or 47% of the corpus that could come from any of the other areas (Tables 3 and 4 in Appendix A). Finally, Holland reports 70 body fragments: 9 were from area L; 13 from Cave I/Room J; 4 from Area A; another 24 from Iron Age loci in area A; and 20 fragments, or 29%, from all other areas combined (see Tables 5 and 6 in Appendix A). Thus, of the total corpus, 46% of the figurines from Kenyon’s

“Field A” but without including a registration number or any details so Kletter’s identification cannot be confirmed. Kletter places a third fragment (Holland, “Typological and Archaeological Study of Human and Animal Representations,” A.I.g.1/Kletter, Judean Pillar-Figurines, Appendix 2, 359A+1.A) in Area C but this cannot be confirmed.

Kletter places another 3 in Area A but neither the soil layer numbers he lists nor the registration numbers are listed in Boas-Vedder, “Appendix I,” 122-26 or Holland, “Study of Palestinian Iron Age Baked Clay Figurines,” 178-82.

Kletter lists another 4 in area A but neither the soil layer numbers nor the registration numbers appear in Boas-Vedder, “Appendix I,” 122-26. He also lists two in Area C, but this cannot be confirmed.

This number includes 3 unprovenienced bases as well as 1 pedestal fragment assigned to Phase 1 but not discussed in the text, making them of little value for Iron II contexts.
Jerusalem excavation are accounted for, with 66 fragments securely located in Iron II layers.\textsuperscript{26}

Ultimately, although the number of unprovenienced figurines impedes a complete record of iconographic variation in Jerusalem, the missing data consist of figurines in later secondary or tertiary contexts rather than \textit{in situ} occupational debris. In other words, the vast majority of figurines found in Iron II occupational contexts are published.

\subsection*{4.2 Cave I}

Many scholars have identified Cave I as a cultic site. Following Kenyon and Holland,\textsuperscript{27} they note the presence of figurines as well as other “ritual” artifacts in the cave.\textsuperscript{28} Kletter criticizes this association on methodological and practical grounds, claiming that it is inappropriate to identify all sites containing figurines as cultic and also noting that the small size of Cave I and the large number of objects would have restricted

\begin{itemize}
\item This number omits 4 body fragments from unknown contexts but includes 19 pinched heads, 10 molded heads, and 37 body fragments. This number is significant, considering Kletter’s total provenienced figurines number only 255 (Kletter, \textit{Judean Pillar-Figurines}, 57). Kletter (ibid., 59, 105, Fig. 31) does include 14 from Cave I in his context data; but this number is confusing, since he omits 3 of these fragments from his JPF category (Appendix 5, 5.1.2.3, 5.1.2.4, 5.1.2.5). Thus, Fig. 31 in Kletter, labeled, “The Archaeological Context of the JPFs,” should only include 11 fragments from Cave I. Furthermore, even when 14 fragments are subtracted from the 66 Iron II figurines from Kenyon’s excavations, at least 52 figurines are still missing from Kletter’s context data, a number large enough to affect Kletter’s relative percentages of JPF locus types.


\end{itemize}
movement in the cave. Kletter hypothesizes that the cave contains multiple deposits, but he offers no archaeological data to support this conclusion.

Given the dominance of Cave I in scholarly interpretations, the possibility that the cave represents a Judean public cult site, and the large number of figurines found in it, the site deserves further investigation. Careful stratigraphic analysis may show Kletter correct in doubting the identification of Cave I as a cult site. It does not follow, however, that the figurines are merely the result of random accumulation. A thorough investigation of the archaeological context can provide a more probably alternative to these problematic interpretations of the Cave I figurines.

4.2.1 Cave I in context

Cave I was not the only cave in Kenyon’s excavations. At least two other caves were found in the immediate area, and all of these caves were incorporated into a series of rooms running along a horizontal rock ledge. The first set of rooms (Field A, Squares XXI, XXII, XXVII, and XXVIII) form a Northern Building, and another set of rooms

---

29 Kletter, Judean Pillar-Figurines, 63.

30 Kletter (ibid., 59) lists 14 fragments of female figurines associated with Cave I making it the second largest group of figurines in his study. When animal fragments and horse and rider figurine are added, the cave contained ca. 80-82 figurines, making this locus worthy of attention.


(Squares XXV and XXVI) form a second building to the south (see Figure 1).\textsuperscript{33} The Northern Building contained Cave II, while the Southern Building contained Cave III as well as Cave I. Although the Northern Building is often omitted in discussion of Cave I, the archaeological remains suggest that both buildings should be considered when interpreting the Cave I deposit.

\textbf{4.2.1.1 Cave II and the Northern Building}

One of the reasons the Northern Building has been ignored is because Steiner dates it to the ninth century,\textsuperscript{34} apparently due to the absence of pillar figurines, which she dates to the eighth century.\textsuperscript{35} Prag disagrees with this dating, citing the similarity between the pottery assemblages of Cave II and Cave III (in the Southern Building), dated by Franken to the eighth century, as well as the presence of eighth century forms in Cave II.\textsuperscript{36} Thus, the Northern and Southern buildings should be considered part of the same phase.

\textsuperscript{33} These buildings will be called the “Northern Building” and the “Southern Building” because no regular nomenclature was used in the excavation reports.

\textsuperscript{34} Steiner, “Stratigraphical Analysis, Architecture and Objects of the Phases,” 10.

\textsuperscript{35} Ibid., 24. Steiner dates the figurines on analogy with Lachish figurines.

\textsuperscript{36} Prag, “Summary of the Reports on Caves I, II and III and Deposit IV,” 217.
Contra Kenyon, Steiner does not consider Cave II or the Northern Building cultic sites, preferring to call the building a “guest house” and Cave II a storage place for
crockery. Eshel suggests that the deposit is a normal domestic or utilitarian pottery assemblage but, due to the quantity of material, links the building with the Judean administration or considers it a merchant’s storeroom. The Northern Building and Cave II contained animal figurines but no anthropomorphic figurines. The building was abandoned and collapsed; and subsequently all the floors were covered with a thick layer of mudbrick debris and rubble. This layer did include 1 pinched head and 1 idiosyncratic male figurine fragment, but it was impossible to distinguish between debris from the collapsing building and that from later erosion layers higher up the slope.

37 Steiner, “Stratigraphical Analysis, Architecture and Objects of the Phases,” 27. Kenyon (Digging Up Jerusalem, 135-40) identifies the Cave II building as a cult site on the basis of pillars in room N, a niche behind Wall 17, and a supposed “altar” in Cave II; the Cave I and II deposits were understood as favissae. Steiner disagrees with Kenyon, partly because Cave II did not contain figurines, rattles, inscriptions, or animal bones in cooking pots. She posits a “guest house” because she believes the pottery assemblage does not constitute a regular domestic assemblage. Of 281 complete pots and many sherds, the deposit contained a high percentage of bowls and saucers and almost no storage containers. She suggests the pots were kept on shelves along the walls.


39 Steiner, “Stratigraphical Analysis, Architecture and Objects of the Phases,” 27. Also in the collapse were 12 animal fragments, 1 base fragment, and 1 lmlk two-winged seal, as well as 6 loom weights, 1 limestone polishing stone, 1 limestone hammerstone, 1 limestone carved hand, 1 basalt mortar fragment, 1 basalt rubber, 2 limestone rubbers, and 1 rim fragment from a basalt bowl. The idiosyncratic head is Holland, “Typological and Archaeological Study of Human and Animal Representations,” A.I.h.1/Kletter, Judean Pillar-Figurines, Appendix 5, 5.1.4.17. a male head with a possible sack on the shoulder and log in the right arm. While this assemblage appears to reflect domestic garbage it should not necessarily be equated with domestic trash from the actual building, which, according to Steiner (ibid., 30), yielded very few finds in the rooms themselves. The building was more than likely abandoned. Unfortunately, the soil layers associated with figurine fragments are not depicted on any section drawings from the area, so it is impossible to confirm their exact placement in relation to the mudbrick collapse and subsequent extended debris accumulation.
accumulation of these layers probably went on for quite some time,\textsuperscript{40} making the collapsed debris less useful for dating figurine style or for spatial interpretation. Furthermore, the debris was covered with two tali, one with only Iron Age sherds and another with a predominance of Roman pottery,\textsuperscript{41} providing ample opportunities for contamination.

\textbf{4.2.1.2 Southern Building}

The building outside of Cave I also runs along a horizontal rock ledge, to the south of the Northern Building. Like the Northern Building, the Southern Building was not fully excavated to its eastern extent, though there was evidence for a second row of rooms to the east.\textsuperscript{42} This building contained a series of rooms, named B through L; and room J was outside of the entrance to Cave I. Another cave deposit was associated with same building, alternatively called Cave III or Room E (see Figure 2).

Steiner interprets this building as a guest house, on analogy with the Cave II building; but she interprets Cave I itself as a popular cult center.\textsuperscript{43} She does not address

\textsuperscript{40} Ibid., 30.
\textsuperscript{41} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{42} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{43} Ibid., 49.
Figure 2: Plan and section of the Southern Building with Caves III and I
the fact that a non-cultic guest house blocked the cave’s entrance from the general populace. Nor does she explain why she considers Cave I a separate entity from the Southern Building after previously linking the Cave II deposit with the function of the Northern Building and the Cave III deposit with the Southern Building. As will be explained, the Southern Building is inextricably linked with Cave I and must be considered in any interpretation of Cave I.

Other than Room J where figurines were uncovered, two rooms from the Southern Building contained significant remains. First, Room B held a “fire place,” and in its “Structure B” were 39 vessels (mostly small bowls) and 3 pestles. The pottery inside Structure B and the adjacent Structure C was discolored with a greenish tint, interpreted as organic matter from a rubbish pit. Second, in “Room E,” a “cave” in the rock scarp measuring 60 by 25 cm, the excavators found 79 mostly complete vessels, along with some fish and animal bones. This space is referred to as Cave III in the field notebooks. Because the Cave III assemblage is similar to the Cave II pottery assemblage, Steiner

1 A stone walled area with an “earth floor” resting on pavement.

2 Steiner, “Stratigraphical Analysis, Architecture and Objects of the Phases,” 32-33. There was also 1 animal figurine fragment, 1 bead, and 1 pendant, although the pendant is intrusive from the Byzantine period (Prag, “Summary of the Reports on Caves I, II and III and Deposit IV,” 218). Note, the “fire place” does not have any apparent outlet other than an open front, and, according to Plate 7, consists of three stone slabs built adjacent to Wall 29. In addition to “Structure B,” “Structure C” consisted of a stone walled area immediately adjacent to Structure B. It contained 1 basalt quern, 3 bowl fragments, 1 plate fragment, 2 carnelian beads, a large number of cooking pot fragments, 1 lamp, and some fish and animal bones.

3 Steiner, “Stratigraphical Analysis, Architecture and Objects of the Phases,” 49.

4 Ibid., 35. Cave III contained a preponderance of small bowls in addition to several pestles, 1 bone spatula, and an animal figurine fragment. In general, the pottery finds from rooms B, C, D, E, and F are badly preserved from Kenyon’s excavation (much of which was discarded during the excavation) and thus the notes in the field notebooks and some remaining pottery are the basis for Steiner’s interpretation.
interprets the Southern Building as a guest house. Prag concurs but stresses the possibility that Room B may have had an industrial or “specialized” function.

Rooms H and J are particularly important for determining the relationship between Cave I and the Southern Building. First, because they are in Square XXVI the excavated pottery was preserved for later evaluation. Second, H and J both underwent multiple architectural phases: Room H has at least two if not three phases of construction; and Room J has at least two phases of use prior to the end of occupation. This phasing reveals the intentional incorporation of Cave I into the building’s architectural plan and the shifting access to Cave I during the life of the building.

Beginning with Room J, the section drawing shows a collapse of soil layers (965.25, .29. 31) into the mouth of Cave I (Figure 3). Steiner notes that many figurine fragments were in the collapse of these layers. According to Steiner, the floor layers of

5 Ibid., 49.

6 Prag (“Summary of the Reports on Caves I, II and III and Deposit IV,” 218-19) bases this hypothesis on the pottery in structure B of room B, the plaster lined bin, and the organic discoloration.

7 This does not mean that they are totally free from problems. Eshel (“Architecture of the Cave Structures and Their Stratigraphical Setting,” 16) says that these extramural areas were dug in probes, thus explaining why certain areas remained unexcavated. Fortunately, Square XXVI was dug down to eighth century levels in the row of rooms adjacent to the rock wall so the figurine count for these rooms should be accurate. The lack of broad exposure would, however, affect any attempt at determining the total number of figurines inside the entire Southern Building.

8 Steiner, “Stratigraphical Analysis, Architecture and Objects of the Phases,” 37, 40.

9 Ibid., 40.

10 “Kenyon used the term “soil layer” rather than locus. While “locus” is a broader term that often applies to earth layers, architecture, and features, “soil layer” usually applies only to earth loci.
Room J (965.41 and 965.32) were cut by these soil layers when the soil washed into the cave. In addition to the unlikely event that soil layers would actually “cut” through a floor surface, the problem with the stratigraphy is the height of Room J floor layers and the angle of collapse into the cave. The section does not show these floor surfaces sloping into the cave. Furthermore these floor layers are much higher than the cave’s floor. If they had not been “cut” by the sloping debris above them, they would have extended into Cave I in midair. The stratigraphy thus suggests the presence of a retaining wall at the

---

Steiner (ibid., 40) describes the layers as “black burnt, evidence of charcoal with many bones, much pottery, and broken figurines.”
mouth of the cave. In fact, the section drawing does preserve a few remaining stones at the cave’s entrance. If these stones were the remains of a wall, that wall would have reached, at a minimum, the height of floor 965.32, thus explaining the higher elevation of the Room J surfaces, why the floor surfaces did not extend to the floor of the cave, and the diagonal collapse of all the soil layers above the remaining stones.

Steiner also mentions these stones, called Wall 11 by Eshel,\(^\text{12}\) noting that they were labeled “stone tumble” in the excavation notebooks but that they could be the remnants of a wall.\(^\text{13}\) In fact, when looking at the photograph from inside the cave, this “Wall 11” appears much more structured than random stone tumble (see Figure 4).

![Figure 4: Wall 8 and Wall 11 from the inside of Cave I](image)


\(^{13}\) Steiner, “Stratigraphical Analysis, Architecture and Objects of the Phases,” 40.
Wall 8 is the long wall entering the cave and Wall 11 is the broad wall in the mouth of the cave. As is obvious in the photograph, the remains of Wall 11 span almost the entire entrance. Moreover, according to the excavator’s description of the main Cave I deposit (966.3–965.25, .29, .31), the layer contained a number of large stones. If most of the soil layers sloping into the mouth of the cave were caused by the collapse of Wall 11, then it would make sense that some large stones, possibly from the wall, remained in the collapse near the cave’s entrance. An important implication of this hypothesis would be that it meant reduced access to Cave I. Based on the section drawings, if Wall 11 did reach the height of floor 965.32, then little more than 75 cm of the cave opening would have been accessible during this phase of the building’s occupation. This is certainly not enough space for humans to access the back of Cave I easily or to engage in cultic rituals within the cave.

Wall 8 provides additional evidence that the architecture of the Southern Building intentionally altered access to the cave. Following Kenyon, Steiner notes that the adjacent room, Room H, had several occupational layers containing stone chips from the extension of the entrance to Cave I. In the section drawing, Wall 8 does not cut any of these stone chip layers. This means that Room H was divided from Room J with the construction of Wall 8, which extends into the mouth of Cave I, as is clearly visible in the photograph.

15 Steiner, “Stratigraphical Analysis, Architecture and Objects of the Phases,” 37, 40.
16 Prag (“Summary of the Reports on Caves I, II and III and Deposit IV,” 209) agrees that Wall 8 was built into the mouth of the cave.
of Figure 4. Subsequently, Room H was backfilled with soil and stone chips from the extension of the cave mouth. The wall may have met Wall 11 inside the mouth of the cave. Thus, it is possible that when the builders decided to construct Room H, they knowingly limited access to Cave I while both rooms were in use.\(^{17}\) It is worthy of note that Cave II was also “enclosed” by Walls 14 and 15, limiting access to the cave’s opening;\(^{18}\) and, judging from the plans, Wall 31 controlled access to Cave III.\(^{19}\) Thus, in both the Northern and Southern buildings the inhabitants uniformly built architectural elements to incorporate natural caves into the buildings, limiting access to the back of the cave spaces and controlling water accumulation.

It should be pointed out that the Southern Building also contained rooms to the east of Rooms H and J (Rooms K and L in Square XXVI as well as Room F in Square XXV). Although badly eroded and not fully excavated, the evidence suggests that these rooms would have blocked Room J and Cave I from plain view. For example, at least one of the floors in room K was at the height of 663.50 m,\(^{20}\) higher than the floor levels of

---

\(^{17}\) This does not mean that Room J had already gone out of use by the time Room H was created. The evidence suggests the rooms were used at the same time. Associated with Wall 8, the floor surface 967.6 (ca. 662.8 m) in Room H was constructed at a relatively equal elevation to floor surface 965.41 (ca. 662.9 m) in Room J. Subsequent use in 967.5 and .4 (ca. 663 m) in Room H also match the general elevation of surface 965.32 in Room J (ca. 663 m). At this point, the section drawing shows that a foundation trench cut surfaces 967.6-.4 so that Wall 7 could separate Room H from Room G to its south. Then a leveling fill (967.2) was laid and a paved floor 967.1 (ca. 663.2-3 m) was added, still at a reasonable elevation to be comparable to the uppermost surfaces of room J. Furthermore, the pottery in both Steiner (“Stratigraphical Analysis, Architecture and Objects of the Phases,” 49) and Eshel (“Architecture of the Cave Structures and Their Stratigraphical Setting,” 15) suggests a simultaneous use of all these rooms.

\(^{18}\) Steiner, “Stratigraphical Analysis, Architecture and Objects of the Phases,” 24, 27.

\(^{19}\) Ibid., 31, Fig. 2-22.

\(^{20}\) Ibid., 42.
Thus, Walls 11 and 8, along with the rooms to the east, significantly reduced access to Cave I during the life of the building, making it difficult to imagine the cave as a popular cult center at that time.

The post-occupational processes further complicate the building’s story. There appears to be at least two phases of collapse into the cave, though it is difficult to calculate the time between them. Steiner describes the burnt fill layers (965.25, .29, and .31) as the location of many figurines and other objects, including a loom weight, a rattle, 2 pestle fragments, and bone objects. Given the evidence of charcoal, it seems possible that these layers reflect upper floor collapse into the mouth of the cave. Following the first collapse, at an undetermined interval, were the bricky stone layers of locus 965.16 in Room J and 965.10a, 17, 18, 19, and 20 in Room H, which Steiner interprets as the collapse of the building’s upper storey. Finally, the stone tumble with wet clay was

---

21 See Figure 2.

22 Ibid., Fig. 2-35. The authors are not consistent in their description of these loci. Later, Steiner (ibid., 49) says that “uppermost floors in porch J continue into the cave, and it is in these layers that all the objects were found.” Yet, earlier she clearly identifies these soil layers with later fill that spilled into the cave. Corroborating the identification of these layers as fill, Eshel (“Architecture of the Cave Structures and Their Stratigraphical Setting,” 75, Plan 7) published a revised section drawing with more elaborate soil descriptions and more detailed locus information.

23 Steiner (“Stratigraphical Analysis, Architecture and Objects of the Phases,” 49) lists the collapse of bricky material as evidence of a second storey. Additionally, the burnt soil and charcoal fragments may be the remnants of burnt wooden ceiling beams.

24 Steiner (“Stratigraphical Analysis, Architecture and Objects of the Phases,” 49). According to the revised section in Eshel (“Architecture of the Cave Structures and Their Stratigraphical Setting,” 75, Plan 7) this layer 965.16, consisting of “stone tumble intermingled with very wet clay,” stops abruptly before reaching the mouth of Cave I. It is possible, however, that 965.16 actually continued into the cave as 966.3, described as “layer of very wet clay overlying a larger number of vessels and some large stones.” The revised section suggests that 965.25, .29, .31 equal 966.3, but they are described as “brown to black burnt soil,” which is obviously quite different in character from water-laid clay deposits. It seems probable that
overlaid by a layer of fine loose earth sloping into the cave (=966.1 inside Cave I), probably post-dating the building’s collapse. In the accumulated material above the building collapse were 8 animal figurine fragments, 2 miniature bed fragments, and possibly 1 pinched head, along with a flint knife, a limestone cylinder, a basalt quern fragment, a travertine ballistic stone, and two bone pins. Furthermore, in the water gullies formed in the collapse were 2 animal figurine fragments, 1 molded head, and 1 female figurine torso, in addition to 1 basalt rubbing stone. All told, the building

these two soil layers, the blackened material and the wet clay, intermingled in the mouth of the cave. This argument is further advanced when Prag (“Summary of the Reports on Caves I, II and III and Deposit IV,” 216) notes that a number of joins have been made between fragments of objects and vessels inside Cave I and fragments from layers 1-39 in Room J. Thus, contra Steiner, the material inside Cave I was not only related to the “brown to black soil” layers but also to the collapsed layers above.


26 Boas-Vedder, “Appendix I,” 123. The head is problematic because it is listed in layer 956.3 but this layer is not visible on any of the drawings from Square XXVI. The other objects in Phase 5 were all from 965 layers, so it is possible that the 956 is a typographical error. A further difficulty is that while Boas-Vedder lists 2 of these fragments in Phase 5 (object number 7457 and 7459, both animal fragments), Holland (“Study of Palestinian Iron Age Baked Clay Figurines,” 180) actually includes them in his registry of Cave I/Room J artifacts, normally grouped together under Phase 4. Finally, Steiner (“Stratigraphical Analysis, Architecture and Objects of the Phases,” 50) says that there were 10 animal figurines, though the registry lists only 8.

27 In addition, (Franken, “Scope of the Present Pottery Study,” 74, Fig. 4-6) notes the presence of 595 sherds (rims) from Phase 5 in Square XXVI.

28 Boas-Vedder (“Appendix I, 123-24, 135). Note that Steiner (“Stratigraphical Analysis, Architecture and Objects of the Phases,” 50) is only able to comment on the relative chronology of these gullies. They post-dated Phase 5 collapse but could have continued collecting water during the time the street of Phase 7 was in use.
probably was abandoned for some time and only at the end of these complex post-occupation processes was the cave sealed by further debris.²⁹

To summarize, the archaeology seems to suggest an inextricable link among the Northern Building, the Southern Building, and Cave I, implying that the cave was blocked by either a guest house or warehouse, depending on whether one follows Steiner or Eshel. The construction of Rooms H and J suggest that the builders intentionally incorporated Cave I into their building renovations at the time when Room H was separated from Room J. Prior to that point it is possible that the deeper recesses of the cave were accessible. When Wall 8 was constructed to separate the two rooms, Wall 11 was built in the mouth of the cave, blocking access to the majority of the cave and explaining why the floor levels of Room J are significantly higher than the floor of Cave I. Cave II in the Northern Building and Cave III in the Southern Building exhibit the same built walls to control access to the caves’ entrances. Visibility and access to Cave I would also have been impeded by the rooms to the east of Rooms H and J as well as the probable second storey of the building. Finally, upon abandonment some material, possibly from the second floor or from trash accumulation in abandoned Room J, collapsed into the entrance of Cave I (once Wall 11 had collapsed). Following that event, the entrance may have been exposed for an undetermined time to additional dumping or activity.

²⁹ Ibid., 50.
4.2.2 Stratigraphy of Cave I

There are some difficulties ascertaining the phasing of the Cave I deposits. Steiner discusses only one phase of use. She allows that the cave may have originally been cut as a tomb but insists there is no evidence for human interment.\(^\text{30}\) The cave contained about 1,300 objects, all scattered in a layer of wet clay, which Steiner calls A/966.3=965.24.\(^\text{31}\) Unfortunately, the section drawing published in Steiner does not include 966.3, making it difficult to identify where the layer begins or ends. Given the fact that the cave is 8.0 m long and up to 4.20 m wide, with two separate “rooms,” listing the exact location of the figurine deposits would have been helpful. Unfortunately, no such information has been published.

The problem is further complicated by the fact that Holland published the Cave I figurines separately, with a separate registration list.\(^\text{32}\) Volume III of the Kenyon excavations does not include any figurines from “inside” Cave I so corroboration is impossible.\(^\text{33}\) Volume III does list figurines in the fill layers from Room J; but the section drawing clearly shows these layers collapsing far into the mouth of Cave I, making any distinction between “outside” and “inside” the cave problematic. Despite this fact, Steiner

\(^{30}\) Ibid., 44, 49.

\(^{31}\) Ibid., 44.

\(^{32}\) Holland, “Study of Palestinian Iron Age Baked Clay Figurines,” 178-82.

\(^{33}\) Boas-Vedder, “Appendix I,” 122-26. Even when the registry does contain figurines from Room J they are problematic. For example, the molded head listed in ibid., Reg. 7366/Holland, “Typological and Archaeological Study of Human and Animal Representations,” A.III.d.7/ Kletter, Judean Pillar-Figurines, 301.B.4.B., is listed in layers outside Cave I; but Kletter says the figurine is inside Cave I.
says that only inside Cave I were human pillar figurines discovered.\(^{34}\) Unfortunately, Holland’s registration list is of little help, describing the location of the figurines as “Entrance Wash,” “Inside Cave,” “Wash into Cave,” or “Room outside Cave,” with no mention of soil layer numbers.

Eshel’s report provides some much needed clarity. He argues for multiple phases of use in Cave I and also claims that the building and Cave I were linked.\(^{35}\) Contra to Steiner who notes only one clay deposit (966.3), Eshel claims that there were three layers of deposit: water laid sterile clay deposits;\(^{36}\) storage of household utensils; and a large number of pots, stones, and debris that fell during the “violent destruction” of the outside structure.\(^{37}\) The details of this phasing will be discussed in due course, but the recognition of multiple phases of use is important in and of itself.

Eshel confirms the fact that 966.3, a layer containing “very wet clay and loose brick material with a large number of pots and other implements as well as large stone

\(^{34}\) Steiner, “Stratigraphical Analysis, Architecture and Objects of the Phases,” 48.

\(^{35}\) Eshel, “Architecture of the Cave Structures and Their Stratigraphical Setting,” 15. Eshel calls Wall 11 an “entrance sill” constructed after the tomb was cleared of remains. This second phase incorporates the cave into the external rooms.

\(^{36}\) Ibid. Prag (“Summary of the Reports on Caves I, II and III and Deposit IV,” 212-13) also notes these sterile clay deposits, confirming that they were underneath the 966.3 layer containing the majority of published artifacts; but Prag questions whether there is evidence for Eshel’s separate Phase 2 use of the cave as a potential water reservoir. She suggests the other possibility that water could have leaked into the cave at any time, creating the water laid mud at different elevations.

\(^{37}\) Eshel, “Architecture of the Cave Structures and Their Stratigraphical Setting,” 15. The existence of a violent destruction is not supported by most of the evidence from the building outside of Cave I. Cave I does contain layers of blackened soil with some charcoal, but this appears to be the only evidence for destruction in the entire building. Thus, a better solution is that of Steiner (ibid., 50), who claims the building was probably abandoned. This would not preclude the existence of a small scale fire principally affecting room J either before abandonment or after.
and burnt clay material,” was equal to layers 965.25, .29, and .31 in Room J collapsing into the cave. He further notes that this layer (966.3=965.25, .29, .31) extended well into the cave.  Thus, it seems clear that the objects in 966.3 were not carefully deposited into Cave I but that they were part of a collapse from outside the cave. This is further supported, according to Eshel, by the fact that fragments of at least one figurine and one incense altar were found in debris both outside and inside the cave.  Prag expands on this point, citing several fragments outside and inside the cave from the same objects or vessels. In fact, she says “any attempt to separate the two deposits [966 in Cave I and 965 in Room J] becomes stratigraphically meaningless.”

This does not imply that Layer 966.3 covered the entire cave floor. It only extended about 4.0 m into the cave, and the western 4.0 m contained a different deposit entirely. Prag describes a large number of broken and compacted sherds, including a minimum of 1191 rims. Given the vast range of types and sizes represented by these rims, Prag concludes that it is unlikely they were deposited whole in the cave; rather, the cave was probably used as a dump sometime prior to the collapse in 966.3. Thus, just

38 Ibid., 16.

39 Ibid. Prag (“Summary of the Reports on Caves I, II and III and Deposit IV,” 213) confirms, based on the notebooks, that the excavators themselves considered 966.3 collapse from the building outside.

40 Ibid., 216.

41 Ibid., 213. Surprisingly, Eshel omits any discussion of the deposit in the western most areas of Cave I. The different character of this deposit is further supported by the fact that the excavators designated the deposit by a different soil layer number, 966.4, than that of the collapse in the entrance hallway (966.3).
like the building outside, Cave I itself evidenced multiple phases of use with different depositions in each phase.

### 4.2.3 Objects associated with Cave I

Some confusion exists concerning the number of objects, including figurines, that were found inside or associated with the Cave I deposit. In an attempt to integrate all the earlier publications, Prag suggests that the total deposit includes objects inside Cave I proper as well as those in Room J. After recounting from the register, the total deposit included 61 figurines inside Cave I, 19 figurines from the porch, 26 “cult apparatus” object from Cave I, and 4 cult objects from the porch, for a total of 80 figurines and 30 cult apparatus objects.\(^{42}\)

The cult apparatus objects include 6 rattles, 7 couch/chair fragments, 1 almost complete incense stand and 3 fragments of possible incense stands, 7 fragments of either pedestals of figurines or chalice bases, 1 model house/shrine box, 2 vessels with human motifs, an unidentifiable fragment, and 2 cream limestone dishes, which Holland calls “altar?” dishes. It is significant that between 13 and 20 of these objects are figurine bases, miniatures, or rattles, which are found in many different contexts, not necessarily cultic locations. Furthermore, at least 4 of the object identifications are in doubt.\(^{43}\) Thus, the

\(^{42}\) Ibid., 216.

\(^{43}\) Some of these putative cult objects are only tentatively identified and are thus of limited value in the interpretation. See specifically the “altar dishes” and the “shrine box” with no parallels (Holland, “Study of Palestinian Iron Age Baked Clay Figurines,” Fig. 9:20, 21, 22; 187).
cultic apparatus objects do not comprise conclusive evidence for a cultic center in the cave.

As to the figurines, by correlating Prag’s list with Holland’s context information, it appears that the Room J collapse contained 2 molded heads, 4 pillar torso fragments (3 bell shaped), 6 fragments of horse and rider figurines, 2 bird figurines, and 3 animal figurine fragments. Cave I included 1 very broken, molded head fragment, 3 solid pillar torsos (2 with hands and arms supporting breasts, and 1 with arms upraised), 1 “hands-on breasts” torso fragment, 1 fragment holding an

44 Prag’s list of figurines inside Cave I and in Room J (“Summary of the Reports on Caves I, II and III and Deposit IV,” 216) roughly parallels Holland’s article (“Study of Palestinian Iron Age Baked Clay Figurines,” 178-182, Fig. 7). Prag’s “Cave I” category corresponds with Holland’s “Inside Cave” category and Prag’s “Room J” category parallels a combination of Holland’s “Entrance Wash”, “Wash into Cave,” “S of Cave Entrance,” and “Room Outside Cave.”


47 The horse and rider figurines are problematic in Holland’s analysis because he includes all horses, regardless of whether they have evidence of a rider, in his “Solid hand-modeled horses and riders,” category (“Study of Palestinian Iron Age Baked Clay Figurines,” 179-80, Fig. 7). Of these 6 fragments, 2 do not have evidence of riders.


unidentifiable object, 51 1 partially hollow bell shaped torso fragment, 52 3 hollow body fragments (2 wheel-made), 53 14 horse and rider fragments, 54 5 bird figurine fragments, and ca. 36 animal figurine fragments. 55 The assemblage is characterized by a wide degree of variety in both technological production style (solid, hollow, wheel-made, hand-made).
and design (face style, hand position, implements) and is notable for the absence of pinched heads.\textsuperscript{56}

The horizontal placement of the figurines within the cave can be surmised from the various descriptions of the cave deposits. The figurines were probably found only in the front hallway (966.3) rather than the west room (966.4). Prag’s description of this western deposit and its unique character suggests that no figurines were found in the crushed pottery in the back of the cave. This supposition is further supported by the descriptions of figurines in soil layers 966.3 and 965.25, .29, .31 as well as the joins made between figurine and object fragments in 966.3 and Room J.

Unfortunately, it is difficult to identify the “vertical” successive layers of deposition inside Cave I and Room J and thus determine whether all the objects in 966.3 are really from the same depositional activity. One alternative is that the figurines were deposited separately from the pottery in Cave I. Steiner notes that the figurines were broken and ritually deposited because un-restorable figurines were found next to complete bowls.\textsuperscript{57} This phenomenon might indicate two separate depositional events—one for the storage of domestic pottery and one cultic. The claim is misleading.

According to the photograph in Figure 5 and Eshel’s plates, not every vessel in Cave I

\textsuperscript{56} This breakdown is not exactly the same as Prag’s, with 17 fragments in Room J and 65 in Cave I (versus 19 and 61). The total is roughly 2 fragments higher than Prag’s count, probably due to variation of opinion on the number of miscellaneous animal limb fragments. This appears to be the best compromise between Prag’s count and Holland’s material.

\textsuperscript{57} Steiner, “Stratigraphical Analysis, Architecture and Objects of the Phases,” 48.
was complete, that is, many fragments were missing from many vessels, though there were often enough pieces to restore the vessel form.\(^{58}\)

No one would claim that a vessel missing even half of its fragments was ritually broken and disposed. A figurine missing one or two fragments should be treated in the same manner as the rest of the ceramic objects. Thus, the broken state of the figurines is not a compelling reason for interpreting them as a deposition separate from the vessels in the cave.

Another alternative is to understand all the figurines and the vessels as part of the same general deposit, as per Eshel. He connects the cultic objects with the total

![Figure 5: Pottery found inside Cave I, near the mouth of the cave](image)

---

assemblage, concluding that these were part of the “normal domestic household range.”

On one hand, the interpretation of the total deposit as domestic should be questioned (Eshel’s interpretation will be evaluated below). Indeed, the large number of vessels in Cave II causes Eshel to doubt whether the assemblage can be explained as regular domestic refuse or storage. If Cave II is abnormal with 288 pottery items, Cave I with 1200 pottery items certainly cannot be explained as regular domestic storage or garbage. On the other hand, Eshel is correct to point out the small percentage of cultic objects when considered against the total assemblage as a whole.

The problem is that Eshel does not provide a solid archaeological reason for interpreting all 1300 objects as part of the same deposit, save to claim that the building outside Cave I was violently destroyed, depositing all the artifacts in the cave together. Unfortunately, no evidence exists for a conflagration in the building outside or for burning on the animal bones inside the cave; and the burning on cooking pots and jugs is related to cooking. The lack of evidence for destruction means that the building stood

59 Eshel, “Functional Character of the Two Jerusalem Groups from Caves I and II,” 20-21. Contra Holladay (“Religion in Israel and Judah Under the Monarchy,” 257), who connects the Cave I assemblage with Samaria E 207, Eshel says the percentage of so-called cultic pottery, which includes 188 figurines as well as chalices, cups and saucers, protage braziers, kernos, and rattles, was much higher in the Samaria assemblage.


61 Ibid., 21.

62 Prag, “Summary of the Reports on Caves I, II and III and Deposit IV,” 214-15. See also Hanan Lernau, (“Faunal Remains from Cave I in Jerusalem,” in Excavations by K. M. Kenyon in Jerusalem 1961-1967: Volume 4: The Iron Age Cave Deposits on the South-east Hill and Isolated Burials and Cemeteries Elsewhere [ed. Izak Eshel and Kay Prag; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995], 203) who says the animal bones in the cave show no signs of burning. While the soil layers 965.25, .29, and .31 were described as black, burnt with some charcoal this relative thin soil deposit is not enough to posit a violent
abandoned for an undetermined amount of time prior to collapse into the cave. Given the abandonment phase, the collapsed deposit and the storage deposit cannot be grouped together without accounting for the possibility that the collapsed remains represent post-occupational debris and are unconnected to the function of the Southern Building and Cave I as a storage area.

Fortunately, there is some reason to believe that the materials that collected in Room J and collapsed into Cave I were related to the function of the Southern Building rather than random dumping. From all of the Southern Building’s rooms, only Room J and Cave I contained pillar figurine fragments. Further, none of the other rooms contained comparable numbers of zoomorphic fragments. The extremely low number of figurine fragments and absence of pillar figurine fragments cannot be blamed on poor preservation in the Southern Building. Room B, Cave III, and Room H contained some substantial remains of objects, pottery, and even installations. If the pillar fragments and/or pottery were random post-occupation debris, it is strange that they would naturally coalesce in one room out of the entire row and in one cave rather than the other.

destruction for the entire block of rooms and could be explained by a localized fire that destroyed wooden roof beams in Room J. Moreover, this layer was combined with 966.3, which is described as water-laid clay; and many of the figurines must have been found in this material.

Steiner (“Stratigraphical Analysis, Architecture and Objects of the Phases,” 33-35, 42) lists 1 animal fragment in Room B, 2 in Room C, 1 in Room E/Cave III, and 2 in Room K. This should be compared with ca. 46 zoomorphic fragments from Room J/Cave I.
4.2.4 Conclusions

The evidence suggests that figurines were not deposited in the cave as part of an identifiable ritual space during the time when the cave and the building outside were in use. If Cave I was a popular cult site it could only have been functional after the collapse of the Southern Building, which restored public access to the mouth of the cave. Because much of the material in Cave I resulted from the collapse of Room J, the possibility that cultic activity occurred in Room J must still be entertained. Alternatively, there is no evidence that Room J was a major cult center. As stated above, a number of cultic implements from the Cave I assemblage are questionable. Further, as Eshel points out, the percentage of figurines and cultic equipment out of the overall ceramic assemblage is not very substantial.

Another important aspect of this deposit is chronological. The cave was stratigraphically sealed from the later figurine deposits in Phases 8 and 9. The fact that Phase 8 of the same area contains a sizable number of pinched heads suggests pinched heads became more popular later in Jerusalem, rather than in the eighth century to which Cave I is dated.⁶⁴

---

⁶⁴ Izak Eshel (“Morphological Classification of the Pottery Groups in Caves I and II,” 55, 61) attempts to date the Cave I deposit to the second half of the seventh century, based on his re-dating of the Lachish deposits; but he stands alone. For a counter argument see Alon de Groot and Donald T. Ariel, “Ceramic Report,” in Excavations at the City of David 1978-1985: Directed by Yigal Shiloh: Volume 5: Extramural Areas (ed. Donald T. Ariel;Qedem 40; Jerusalem: The Institute of Archaeology, the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 2000), 94. Ariel dates the caves and the buildings to the eighth century; this is the majority position.
4.3 Extramural city street

4.3.1 The data

On top of the sealed debris of Phase 4 (Cave I) Kenyon’s excavation uncovered a 5.0 m wide city wall (Wall 1 or Wall NA), dated either to the end of the eighth century or to the first half of the seventh century.\(^65\) At the foot of the wall outside of the city the excavators found a pavement 2.0 to 3.0 m wide on top of the Middle Bronze city wall and the collapse that sealed Cave I. This pavement is interpreted as a street. To the east of the pavement was a 1.0 m wide retaining wall, or covering wall (called Wall 2), which was built into the debris of the previous collapse.\(^66\) The wall and street were tracked across five excavated squares, approximately 35.0 m in length (see Figures 6 and 7).\(^67\) Contra Kenyon, Steiner correctly dates the street, the small retaining wall, and the city wall to the same phase.\(^68\)

\(^{65}\) The dating of this wall is relative. Steiner (“Stratigraphical Analysis, Architecture and Objects of the Phases,” 56) indicates that the wall was built sometime after the end of Cave I, and so its date rests on the dating of Cave I not on any internal dating criteria. The pottery morphology supporting the argument is the variation of bowl types from Phase 4 to Phase 8 (Franken, “Scope of the Present Pottery Study,” 74, Fig. 4-7, 75). For a late eighth century dating of another segment of the same wall see Chapter 5.


\(^{67}\) Note that the full width of the wall was only uncovered in Trench I (XII and XIII). In Squares XXIX, XV, XIV, XXV, and XXVI only the face of the wall was excavated (ibid., 50).

\(^{68}\) Ibid., 55, Fig. 2-40; 56. Although Kenyon claims that the foundation trench for the city wall cut the street pavers, Steiner’s reevaluation of her section drawing demonstrates the opposite. Kenyon has drawn paving stones stretching all the way from the retaining wall to the city wall; but she did not blacken the stones adjacent to the city wall, thus creating the appearance of a foundation trench.
On top of this pavement was a 75-125 cm thick layer of water-laid deposits. Steiner claims that these soil layers were deposited gradually during the life of the street, which ended with the destruction of the city wall in Phase 9. Within the deposit were several surfaces and floors as well as small drainage walls, suggesting continual use throughout the depth of the deposit rather than one concentrated period of use followed by abandonment.

---

69 Ibid., 56.  
70 Ibid. Unfortunately, there is little information about these successive surfaces or the pottery associated with individual soil layers.
Figure 7: Photograph of city wall, paved street, and retaining wall

Among the items in the deposit above the street were 11 pinched heads, 71 5 molded heads, 72 1 male head (also pinched), 73 14 torsos, 74 1 pillar, 2 horse and rider

---


figurines, and 52 animal figurines. Given the large number of anthropomorphic figurines (32 pillar based fragments), not to mention the total figurine count (86 fragments), it is unfortunate that the object registry from the excavation was not published until 2001, well after Kletter’s published manuscript. This large street deposit was therefore not included in his context information.75

A few factors concerning the data must be noted. First, the street deposit of Phase 8 covers a very large area and ranges from 75 cm to 125 cm in depth. Second, almost none of the soil layer numbers associated with figurines are described or included in section drawings, so it is almost impossible to identify the relative elevations of the fragments; at most, the assemblage can be divided into separate squares. Third, of the 32 anthropomorphic fragments, Kletter was able to identify only 8 from Holland’s list, 73

73 Reg. 7052/Holland, “Typological and Archaeological Study of Human and Animal Representations,” A.I.j.5/Kletter, Judean Pillar-Figurines, Appendix 5, 5.I.4.18. Holland says the figurine has incised eyes and a mouth with a beard or pointed chin. Kletter does not consider it a JPF.

74 Kletter identified 3 including, Reg. 3339/Holland, “Typological and Archaeological Study of Human and Animal Representations,” A.X.b.21/Kletter, Judean Pillar-Figurines, Appendix 2, 389.C.1, a body fragment with both hands and arms supporting breasts from Square XXVI; Reg. 4444/Holland, “Typological and Archaeological Study of Human and Animal Representations,” A.X.c.6/Kletter, Judean Pillar-Figurines, Appendix 2, 412.C.2, a body fragment with hands below each breast from Square XXV; Reg. 5890/Holland, “Typological and Archaeological Study of Human and Animal Representations,” A.X.c.7/Kletter, Judean Pillar-Figurines, Appendix 2, 413.C.2, a body fragment with hands below each breast from Square XXVI.

75 Kletter, The Judean Pillar-Figurines, 59-60. This large number would definitely affect Kletter’s categorical breakdown of context areas. In his work he listed only 9 fragments (with 11 possible additional fragments) in “public contexts,” only 8 fragments from streets and alleys, and only 12 outside settlements. The Kenyon figurines would expand Kletter’s figurine count in all three of those categories.
making it difficult to correlate detailed variations in style or production technique with spatial patterns.

Despite these difficulties, arranging the deposits by square number produces some interesting results. Moving from south to north along the city street, Square XXIX contained only 3 out of 86 total figurines (4%), Square XV contained 2 (2%), Square XIV contained 26 (30%), Square XXV contained 12 (14%), and Square XXVI contained 43 (50%) (see Table 7 in Appendix A). The high concentration in Square XXVI demands explanation, but first the effects of excavation and preservation must be accounted for. The squares along the street are not all the same dimensions and the deposit depth has a range of 50 cm. Unfortunately, the reports do not specify the depth of individual squares, which leaves the possibility that squares with large numbers of figurines were simply those with the deepest deposit. Upon calculating the average number of figurines per square, the significant number in Square XXVI cannot be explained away, even if the deposit had reached 125 cm in depth. This suggests that

---

76 Square XXVI also contained the highest number of pillar figurines (19 fragments out of 43) or 44% of XXVI assemblage. Compare this with XIV that had 6/26 or 23%, XXV that had 5/12 or 42%, XXIX with 2/3 or 67%, and XV with 0/2. Thus XXVI had 59% of the pillar fragments from the total deposit. This is much higher than the total assemblage which contained only 37% anthropomorphic pillar related fragments.

77 Depth, length, and width must be ruled out as causes for the depositional pattern. First, in order to test the correlation between figurine count and locus depth, an artificial average figurine number per centimeter can be used. If it is assumed that the squares with smaller numbers of figurines were also the squares with more shallow deposition, then 3 figurines fragments in 75 cm of depth (in Square XXIX) would equal 1 figurine per 25 cm. If this figure were applied to Square XXVI, assuming it was the deepest deposition (125 cm) only 5 figurine fragments would be expected, rather than 43. Secondly, the larger number in XXVI could be blamed on the larger dimensions of the square. The width of the street in all Squares is roughly equal, so it could have no major effect on recovery. Conversely, the length of excavated street per square does vary. Square XV, for example, with only 2 fragments, is roughly half the length of Square XXV with 12 fragments. Despite this fact, square length does not explain the deposit. Square XXV, which is actually
ancient phenomena, rather than modern recovery, were responsible for the varying depositions.

Alternatively, although it is possible that the large deposit was the result of low elevation or cracks in the city wall rather than human activity, these considerations can also be dismissed. First, the elevation in Square XXVI was actually higher than the other squares; figurines would not naturally roll into XXVI, nor would water carry them there. 78 Second, although a “large gully” was undermining part of the city wall during this phase, the break is in Square XIV. 79 Because XXVI is separated from this breach by Square XXV as well as a 5.0 m baulk, it is unlikely that figurines would have washed through the breach in the city wall, rolled uphill, and landed in Square XXVI. Finally, if one compares the deposition on the street with the Phase 9 destruction of the city wall, it becomes clear that the depositional patterns formed by building destruction and wall collapse vary from that on the street (see Figure 8 and Table 7 in Appendix A). 80 Thus natural processes alone cannot account for the figurines’ locations.

longer than Square XXVI, had almost one fourth the number of figurines. Square XIV, roughly the same size as XV, contained 26 fragments as opposed to 2 fragments in XV. Further, XIV has twice as many figurines as XXV which is double its size. Thus, there appears to be little correlation between size of excavated area and figurine count.

78 Steiner (‘‘Stratigraphical Analysis, Architecture and Objects of the Phases,’’ 50) lists the base of Wall 1 in XXIX (the southern end) as 663.5 m while the base in XXVI (northern end) was 668 m. Further, Steiner (ibid., 56) says that gullies forming in the street ran from north to south due to the differences in height.

79 Ibid.

80 Steiner (ibid., 57) describes Phase 9 as a big tumble of large stones and hard packed earth with few sherds. The excavation notebooks said material from higher up the slope actually fell down during
Figure 8: Percentage of figurines, per square, in Phases 8 and 9, proceeding from the lowest elevation on the left to the highest elevation on the right

4.3.2 Interpreting the extramural street deposit

What, then, are the potential causes for this depositional pattern? Franken and Steiner interpret the associated pottery as household debris from inside the city. Franken studied approximately 1311 diagnostic potsherds (rims) from the street deposit in Square excavation, adding to the debris which had washed down immediately following the wall collapse. Phase 9 included 17 figurine fragments (9 anthropomorphic), with the highest numbers in Squares XV (11/27 or 41%) and Square XIV (9/27 or 33%), a medium amount in XXV (6/27 or 22%) and the least in XXVI (1/27 or 4%). Unlike the previous phase, the largest numbers are at the lowest elevations and incrementally decrease as the road becomes higher. The two squares with the highest concentrations are also adjacent to the breach in the city wall. The two most striking differences are in XV and XXVI. The former contained only 2 figurines, the smallest percentage (2 %) in Phase 8, versus 11, the largest percentage in Phase 9. The latter contained 43 figurines (50%) in Phase 8 versus only 1 (4%) in Phase 9.
According to his analysis, the pottery from this deposit was used inside the town walls and washed down or was discarded in the street outside. The pottery analysis, however, reveals some complications in Franken’s theory. After analyzing the percentages of various pottery forms in the assemblage, Franken and Steiner combine this data with the supposed use-life of each form. Because they assume that the assemblage reflects regular domestic trash from inside the city, they are left to explain the infrequency of several domestic pottery types, such as lamps and cooking pots. Furthermore, they do not address the nature of the total assemblage, with figurines and other registered objects included, when interpreting the street deposit.

There are, in fact, a few problems with interpreting the Square XXVI street deposit as domestic garbage from inside the city. First, if the debris of Phase 8 was caused by random dumping over the entirety of the city wall, one would expect concentrations either at lower elevations or figurines in lower frequencies randomly distributed throughout all the squares. Rather, the figurine data suggest a significantly larger number of figurines in XXVI than in any other square along the street despite its...

81 Focusing on the XXVI pottery assemblage is partially due to the fact that pottery from this square was retained for investigation whereas pottery from other squares was discarded during excavation. It is fortunate for the present investigation that this square contained such a dominant percentage of the figurine corpus.

82 Franken and Steiner, “Conclusions,” 129.

83 Franken and Steiner (ibid., 130) explain that lamps were only lit at festivals or on the occasion of visitors and that people did not normally cook a daily meal. Their alternate explanation is that only upper classes owned these objects.
Second, an alternative explanation is that only Square XXVI, not the entire street, was the location of intensive household dumping; this is unlikely for several reasons. The built street with paving stones, as well as successive layers of resurfacing, is an unlikely place to regularly dump garbage and block movement. The distribution of figurines by soil layer suggests that they were not dumped intensively but gradually accumulated. Finally, the phase could have begun as early as the end of the eighth century and ended with the 587 destruction; so the materials were not deposited as one large group. In the end, the deposit cannot be explained by either random domestic trash accumulation or intensive dumping from inside the city walls.

When combined with the problematic pottery interpretation, the total street assemblage cannot be explained as domestic debris from inside the city. The square contained at least 19 stamped or incised jar handles, a high number if the deposit were

---

84 The figurine figures are backed by the amount of potsherds from inside XXVI, which is remarkably higher than that from any other square. The pottery data is compromised, however, because Kenyon disposed of most of the adjacent square’s pottery during the excavation; and it has been impossible to use the data left on the pottery cards.

85 Steiner (“Stratigraphical Analysis, Architecture and Objects of the Phases,” 56) notes the presence of several surfaces in the layers above the paved street. It is plausible that these surfaces represented continual maintenance of the walkway. The author also says that these layers contained much pottery.

86 The average number of figurines per soil layer is about 2 with no more than 7 in one layer. For example, figurine fragments per layer in Square XXVI: 965.13: 5 fragments; 953.17: 7 fragments; 955.18: 2 fragments; 955.25: 2 fragments; 955.28: 1 fragment; 955.29: 4 fragments; 955.32: 1 fragment; 955.33: 1 fragment; 955.49: 2 fragments; 957.5: 2 fragments; 957.7: 3 fragments; 957.10: 2 fragments; 957.14: 1 fragment; 957.16: 2 fragments; 957.17: 1 fragment; 957.18: 3 fragments. Unfortunately there is no way of knowing the relative elevations of these layers or their sizes. Regardless, it does show that the figurine deposits, both zoomorphic and anthropomorphic, accumulated gradually.
only gradual accumulation of domestic garbage. Furthermore, the total assemblage in Phase 8 of Square XXVI contains much pottery but very few non-ceramic domestic remains. The spatial concentration of figurines in Square XXVI is better explained as the result of activity centered in that area (see below), with the materials randomly dispersed throughout the adjacent squares by foot traffic.

4.3.2.1 Cave I revisited

The street assemblage in XXVI is not entirely unique, however. The pottery assemblage from the street in XXVI is similar to assemblages from Cave II, Cave III, and Cave I in regards to percentages of serving vessels, storage vessels, and cooking vessels. While there are obvious variations, and the difficulty estimating minimum number of

87 The majority of these are 2-wing *lmk* stamp impressions. Note also the 38 *lmk* jar handles, 1 rosette, 1 incised cross, 1 oval stamp with inscription, 2 concentric circles, and 1 incised sign in Square XIV. Square XIV also differs in the depositional pattern of stamp seals. Unlike XXVI, which contains no more than 6 stamps in the same soil layer with an average of one or two, XIV contains 17 stamps in 820.4 and 23 in 821.5. Because the relative depths of the soil layers is not known, more comparison is impossible; but these are extremely high numbers in XIV, suggesting some specific type of activity related to the square.

88 Throughout the entire deposit (all the soil layers included) XXVI only has 1 bead, 1 basalt quern fragment, and 1 glass rim fragment in the registration list. Even if it is assumed that more mundane finds were discovered and not registered, this is an extremely small percentage of the total objects and would require much additional material to explain the paucity of domestic objects in relation to the preponderance of pottery and figurine finds. This is not unique to XXVI. Square XXIX had only 3 non-ceramic finds, XV had 2, XIV had 2, and XXV had 3. Given the size of the street in each of these squares and the depth of deposit, these non-ceramic objects represent an extremely small percent.

89 Figure 4 shows that the retaining wall was unexcavated in Square XXV. It is possible that XXV may have originally contained a higher percentage of finds but that they washed down the slope because the retaining wall was not preserved. This would not, however, fully account for the drastically different figurine count between XXV and XXVI; but it might account for the smaller discrepancy between XXV and XIV.
vessels must be kept in mind, the relative hierarchy of serving, storage, and cooking vessels are roughly comparable, and the pattern questions the identification of any of

---

90 Lagro and Noordhuizen warn that the estimated prevalence of forms could be affected by the fact that only rims were kept and that the deposition in caves might affect breakage pattern (Ted Lagro and Dick Noordhuizen, “Classification of the Fragmentary Pottery Found in Cave I and Cave II during the 1961-1967 Kenyon Excavations,” in Excavations by K. M. Kenyon in Jerusalem 1961-1967: Volume 4: The Iron Age Cave Deposits on the South-east Hill and Isolated Burials and Cemeteries Elsewhere [ed. Izak Eshel and Kay Prag; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995], 199, Fig. 26). The comparison between the street deposit in Square XXVI and the cave deposits must take into account the bounded nature of the cave deposits. The pottery is separated into discreet assemblages by the caves’ natural boundaries and probably represents large storage contexts with the addition of a smaller percentage of secondary refuse. In contrast, the street deposit accumulated more gradually. Additionally, Square XXVI is only part of the depositional layer, which also covered the other squares; and the pottery from the other squares cannot be combined with that from XXVI because much of it was disposed during excavation. This means that XXVI is only a portion of the total street deposit (not a naturally bounded assemblage) and may not contain a representative sample. To test XXVI, it can be compared with the only other published pottery data from the Phase 8 street. Steiner (“Stratigraphical Analysis, Architecture and Objects of the Phases,” 56) published the phase cards from Square XIV, “pottery found in association with the stamped handles.” The size of this “phase group” cannot be confirmed, so it is unclear if it represents pottery from all of the XIV soil layers or only the layers that contained stamped handles (820.1c, 820.4, 821.3, 821.4, 821.5, 830.10). According to Franken’s designation into serving, storage, and cooking vessels, the percentages are: serving vessels 28%, storage vessels 65%, cooking vessels: 4% (total 227 vessels) compared with Phase 8 street in XXVI: serving vessels 57%, storage vessels 36%, and cooking vessels 5% (total 1311 vessels). The higher storage percentage is due to the high percent of lmlk jar handles in XIV, but the variation occurs only between serving and storage vessel. Both groups maintain the same low percentage of cooking vessels. When combined, the total known vessels from XIV and XXVI are serving vessels 53%, storage vessels 40%, and cooking vessels 5%, the same pattern as XXVI taken alone. Like Square XXVI, the total layers in XIV contained few other registered artifacts outside of ceramic items (1 sand stone counter in layer 821.6 and 1 basalt vessel in layer 833.1b). Thus, XXVI is not an entirely aberrant pattern and should be considered a reasonable pottery sample from the street deposit. At the same time, various parts of the街 yielded different intensities, such as the stamped jars in XIV and the figurines in XXVI.

91 Franken, “Scope of the Present Pottery Study,” 74, Fig. 4-6; Franken and Steiner, “Conclusions,” 126, Fig. 7-3. Cave II: serving vessels are 72%, storage vessels are 18%, cooking vessels are 3%; Cave III: serving vessels are 58%, storage vessels are 12%, and cooking vessels are 10%; Cave I: serving vessels are 63%, storage vessels are 24%, and cooking vessels are 9%; Phase 8 street in XXVI: serving vessels are 57%, storage vessels are 36%, and cooking vessels are 5%. The order of frequency is the same in every case. Franken and Steiner based their Cave I percentages on the combined deposit from the collapse in the mouth of the cave (966.3) and the rims from the western room (966.4), which could be problematic if they are two different phases. When separated, the study of 1191 rims from the back of Cave I (966.4) by Lagro and Noordhuizen does not change the relative frequency of these types (Lagro and Noordhuizen, “Classification,” 199, Fig. 26). As for 966.3, Eshel (“Functional Character of the Two Jerusalem Groups from Caves I and II,” 20 Table 3) bases his relative percentages on only the 966.3 deposit; but Eshel (“Morphological Classification of the Pottery Groups in Caves I and II,” 35-54) has organized his pottery typology differently than Franken making it almost impossible to compare it with Franken’s data. If only the 966.3 pottery published in Steiner (“Stratigraphical Analysis, Architecture and Objects of the Phases,” 212
these assemblages as normal domestic deposits. Furthermore, all four deposits contain figurines in addition to pottery; and they include only trace amounts of other objects. At least in the case of Cave I and the Phase 8 street in XXVI, the number of figurines is much higher than a regular domestic assemblage, which averages 1 to 3 figurines in a room or building. In other words, all of these assemblages, regardless of size, are dominated by ceramic items; and the assemblage profiles are not necessarily domestic.

48) is considered, then Cave I has 41% serving vessels, 28% storage vessels, and 11% cooking vessels, still maintaining the same general hierarchy.

92 The percentage of serving vessels is due to the large number of bowls in all the assemblages. The large percentage of bowls does not necessarily eliminate the possibility that a deposit is domestic; but the combination of the very low percentage of cooking pots, the low percentage of domestic non-ceramic objects, the extremely high number of total items, and the location of deposits, which are not associated with typical domestic architecture, casts reasonable doubt on the domestic nature of the assemblage.

93 For example, all of Cave I contained only 2 sling stones, 1 stone pendant, 1 mortar, 1 bone pendant, 3 bone spatulas, 2 tabun fragments, and 1 unidentified stone object (Prag, “Summary of the Reports on Caves I, II and III and Deposit IV,” Fig. 32, 213), Cave II contained 1 stone bowl and 2 spatulas (Eshel, “Architecture of the Cave Structures and Their Stratigraphical Setting,” 106, Fig. 8), and Cave III contained 3 limestone pestle fragments, 1 complete pestle, and 1 bone spatula (Steiner, “Stratigraphical Analysis, Architecture and Objects of the Phases,” 35, 39, Fig. 2-29).

94 Although Franken and Steiner base their interpretation on the unusual number of serving vessels and low number of storage vessels, Eshel believes the assemblage is domestic and that the large size of the deposit is the main atypical factor. Complicating the situation is that Eshel (“Functional Character of the Two Jerusalem Groups from Caves I and II,” 20 Table 3) published an entirely different morphological treatment without any explanation of the differences from Franken’s previous study. The differences are significant, however, and affect Eshel’s interpretation of the deposit as “domestic.” First, he appears to combine Franken’s class 1 (small bowl), class 2 (small bowl), class 4 (small bowl), and class 11 (large bowl) into one category and then adds an entirely different morphological shape—the plate. Eshel’s plate (“Morphological Classification of the Pottery Groups in Caves I and II,” 108, Fig. 9:1-28) is equivalent to Franken’s Class 5, “Saucers or plates for serving food.” The plates are significant. Eshel admits that, despite his identification of the plates as domestic, they are only identified as such in the Jerusalem groups Cave I and II and not at all in domestic pottery groups outside of Jerusalem (ibid., 36). This makes it difficult to associate them with domestic functions. Second, Eshel (ibid., 44) lists 168 cooking pots to Franken’s 137 but claims that 31 registered pots were not drawn or classified into specific types. This would explain the difference between the figures. It seems likely that these 31 pots were never located. Unfortunately, if they are included they improve the percentage of cooking pots from about 11% to 14.5%,
Finally, none of these deposits are associated with clearly identifiable domestic architecture.

In addition to the similarities in assemblages, one cannot escape the spatial relationships between phases. The large deposit of the street in Phase 8 Square XXVI is located in the same area as Cave I of Phase 4. In fact, the entire street overlays the Southern Building of Phase 4. Returning, for a moment, to the Southern Building, neither Steiner nor Eshel are comfortable describing either the Northern or Southern Building as improving the domestic profile of the assemblage. A final discrepancy is in the function assigned to different forms. Franken and Steiner ("Conclusions," 126, Fig. 7-3) include classes of small bowls, saucers, and juglets as serving utensils and separate the large bowls (appear to equal Eshel’s large, loop-handled bowls with thickened rim and/or with thick rounded rim, "Morphological Classification of the Pottery Groups in Caves I and II," 122, Fig. 16:1-10) as storage vessels, thus increasing the percentage of storage vessels in the deposit. Eshel combines all the bowls in the bowl category and appears to consider only the presence of jars as indicative of storage. Franken also includes 51 juglets as serving utensils, increasing his percentages of serving vessels, but Eshel does not note the function of this form. Unfortunately, Eshel does not identify the function of any of his forms except cooking pots. He does not argue against Franken’s classification of certain vessels by function nor does he present comparative data with regular domestic assemblages to support his point. He also does not specify which forms undergird his interpretation of the assemblages as domestic. Furthermore, when he compares the cave assemblages with other assemblages he compares them with clear non-domestic groups. For example, Eshel (ibid., 24) contrasts the Cave I assemblage with Beersheba Locus 221 but appears to start from the assumption that Cave I is a domestic assemblage, thus explaining the differences from the Beersheba storage assemblage. These differences are primarily limited to the higher percentage of jars at Beersheba; but the cooking pot percentage is almost exactly the same, as are platters and kraters. The Cave I deposit is higher in bowls, jugs, and lamps. While it is clear that the deposits are not exactly the same, two similarities are striking. In both assemblages the bowls make up the largest percent, and in both assemblages the cooking pots make up only about 14%. Thus, if the percentage of cooking and serving vessels are equal between the two sites and if the Beersheba group is primarily storage, then, on analogy, this seems to cast doubt on the Cave I deposit as domestic. Eshel (ibid., 23-24) also compares the Cave I deposit with pottery from Locus 329+477 at Ramat Rachel. Aharoni claims that this large deposit (at least 215 published vessels) was a regular household assemblage, except for a few exceptional import or non-local vessels (see Chapter 7). Eshel does not question Aharoni’s opinion. The extremely large percentage of bowls in this assemblage (75.4%), however, when coupled with the very low percentage of cooking pots (5%) and the questionable purpose of the large building in which the pottery was found, suggests that this deposit is not a regular domestic assemblage. In as much as Eshel posits some similarities between Cave I and Ramat Rachel, this assemblage also questions whether Cave I can be considered a normal domestic assemblage.
regular domestic units. Steiner posits a guest house, due to the large amounts of serving vessels; but Eshel adds the possibility that the Northern Building was associated with a merchant’s warehouse. Additionally, Prag notes the “industrial” installation in Room B of the Southern Building, suggesting that the room was not only domestic. It seems plausible, therefore, that the Phase 4 building and caves comprised a store house for pottery rather than a regular domestic structure.95

The connection between potters’ activities and caves has also been observed in the Late Bronze Age at Lachish. Although Cave I and Lachish Cave 4034 are not identical,96 they do share certain features. For example, both are situated in slopes on the

95 This does not mean that all vessels inside the caves were unused. Indeed, the cooking pots in Cave I were soot-encrusted. Cooking pots may be used for any number of functions and may not be limited to food preparation. Without chemical analysis from the inside of the pots there is no way to identify the end to which they were used. Pertaining to this question of function, “a large number of fragments of cooking pots,” were found in “Structure C” to the south of (and related to) Structure B in Room B of the Southern Building (Steiner, “Stratigraphical Analysis, Architecture and Objects of the Phases,” 32-34), with another two cooking pots in Structure B itself. If Prag is correct to suggest that this room had an industrial or specialized function, this might mean that the cooking pots could be used for processes other than domestic food preparation. Of course, this would assume that the cooking pot fragments actually relate to the function of the room rather than post-occupational scatter or dumping. Because they are found only in this deposit (located in the only room with a “fire place”) and in the cave deposits the depositional pattern seems to rule out random, post-occupational distribution for the cooking pots, regardless of whether other post-occupational objects found their way into the space.

96 Pamela Magrill and Andrew Middleton, “A Canaanite Potter’s Workshop in Palestine,” in Pottery in the Making: Ceramic Traditions (ed. Ian Freestone and David Gaimster; Washington D. C.: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1997), 68-73. The Lachish cave also contained unfired sherds, lumps of red and yellow ochre, heaps of prepared clay, crushed stone and shell, bone points, polishing pebbles and shells, and sherds smoothed down by use in shaping pots (ibid., 68). Note that many of the tools used for the shaping of pottery are difficult to identify as such, including non-descript bone tools and old pottery sherds. Note also the presence of one plaque figurine in the Lachish cave (Kletter, Judean Pillar-Figurines, Appendix 5, 5.5.2.25/Holland, “Typological and Archaeological Study of Human and Animal Representations,” C.V.a.14/ Reg. 6990).
edges of cities and located in close proximity to potential clay sources. Furthermore, both the Lachish cave and Cave I contained a large number of broken sherds, as well as bone tools and a large deposit of water-mixed clay. Although Prag and Eshel have posited varying reasons for the water-laid clay deposits in Cave I (cistern or natural deposition), neither considered the possibility that clay in various stages of preparation may have been stored in the cave; the clay became wet when the collapsing walls allowed run-off to enter the cave’s mouth. Finally, the Lachish study includes some ethnographic evidence for Palestinian pottery production and storage in caves of the 1930s. Thus, throughout various time periods the region’s potters recognized similar functional advantages to working and storing pottery in caves.

Much of this specific data in Cave I is further reinforced in Carol Kramer’s ethnoarchaeological study of potters in India, as well as Kim Duistermaat’s work on Late Bronze pottery workshops in Syria. Kramer suggests that many of potters’ tools

---

97 For the Lachish cave see Magrill and Middleton, “Canaanite Potter’s Workshop,” 69, 72. For potential clay sources near Cave I see the petrographic study in Chapter 6.

98 Ibid., 72. They are here citing a letter from Dr. K. M. E. Murray to her mother describing pottery making in the Palestinian village of ‘Irtah. They also note that the low ambient temperature of caves makes them ideal for pottery production in hot climates.

99 Carol Kramer, Pottery in Rajasthan: Ethnoarchaeology in Two Indian Cities (Washington D. C.: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1997), 72-80. Admittedly, material from modern India can only be tentatively applied to ancient Israel; but the value in Kramer’s study is that it identifies which elements from observable potting activity would survive in the archaeological record, which would be diagnostic, and which would be misleading. Thus, if certain features or objects are uncovered by archaeologists, Kramer’s data can be used to establish the range of interpretive possibilities. Even more important, Kramer’s findings can be used to discard interpretive assumptions that are blatantly incorrect, such as the presumption that every stage of pottery production takes place in the same area.

100 Kim Duistermaat, The Pots and Potters of Assyria: Technology and Organisation of Production, Ceramic Sequence and Vessel Function at Late Bronze Age Tell Sabi Abyad, Syria (Palma Near Eastern
are either perishable or difficult to recognize in the archaeological record. She also notes that “one of the most distinctive attributes of potters’ workshops, homes, or neighborhoods are piles of pot sherds,” perhaps similar to those in the back of Cave I. Such piles are not usually found in the homes of non-potters and thus constitute a diagnostic criterion for identifying potters’ activity areas. Furthermore, Kramer’s study demonstrates potters living and working in the same structures, as is also evident at Tell Sabi Abyad, in Syria. Thus, the domestic items in Cave I and the Southern Building may be the result of domestic activities taking place within the compound. Finally, Kramer suggests that unprocessed clay is usually kept within the potter’s compound, often in covered areas, as may have been the case for the Cave I clay deposits.


Duistermaat also cites the presence of wet clay deposits in pottery workshops at Tell Sabi Abyad, as well as Sarepta, Tell Mishrifeh, and Abu Salabikh.

Perhaps the most interesting finding in Kramer’s study was that firing took place in open spaces, like courtyards, neighborhood plazas, and village perimeters, often “near but not formally related to the potter’s workshop/residence.” Duistermaat also notes that kilns at Tell Sabi Abyad were located in the general neighborhood of the workshops but were not necessarily attached to the workshop itself. Furthermore, while single isolated fragments of wasters or ceramic slag were found, Duistermaat says, “nowhere at

---


the site, whether in houses or in open areas near kilns, were found the almost proverbial ‘piles of wasters’ usually thought to be connected to pottery production location.”¹¹¹ This is significant because the presence of wasters is often treated as the most important factor for interpreting a space as a pottery workshop.¹¹² Moreover there is little evidence to suggest that the varying production steps, like mixing the clay, forming the pots, decorating the pots, and firing, were performed in the same activity area.¹¹³ Thus, the absence of wasters in a locus only indicates that firing was probably not occurring there.¹¹⁴

To be more specific, wasters were not present in Cave I or the excavated rooms of the Southern Building; but this does not mean that the Cave I material was unconnected with potting activity.¹¹⁵ As only some rooms of the Southern Building were excavated

¹¹¹Ibid, 349.

¹¹²London, “On Fig Leaves, Itinerant Potters, and Pottery Production Locations,” 73, 75. Based on her ethnoarchaeological work with traditional rural and itinerant potters on Cyprus, London concludes that “the material correlates of the pottery industry will not necessarily be preserved, even in fragmentary form” (ibid., 73).

¹¹³For example, in Palestinian villages, clay levigation, wheel forming, storage of pottery, and firing were all done in separate spaces. See Hamed J. Salem, “Implications of Cultural Tradition: The Case of Palestinian Traditional Pottery,” in Archaeology, History and Culture in Palestine and the Near East: Essays in Memory of Albert E. Glock (ed. Tomis Kapitan; ASOR Books 3; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1999), 76-78.

¹¹⁴Matson suggests that even kiln areas in the Mediterranean and Near East will lack sherds. See Frederick R. Matson, “Physical Characteristics of the Fabric, Slip and Paint,” in East Cretan White-on-Dark Ware (ed. Philip P. Betancourt; University Museum Monograph 51; Philadelphia: University Museum, 1984), 52-59. This was confirmed by London’s study on Cyprus (London, “On Fig Leaves, Itinerant Potters, and Pottery Production Locations,” 76). London also cites personal investigation of a female potter in Jordan in 1987, where the only sign of potting activity was a box of sherds in the courtyard.

¹¹⁵Obviously there are other features that would make the case stronger, such as basalt wheels, slag, wasters, or ochre. Alternatively, Nicholson and Patterson, (“Pottery Making in Upper Egypt,” 230) have shown that when a workshop is abandoned little evidence remains, including the potter’s wheel, which is
and the building was abandoned, it is possible that additional objects may have existed. Rather, the combined presence of bone tools, extensive wet clay deposits, piles of broken potsherds, industrial installations, and three large caches of pottery and ceramic objects in non-domestic contexts all suggest some connection to the work of potters serving the Jerusalem community.

4.3.2.2 The street assemblage once again

Given the similarities in assemblages between the Phase 4 Southern Building and the Phase 8 street in Square XXVI, it is also possible that the Phase 8 street deposit resulted from the transport and sale of pottery outside of the city walls. Discussing the architecture of the city wall, street, and retaining wall, Steiner interprets the retaining wall to the east of the street as part of a defense system for troop movement. This makes the extra-mural street primarily defensive in function.\(^{116}\) Steiner admits, however, that there are no parallels for this interpretation; nor does she offer any argumentation. Moreover, she does not take the objects or pottery into consideration when positing the defensive function. To the contrary, the total assemblage suggests that the street was used for the first thing taken from the building. Furthermore, Moorey (Ancient Mesopotamian Materials and Industries, 146-47) suggests the possibility that stone wheels were too slow for pot forming. He counters that wheel may have been made of baked clay instead and were not often preserved in the archaeological record.

\(^{116}\) Steiner, “Stratigraphical Analysis, Architecture and Objects of the Phases,” 52.
various kinds of traffic, with no evidence for the movement of soldiers, and that the debris on the street may be the result of a small pottery market.

The plausibility of this suggestion is supported by the location of the Phase 4 building and the Phase 8 debris—on the outskirts of the city proper. Potters typically work outside of city walls, given the smells and dangers associated with their work.\(^\text{117}\) The continuity between Phases 4 and 8 could relate to longstanding traditions about the place of potters and their wares outside of settlements.\(^\text{118}\) Furthermore, Kramer’s study of itinerant pottery markets seems to accord with the deposition of figurines on the Phase 8 street. In just five days to two weeks, a market of about seven hundred vessels produces a 3.0 or 4.0 m scatter of potsherds, which remains even after the potter has left the area. Additionally, these itinerant potters repeatedly return to the same locations.\(^\text{119}\) Thus, the

---

\(^{117}\) Locations of potters external to settlements was already argued by David P. S. Peacock (Pottery in the Roman World: An Ethnarchaeological Approach [London: Longmans, 1982], 38) and is confirmed by workshops in Egypt (Nicholson and Patterson, “Pottery Making in Upper Egypt,” 226). For the Neo-Assyrian Period see J. Nicholas Postgate, “Employer, Employee, and Employment in the Neo-Assyrian Empire,” in Labor in the Ancient Near East (ed. Marvin A. Powell; AOS 68; New Haven: American Oriental Society, 1987), 268. Here Postgate refers to “The Village of Pots” near Nineveh. He believes the location of potters in a separate village, rather than within the major city, was due to potters’ clay procurement needs and pottery firing hazards.

\(^{118}\) The existence of a fairly regular space devoted to market activity is also mentioned in the Mesopotamian texts. Elizabeth Stone notes that although ancient Near Eastern cities did not contain any area comparable to a “suq” the textual record records regular market space at city gates and ports. See Stone, “Tell Abu Duwari Project, Iraq, 1987,” 143.

\(^{119}\) Kramer, Pottery in Rajasthan, 99-100. In Cyprus, areas designated “pottery markets” were still known in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries at Nicosia and Larnaca, as well as Paphos, Polis, and Morphou (Ionas, Traditional Pottery and Potters in Cyprus, 199). Note that the workshops at Sarepta also reveal an unbroken tradition stretching over a millennium, with pottery activities taking place in the same locations (Anderson, “Pottery Industry at Phoenician Sarepta,” 210).
Phase 8 street deposit may be most clearly explained as the remains of transportable pottery markets regularly set up in traditional locations outside the city. A corollary to this suggestion is the possibility that the same merchants were selling regular pottery as well as figurines. This does not imply that the pottery and figurines were constructed from the same materials, or necessarily by the same workshop (see Chapter 6) but that they may have been sold together. If this were in fact the case, then the figurine fragments in Phase 8, as well as those in Phase 4, may be the result of storage or market debris, rather than cultic use or random dumping.

A final issue with the two deposits is the potential chronological difference between late eighth century/early seventh century figurines and those starting in the mid-seventh century. There are no pinched heads in the Phase 4 deposits, but at least 11 were found in association with the Phase 8 street in comparison with only 5 molded heads (see Figures 9 and 10 and Table 8 in Appendix A).\textsuperscript{120}

\textsuperscript{120} In Phase 9 pinched heads make up 11\% of the total figurine assemble and molded heads 4\%. In Phase 8 pinched heads make up about 14\%, while molded heads make up only 6\%. Compare this with Phase 4, including Cave I, where pinched heads make up 0\% and molded heads 3\% (Figure 9). Another way of looking at the percentages is that in Phase 9, 25\% of heads were molded (1 fragment) while 75\% were pinched. In Phase 8, 29\% were molded and 71\% were pinched. In Phase 4, 100\% were molded and 0 were pinched (Figure 10). As above, there are 2 heads from the street deposit called “human head” rather than “female head.” These have been included in the molded head category. Should this be incorrect, then the discrepancy between pinched and molded heads is even larger than that hypothesized in the present analysis. Both in terms of the percentage of total assemblage and in terms of percentage of figurine heads, there is an increase in pinched heads and a decrease in molded heads from the seventh through the sixth centuries.
Figure 9: Percentages of figurine types within the total figurine assemblage in phases 4, 8, and 9 of Square XXVI

Figure 10: Percentages of molded heads versus pinched heads in phases 4, 8, and 9 in Square XXVI
This does not mean the molded design ceased. The fact that these two types of heads occur in various soil layers throughout Phase 8 of Square XXVI implies that both were being used at the same time.\textsuperscript{121} It may suggest that the pinched-head form gained in popularity throughout the seventh century and into the sixth century in Jerusalem. It may also suggest that molded heads decreased in popularity. These suggestions are further supported by the much larger number of pinched heads from the Kenyon excavations in Jerusalem (55 pinched heads versus 19 molded heads). Even fill for later construction in Area L, which contained large deposits from the seventh century, contained no molded heads, only pinched heads and body fragments (see above).

\section*{4.4 Area A: Buildings 1-7 and Squares XII and XIII}

The uniqueness of the large figurine deposits in Cave I and the Phase 8 street becomes evident when compared with the other excavated squares in Buildings 1-7 (see Figure 11).

\textsuperscript{121} Molded heads are found in layers 953.13, 955.49, 955.33, and 957.17 while pinched heads are found in 955.25, 955.32, 957.7, and 957.18. As indicated by Kenyon’s number system, some of these layers must have been adjacent.
Buildings 1-4 contained no human figurine fragments and only a few animal figurine fragments.\textsuperscript{122} Steiner interprets these buildings as houses of the traditional type.

\textsuperscript{122} Steiner (\textit{Excavations by Kathleen M. Kenyon in Jerusalem}, 60-71) relates only 1 of these to an actual floor (Area 3 A/10.10) with the other 2 in “possible garbage dumps” (Area 6 A/25.2). Building 3 in Area 10 contained 3 more zoomorphic figurine fragments on a “white clay floor.” Area 11 contained 2
complete with courtyards, working and storage rooms, and an upper floor. If anthropomorphic figurines are primarily associated with domestic structures their absence here is puzzling. Also Building 5 (Areas 23-25) contained no figurines. Conversely, while Building 3 seems to have been fully excavated, only parts of Building 2 were excavated down to the twelfth century remains and none of Building 1 was excavated beneath the latest Iron II floor surfaces. Further, Shiloh’s excavation of exactly the same area produced a considerable number of figurines, so the paucity must be attributed to shallow excavation.

Area 26, or Building 6, to the east of Building 5, yielded the largest number of figurine fragments from any of the domestic structures. Four “consecutive floors” were noted in this building: with no figurine fragments on the lowest floor; 1 miniature table fragment and 2 animal figurine fragments on the second floor; 1 pinched head with zoomorphic fragments on a floor, Area 17 contained 1 animal fragment on a series of floors, and Area 20 contained 1 animal fragment on a series of floors.

---

123 Steiner, *Excavations by Kathleen M. Kenyon in Jerusalem*, 80. Note that Steiner thinks these buildings comprised a town quarter for artisans and tradespeople with one building belonging to a bronze smith and one to a trader (House of the Bullae). If Steiner is correct, then the traditional character of the domestic structures may be in question since the same structure could function as domestic space as well as a shop.

124 Ibid., 60, 63-66.

125 For more see Chapter 5.

126 Steiner (Excavations by Kathleen M. Kenyon in Jerusalem, 83) says the uppermost floor was at 671.0 m, ca. 1.5 m above the lowest at 669.5 m.

127 Floor 2 also contained 1 quern, 1 jar, 2 lamps, 1 jug, 1 bottle, 2 bowls, 1 plate, 1 loom weight, and 1 mortar (ibid., 86, Fig. 6.36).
cap, 2 animal fragments, and 1 unidentified fragment on the third floor; and 1 female torso in addition to another potential female bust and 2 animal figurine fragments on the highest floor. Thus despite the fact that 10 figurine fragments come from the room (3 anthropomorphic), there were actually only 2 to 4 fragments per phase of use.

There are some disadvantages inherent in this context. Unfortunately, only a small part of the total building was excavated (Areas 26 and 27), so the figurine count represents multiple phases of one room rather than the entire structure. Another complication is the original excavators did not always include possible occupational debris with its related floor surface; some material could have been divorced from its architectural context. Finally, the building was stationed at the bottom of the trench, raising the possibility that finds could have been deposited there by natural means.

128 Floor 3 also contained 3 bowls, 1 pottery rattle, 1 juglet, 1 bone spatula, 1 iron strap fragment, 1 rubbing stone, and 2 loom weights (ibid., 87, Fig. 6.37). According to Kletter this pinched head with cap (Reg. 1046) may be Holland, “Typological and Archaeological Study of Human and Animal Representations,” A.I.d.iv/Kletter, Judean Pillar-Figurines, Appendix 2, 366.A.4.A, although he has the registration number listed in a different layer number and does not provide a Square number. Additionally, the same information is listed under Kletter, Judean Pillar-Figurines, Appendix 2, 369.A.4.A so there is some confusion in Kletter’s identification. Either way, Steiner (Excavations by Kathleen M. Kenyon in Jerusalem, 86, Fig.6.37) also describes the fragment as a pinched head with cap, so the morphological identification is sound.

129 The highest floor also contained 1 quern, 2 bowls, 1 juglet, 3 fragments of a cooking pot, 1 loom weight, 1 platter, 2 lamps, 2 bone spatulas, 1 scarab, 1 rubbing stone, 1 nail, and 1 bone fragment (ibid., 88, Fig. 6.38). The figurine fragments are problematic because only 1 (bust fragment Reg. 1000) is listed in the registry while 3 more (bust, Reg. 1001 and 2 animal figurine fragments are listed only in Steiner, “Stratigraphical Analysis, Architecture and Objects of the Phases,” 88, Fig.6.38 but not in Boas-Vedder, “Appendix I,” 122-26.

130 Steiner (Excavations by Kathleen M. Kenyon in Jerusalem, 83) notes that some material was excavated separately from the lowest floor as “packing between floors” and has tried to connect it with the floor. Additionally, some sherd above the highest floor were excavated together with debris from the area’s collapse instead of with the floor surface.
That having been said, the figurines were found on three out of four superimposed floor surfaces, two of which were not left exposed to post-occupational debris.\textsuperscript{131} It is therefore plausible that those artifact groups were the remains of household garbage. Interestingly, the assemblage associated with the figurines in Area 26 differs from the assemblage of Cave I or the Phase 8 street. Area 26 contained a larger number of additional objects than do the other two deposits, which included very few non-ceramic objects despite covering much larger areas.\textsuperscript{132} Also interesting is the fact that Steiner dates all four floor phases to the seventh century,\textsuperscript{133} given the fact that the only figurine head is pinched rather than molded.

Even further east of Building 6, at the very bottom of Trench I, was the city wall built in Phase 7 and used throughout Phase 8. As previously noted, part of the wall in Squares XII and XIII contained a breach. This breach was overlaid by a floor and walls, which Steiner interprets as a guard room.\textsuperscript{134} Two figurine fragments, an animal figurine fragment and a female torso, were recovered.\textsuperscript{135} Unfortunately, because of the

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{131} Ibid., 84, Fig. 6.32. The section drawing shows that these four floors are superimposed.

\textsuperscript{132} See above for other objects found with the figurines. This is especially true given the ratio of figurines to other objects (pottery included): Floor 3: 4/14 with only 1 anthropomorphic fragment, and Floor 4: 4/22 with only 2 anthropomorphic fragments.

\textsuperscript{133} Ibid., 85.

\textsuperscript{134} Ibid., 92.

\textsuperscript{135} Ibid., 91. Female fragment Reg. 1066. Also found dating to the seventh century was some Iron II pottery, 1 chert nodule, 1 bead, and 1 seal with inscription.
contamination of later debris during excavation and the presence of an ancient water
gulley, it is difficult to identify any of the remains as truly in situ.\footnote{Steiner (Excavations by Kathleen M. Kenyon in Jerusalem, 92) notes the presence of Roman/Byzantine and Middle Bronze II sherds, as well as a modern knife.}

Finally, in Building 7, Area 28 a pinched head was found along with several other objects and 133 pottery sherds.\footnote{Ibid., 97. Figurine Reg. 6485. Along with the head was 1 stamped rosette jar handle, 1 bronze spit pin, 1 iron object, 1 incised cooking pot sherd, 1 bowl fragment, 2 foot baths, 1 holemouth jar, 1 incised handle fragment with a single circle, 1 stone weight, 1 stone seat (probably secondary), and ca. 32 loom weights (ibid., 96, Fig. 6.52).} Like the deposits in Building 6, Area 26, this assemblage contains a much higher diversity of finds per size of excavated area. Furthermore, the pottery assemblage from Area 28 contained a much higher percentage of cooking pots (19.5\%) and storage vessels (41\%) than the street assemblage or the Cave I assemblage.\footnote{Ibid., 101, Table 6.5. If all three rooms in this building are taken together then the cooking pot percentage still remains quite high (7.8\% of Area 29 and 16.9\% of Area 30); and the percentage of storage vessels is even higher (52\% in Area 29 and 24\% in Area 30).} Additionally, the area has a lower intensity of figurine fragments, which is commensurate with domestic figurine distribution patterns. Despite the fact that only a small percentage of the estimated total building was excavated, Steiner notes the lack of erosion and better preservation in this area in comparison to Buildings 1-3; thus the small number of fragments cannot be blamed on natural processes.\footnote{Ibid., 100.} Once again, the absence of molded heads is noteworthy.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textbf{References:}
\item \textit{Steiner (Excavations by Kathleen M. Kenyon in Jerusalem, 92) notes the presence of Roman/Byzantine and Middle Bronze II sherds, as well as a modern knife.}
\item \textit{Ibid., 97. Figurine Reg. 6485. Along with the head was 1 stamped rosette jar handle, 1 bronze spit pin, 1 iron object, 1 incised cooking pot sherd, 1 bowl fragment, 2 foot baths, 1 holemouth jar, 1 incised handle fragment with a single circle, 1 stone weight, 1 stone seat (probably secondary), and ca. 32 loom weights (ibid., 96, Fig. 6.52).}
\item \textit{Ibid., 101, Table 6.5. If all three rooms in this building are taken together then the cooking pot percentage still remains quite high (7.8\% of Area 29 and 16.9\% of Area 30); and the percentage of storage vessels is even higher (52\% in Area 29 and 24\% in Area 30).}
\item \textit{Ibid., 100.}
\end{itemize}
4.5 Summary and conclusions

The varying depositional patterns in the Kenyon excavations alone are intriguing and suggest that combining all figurine types together and creating an average context glosses over important variations in the depositional record. Furthermore, the finds in these excavations challenge the notion that the majority of figurines come from domestic contexts, given the large numbers in Cave I and the Phase 8 street, versus figurines from Buildings 1-7 combined.140 The varying assemblages attest to two depositional patterns. Cave I and the extra-mural street contain larger depositions with a non-domestic pottery profile, given the percentages of vessel types and the size of the assemblage. They also contain very large numbers of figurines and lower percentages of non-ceramic objects. Further, these deposits were not found in relation to regular domestic architecture. These depositions cannot merely be dismissed as domestic garbage, city dumps, or popular cultic centers. Rather, they may be better understood as refuse from market debris on the outskirts of the city proper.

In contrast, the figurines in Area 26 of Building 6 and Area 28 of Building 7 suggest a more regular domestic assemblage, with smaller amounts of artifacts, a larger variety of objects, and a significantly smaller percentage of figurines. Moreover, the artifacts were recovered in the contexts of identifiable domestic structures.141 This does

---

140 Even if Shiloh’s excavations of the same area are considered, 32 anthropomorphic fragments came from all Iron II loci in this area combined, plus another 5 from Kenyon’s excavations, versus the 31 anthropomorphic fragments from the street assemblage alone.

141 Steiner (ibid., 105-6) suggests that Buildings 1-7 were not only domestic but represented a town quarter for traders and artisans working out of their houses. While a very creative interpretation, there is not yet the
not mean that the figurines necessarily represent activity as it occurred in these buildings but rather that the profile of remaining debris forms a pattern distinct from that in Cave I and the extra-mural street, keeping in mind the possibility for movement of fragments due to water, sloping elevation, and post-occupational activity. Unfortunately, the incomplete state of Kenyon’s excavation for many of the buildings in Area A prevents any full examination of figurine deposition and its relationship to socio-economic status. If the initial assessments of Steiner prove reliable, this area was inhabited by at least some persons with fairly high economic standing.¹⁴²

Finally, there does appear to be an emerging pattern in the types of heads popular in Phase 4 (end of the eighth and beginning of the seventh century) versus that popular in the mid-seventh century until the 587 destruction. Molded heads are found in Cave I and pinched heads were not. The cave deposit was sealed from the extra-mural street deposit which contained a higher number of pinched heads than molded heads. This ratio also characterizes the Phase 9 collapse of the city wall. Fills made of seventh century debris used for later construction in Area L also contained only pinched heads, and Building 6 and 7, dated to the seventh century, contained only pinched heads. This does not mean that the two styles were never used at the same time but that a general technological data to make such an argument totally convincing. For example, Building 7 was identified as a weaving industrial center because of the presence of 32 loom weights however this number is not so large and the weights were found in the street (Area 30) rather than in the building proper (ibid., 100).

¹⁴² Steiner, *Excavations by Kathleen M. Kenyon in Jerusalem*, 64) describing the House of Ahiel and Steiner (ibid., 100) describing Building 7. See Chapter 5 for more on this area from the Shiloh excavations.
change may have been taking place in the eighth through sixth centuries, a fact that will be born out further after examining Shiloh’s excavation of the same area (see Chapter 5).
CHAPTER 5: SHILOH’S JERUSALEM

From 1978 through 1985 Yigal Shiloh excavated several areas (A1, A2, B, D1, D2, E1, E2, E3, G, H, J) across the southeastern hill of Jerusalem, to the south of the Temple Mount/Haram al-Sharif. Iron Age remains (Strata 15-10) predominated in D1, D2, E1-3, and G, with minimal Iron Age remains elsewhere and almost no anthropomorphic figurines in other areas. The majority of the anthropomorphic figurines from these six areas come from Strata 12-10, or the eighth-sixth centuries B.C.E.

The figurines from the Shiloh excavations are the largest group excavated in Israel, numbering 1,309. This total includes ca. 240 anthropomorphic fragments (excluding identifiable horse and rider figurines), making it the largest group of anthropomorphic statuary recovered in Judah. The present study includes 233 of these fragments (see Tables 9-12 in Appendix A). Kletter lists many of Shiloh’s figurines in an addendum to Appendix 2 of his book; but he does not include the figurines in his data base, the statistical analyses, or the context analysis, with the exception of one site distribution table. Kletter chose not to analyze the stratigraphic context of the figurines

---


2 Ibid., 4, Table 2.

3 Gilbert-Peretz, “Ceramic Figurines,” 32.

4 Omitted fragments are clearly later types of figurines or figurines whose identification is questionable.

because of Gilbert-Peretz’s forthcoming publication\(^6\) and because he believed many fragments were late. As in Kenyon’s excavations, multiple fragments were found in later contexts; but an impressive number came from the Iron II—60% of the corpus of anthropomorphic fragments or 140 pieces (cf. with 66 or 47% from Kenyon’s excavations).\(^7\) This is the largest group of figurine fragments recovered from Iron II loci at any site in Judah.

Because these Iron II figurines come from well-established stratigraphic context, they present an ideal opportunity to evaluate the deposition of Jerusalem figurines through time. Furthermore, the figurines come from areas containing both domestic and public structures, providing an opportunity to compare the depositions in different types of buildings across various residential areas on the southeastern hill. Finally, for the majority of figurines, all the material cultural remains in the same loci have been analyzed and recorded. This provides a complete picture of each excavated locus rather than the partial vista afforded by older excavations or partially published excavations.

Thus, in an attempt to consider the figurines holistically in their archaeological context, this chapter first outlines the challenges using Shiloh’s data (5.1), then describes the figurine depositions in Area D1, Area D2, and Area G (5.2), focusing on distribution in Area E (5.3). The chapter ends by making some general conclusions about the

\(^6\) Gilbert-Peretz, “Ceramic Figurines.”

\(^7\) 38 pinched heads, 15 molded heads, 35 body fragments, 53 bases.
chronological and spatial distribution of the figurines and assemblages containing figurines (5.4).

5.1 Challenges in the Shiloh data

The published materials from Shiloh’s excavation pose certain challenges. First, Kletter’s addendum contains several typographical errors when compared with the Gilbert-Peretz publication; and some of his numbers cannot be correlated with the City of David report. Second, correlating Gilbert-Peretz’s typology with that of Holland or Kletter is sometimes difficult. Finally, Gilbert-Peretz reports a large number of pillar bases (ca. 96 total fragments from all loci) that may have been misidentified or ignored in other publications. The larger number of anthropomorphic figurines in Iron Age strata

---

8 Pinched, Handmade heads: Kletter (Judean Pillar-Figurines) lists 42 in his Addenda to Appendix 2. Thirty-eight were correlated (with reasonable success) with the 53 pinched/handmade heads in Gilbert-Peretz (“Ceramic Figurines”), leaving 4 of Kletter’s heads unidentified from the Gilbert-Peretz list. After subtracting his 42 from the total, 15 from Gilbert-Peretz remain unaccounted for from Kletter’s Type A list. One was designated as a non-JPF in Kletter Appendix 5, leaving 14. Once the 4 unidentified heads from Kletter are subtracted, the Gilbert-Peretz list outnumbers Kletter by 10 fragments. Of these 14 fragments lacking Kletter numbers, 12 are from Iron Age contexts. Two more fragments (E2/7352 and G/11769) would not be considered JPFs by Kletter, by definition, though their absence in Kletter’s Appendix 5 is puzzling. Molded Heads: of 28 heads in Gilbert-Peretz, only 14 could be satisfactorily coordinated with Kletter’s publication. One of these was in Kletter’s non-JPF category, leaving 13 molded heads without correlation to Kletter’s system. Bodies: Kletter lists a total of 43 body fragments (C.1,2). Of the 56 body fragments, 9 were unidentifiable with Kletter’s list; another 8 Kletter removed from the JPF category. One further fragment from Kletter’s Appendix 5 (ibid., 5.I.5.19) could not be identified with Gilbert-Peretz. This adds about 5 fragments to Kletter’s total C.1,2 body fragment count from the City of David. Bases: Kletter lists 130 base fragments while Gilbert-Peretz lists only 96. Of those 12 could not be correlated with Kletter’s lists. For individual fragments and their Kletter and Gilbert-Peretz numbers see Appendix A.

9 Gilbert-Peretz, “Ceramic Figurines,” 30-31, Table 1.

10 The discrepancy may not be that alarming. Holland distinguishes between body fragments (X) and bases (XI) as well. See Holland, “Typological and Archaeological Study of Human and Animal Representations.”
could be due to more careful excavation rather than actual figurine frequency in the excavated areas. Where possible, the number of figurines will be noted with and without the base fragments to account for the potential discrepancy.\(^{11}\)

In addition to the challenges of varying typologies, the context information for Area E, which contains the majority of Iron II figurines, was not available when the figurines were published. Thus, Volume IV of the City of David publications provides only the designated stratum number, area number, and locus number for each figurine. Locus descriptions are totally absent as are accompanying artifacts. As a result, the figurine studies in this volume do not compare depositions between large excavated areas, such as E1 and G, or between structures or loci within the same area. Without this information little can be said about spatial patterns and figurine deposition.

Further, the studies depend on problematic absolute dates for each stratum. For example, in his statistical study, Sharon assumes that Stratum 12 dates to the eighth century, Stratum 11 to the seventh century, and Stratum 10 to the second half of the seventh century and ending in 586. Based on this chronological framework, he concludes that changes in design are not perceptible from one stratum to the next.\(^{12}\) Rather, the unpublished stratigraphic report for Area E says that relative phases can be identified

---

\(^{11}\) Because neither Gilbert-Peretz nor Kletter include significant descriptions of base fragments in their respective catalogues, when bases are discussed in the text their registration numbers are not included. This information can be easily obtained in Appendix A.

within individual structures; but the absolute dating of these phases and their correlation with phases in other structures is frequently uncertain.\textsuperscript{13}

Despite the difficulties, the unpublished stratigraphic report for Area E sharpens the chronological sequence at the site. The report places Stratum 12b in the first half of the eighth century, Stratum 12a at the end of the eighth century, Stratum 11 in the first half of the seventh century, and Stratum 10 in the final quarter of the seventh century until 586 B.C.E.\textsuperscript{14} This additional chronological specificity provided by ceramic analysis aids in reconstructing figurine continuity and change over time.

At present, the archaeological context can be updated for the largest segment of figurines. The stratigraphic report for D1 has been published;\textsuperscript{15} and the unpublished stratigraphic report for almost all of E1, E2, and E3 is awaiting publication. Although this report does not include every locus in E2, most of the figurines from Iron II contexts come from Area E1 (39%) (see Table 13 in Appendix A). Further, almost all of the total figurines in Iron contexts from E1, E2, and E3 are included in the stratigraphic report (70 out of 89 fragments).\textsuperscript{16} Combined, Areas E1-3 contain 89 out of 140 fragments from Iron


\textsuperscript{14} Ibid., 35, 36, 37.


\textsuperscript{16} A number of these unaccounted for fragments are in fill layers (at least 12 fragments), which contribute only a minimal amount of context knowledge. Otherwise, only 3 of these fragments were totally omitted from the locus list. For the remaining 16 fragments, some minimal information was present in the locus list; but the loci were not discussed in the text nor mapped on any of the extant plans.
Age contexts, or 64% of the total number of figurines from Iron contexts (see Table 14 in Appendix A).

Further, even though no stratigraphic reports for Areas D2 and G have been published, combined they represent a smaller percentage of Iron II figurines (34%) (see Table 13 in Appendix A). In particular, Area G produced 23% of the figurines from Iron Age contexts; but a massive destruction layer prevents the identification of these figurines with exact occupation layers. Furthermore, several of the loci are published to varying degrees in other reports, making available some information about the figurines’ stratigraphic context.

5.2 Overview of Areas D1, D2, and G

5.2.1 Area D1

D1 lies to the east of Area D2, on the steep eastern slope of the City of David. The area was excavated from 1978 to 1982 and yielded only 3 figurine fragments (2 pinched heads and 1 body fragment) in Iron Age levels; two are dated to the Iron II. This paucity is odd given the prominence of Iron Age remains, including a residential area. Unfortunately, the area produced very few artifacts or evidence in general; and the excavators found it impossible to date the phases or coordinate phases between the various structures.¹⁷ Thus, the meager remains could also be due to the area’s state of preservation.

¹⁷ Ariel, Hirschfeld, and Savir, “Area D1,” 42.
One body fragment from the Iron I was found in Locus 433. The fragment has an applied mass of clay instead of one breast, and the other breast was possibly broken. It does not appear to be a regular pillar figurine.\textsuperscript{18} The Stratum 15 (Iron I) remains, from which this figurine came, did not contain any walls. Locus 433 was a layer of brown dirt that covered Debris Layer 450 and exposed bedrock; and it contained pottery, a zoomorphic fragment, and faunal remains, in addition to the anthropomorphic fragment. The dirt layer was covered by fill layers of Stratum 14.\textsuperscript{19} Additionally, underneath 433, Layer 450 also contained 1 idiosyncratic figurine, possibly of the “ashdoda type.”\textsuperscript{20} The excavators interpret these layers as dumps from activity further up the slope.

One small, pinched head dating to the Iron IIB was uncovered in Locus 419, a layer of dumps sitting above Wall 526 of Strata 14-15. Locus 419 covered the room to the east and west of that wall.\textsuperscript{21} The locus also contained pottery, botanical remains, 2 zoomorphic fragments, flint, 1 incised handle, and 1 weight. Given the fact that the locus covered the square, that it was separated from the floor by a stone collapse, and that Locus 419 was over 1.0 m thick (651.45-650.30 m), it seems unlikely that this head can be related to the D1 living surfaces. Moreover, the dumps of 419 were covered with a

\textsuperscript{18} D1/12762. Gilbert-Peretz, “Ceramic Figurines,” 47. There are no pictures or drawings, and Gilbert-Peretz is unsure of the designation. Kletter (\textit{Judean Pillar-Figurines}, Appendix 5, 5.1.5.20) says it is not a regular JPF.

\textsuperscript{19} Ariel, Hirschfeld, and Savir, “Area D1,” 38-39.

\textsuperscript{20} D1/13251 in Gilbert-Peretz, “Ceramic Figurines,” Fig. 18:11; Pl. 9:8-9.

\textsuperscript{21} Ariel, Hirschfeld, and Savir, “Area D1,” 45.
limestone chip layer of the Persian period (Stratum 9), meaning that the structure remained uncovered and exposed to dumping from the eighth through sixth centuries.

Another pinched head was located in a structure in squares C/D-8/9. The fragment is assigned to Locus 453, which is described as a “floor” in the locus list but as an “ash layer lying on floor 454” in the text. The other objects in association with the space were pottery, a loom weight, and a thumb-impressed handle. According to the Harris Matrix for the square, this material was covered by Locus 463, a stone collapse that also contained another thumb-impressed handle. Given the lack of clarity in the textual description as well as the possibility that the structure sat abandoned and was covered by various collapse layers, the context may not be secure.

Concerning the dating of D1, de Groot and Ariel say that most of the ceramic material dates to the end of the eighth century, with clear parallels to the destruction layer of Lachish III. They also connect the Stratum 12 assemblage with the Kenyon Cave I, Cave II, the Northern Building, and the Southern Building, making all of these

22 Ibid., 59.
23 Ibid., 48. The locus list for 453 calls it a floor; but it is almost 30 cm thick (647.82-647.55), suggesting the materials listed here were from accumulation above the floor and above the ash layer. This supposition is further supported by the fact that the text says no pottery was found on the floor; yet the locus list includes 8 vessels with the floor. The text also says the thumb-impressed handle was found in the layer above the ash surface, and it is here listed as part of the floor.
24 Ibid., 47, Table 4. This locus is not discussed in the text, although it does mention a stone collapse called 462, which in the locus list is called a foundation trench. It is assumed that the text contains a typographical error.
occupations coterminous. Due to the absence of Stratum 11 or 10 pottery, the excavators assume that D1 was abandoned sometime at the end of the eighth century, the same time as the construction of the city wall in Areas D2 and E.

Because the Kenyon buildings and D1 overlap in occupation, it is significant that the Kenyon areas lack pinched heads in Phase 4 and that Area D1 lacks molded heads. If the pinched heads from D1 actually date to the eighth century, then they are evidence for the beginning of pinched head popularity in Jerusalem. Unfortunately, the D1 loci alone do not support the chronological argument. One of the fragments is from dumping and cannot be associated with a floor surface. The other fragment is possibly associated with a floor (Locus 453); but the stratigraphy is difficult to interpret, and the ceramic evidence is mixed.

5.2.2 Area D2

As stated above, the stratigraphic report for Area D2 has not been written. Excavation in this area began only in 1982, in the project’s fifth year. According to Shiloh’s report, a 6.0 m segment of city wall, which he dates to Stratum 12, or the eighth century, was uncovered. Shiloh also notes that the pottery from adjacent Locus 1839

26 Ibid., 94.

27 De Groot and Ariel (ibid., Fig. 18: 28-31) list 4 pottery forms found on this floor. One bowl is not described in the text, one bowl is a Lachish II form, another bowl is a Lachish III form (ibid., 95), and the lamp is a Lachish III form (ibid., 96). If the “floor” and related material are dated to the latest pottery, then this floor dates after 701 B.C.E.
(paved street) dates between Stratum 12 and 10. This wall is certainly a continuation of the city wall from Kenyon Area A, containing the same adjacent stone and pebble pavement, defined on the east by another wall running parallel to the city wall. The entire pavement is ca. 2.2 m wide. Additional areas were excavated on the border of D2 and D1. In the 1985 season, D2 was extended to the south, where further Israelite remains were uncovered.

The anthropomorphic figurines from Area D2 total 23 fragments, with 16 in Iron Age contexts (7 pinched heads, 3 molded heads, 2 bodies, and 4 bases). According to the plan drawn in 1982, the majority of Iron Age contexts were uncovered just outside the

28 Shiloh, Excavations at the City of David I, 9.

29 Ibid., 28. Shiloh, himself, equates the two. Against this opinion see Lynn Tatum, “Jerusalem in Conflict: The Evidence for the Seventh-Century B.C.E. Religious Struggle over Jerusalem,” in Jerusalem in Bible and Archaeology: The First Temple Period (ed. Andrew G. Vaughn and Ann E. Killebrew; SBLSymS 18; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003), 300. Tatum claims that the Area A Kenyon wall is “outside” the fortification line of the Shiloh city wall. He thus attributes the Kenyon section to Manasseh, as per 2 Chr 33:14, and the Shiloh sections to Hezekiah. Little evidence supports Tatum’s hypothesis. The Kenyon segment is further east than the wall in Area D2 and E but not outside the fortification line, given the southeastern hill’s topography. Moreover, the similarity in construction technique between the two fortifications (width of city wall, adjacent paved street, small retaining wall) is striking. Finally, given the fact that the Kenyon excavations did not generate any stratigraphic relationship between the neighborhood inside the wall and the wall itself, no firm seventh century date can be established. Rather, the large number of lmlk handles on the street indicate construction sometime at the end of the eighth or beginning of the seventh century. It appears most likely that the various segments of wall were constructed as part of the same initiative. The only question remains how long that initiative would have taken to complete. For yet another opinion connecting all of these walls, see Jane M. Cahill and David Tarler, “Excavations Directed by Yigal Shiloh at the City of David, 1978-1985,” in Ancient Jerusalem Revealed (ed. Hillel Geva; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1994), 36. Cahill and Tarler note the adjacent 2.0-3.0 m cobble pavement with retaining wall in D2, E1, and E2.

30 Ibid., 9.

31 Ariel, Hirschfeld, and Savir, “Area D1,” 33.

32 Many of these come from the same locus. For example Locus 2323 contains 5 fragments, and Locus 1882 contains 4. Together this is over half of the figurines in Iron contexts from D2 (see Appendix A).
city wall. Only a few loci from Area D2 have been published, all of which are dated to Stratum 12. Locus 1882 is described as “stone fill.” This locus contained 2 zoomorphic fragments and 4 anthropomorphic fragments. Locus 2323, with 5 anthropomorphic fragments, is identified as a floor and also contained 13 zoomorphic fragments (including 1 bird figurine) and 1 mollusk shell. Another “floor,” Locus 2337, contained 1 pillar base, 1 unidentified figurine fragment, 1 loom weight, and 1 mollusk shell.

Given the pottery readings from the paved street (Locus 1839), which range from Strata 12-10, objects coming from the vicinity of the street may not actually date to the eighth century, while objects from structures abandoned prior to street construction could date to the end of the eighth century or earlier. Moreover, because the excavators believe the extramural structures were abandoned, the loci may have been exposed to subsequent post-occupational dumping. Given the large number of loci for which no

---

33 Shiloh, *Excavations at the City of David 1*, 49, Fig. 11. Further, note 32 says the 1983 season continued to work in the same area. This was before the 1985 expansion to the south, into Squares G8 and F8; but these areas would also be close to the continuation of the city wall.


36 Ibid., 126.

37 Because the pottery has not been published, it is impossible to know for sure. If D2 is similar to D1, then there is no stratigraphic relationship between the street/city wall and any possible structures to its east (unlike Kenyon Area A). If the pottery is similar to that published in D1, the majority of these floors would date to the end of the eighth century.
locus descriptions have been published, the date of Iron Age loci from D2 that contained figurines must remain in question.

Iron Age loci in Area D2 contained 3 molded heads. Fragments D2/20264 and D2/20256 are of the regular JPF style and look very similar in design. The third, D2/13667, is not pictured but is described as idiosyncratic, with a disfigured face and a long and broad neck. Kletter notes the presence of side-locks, which would be curious on a molded head but may resemble the head in Area G (G/5618). All of the seven pinched heads in Area D are the simple pinched head variety. Finally, both body fragments from Area D consist of normal JPF types, with a “hand joined under breasts” type (D2/13658) and a fragment with breasts and broken arms (D2/21064).

As in Area D1, a general contrast can be drawn with Kenyon’s excavations in regards to pinched versus molded heads. Although some molded heads are attested in

---

38 Loci 1882, 1834, 2323, 2319, 2325, 2766, 233, 2765, and 1868.

39 Dating the wall to Stratum 12 appears to rest on Shiloh’s presumption that Hezekiah built the wall (Shiloh, Excavations at the City of David 1, 28). Personal communication with Alon de Groot confirms the dating of D2 remains, but it is still impossible to identify whether the loci were exposed to post-occupational activity or whether they were covered over during Stratum 12 or 11.

40 Compare D2/20264 (Gilbert-Peretz, “Ceramic Figurines,” Fig. 11:9, Pl. 2:10) and D2/20256 (ibid., Fig. 11:10, Pl. 2:9). The only difference in typology according to Gilbert-Peretz (ibid., 30-31, Table 1) is that D2/20264 has a “rounded head” while D2/20256 has a “head pointed upwards and to back.” In reality, these differences are not part of intentional design but are the side effect of pushing the mold into the clay. In the case of D2/20256 the potter simply did not smooth down the clay at the back of the head.

41 Kletter, Judean Pillar-Figurines, Addenda to Appendix 2, 615.B.

42 Gilbert-Peretz, “Ceramic Figurines,” Fig. 11:17, Pl. 2:18; to be discussed below.

43 D2/13743, D2/14083, D2/20242, D2/20243, D2/20283, D2/20333/2, D2/20274. Similar to the molded heads, some of these pinched heads have rounded heads versus pointed heads; but, in their case Gilbert-Peretz keeps them in the same typological category. Once more, the pointing of the head is probably a result of the pinched face. Only occasionally was the back of the head subsequently smoothed down.
Area D2, the majority of heads are pinched. Thus, when D1 and D2 are taken together the evidence dictates that simple pinched heads were used in Jerusalem at the end of the eighth century and that these gained in popularity. Their absence in the Kenyon Cave I material is either an accident of preservation, or the Cave I figurines represent a figurine tradition from the earlier half of the eighth century (see Chapter 7).

5.2.3 Area G

5.2.3.1 Pre-Stratum 12 figurines

Area G was located at the top of the eastern slope on the upper part of the hill. Excavations began in 1978 and yielded a total of 32 anthropomorphic fragments from Iron Age loci. According to Shiloh, Area G was not built-up during the tenth through seventh centuries, with the exception of the stepped stone structure that covered most of the area. Regardless, 1 small pinched head figurine with applied pellet eyes is dated to this period (Stratum 13, or the ninth century). According to published locus descriptions, the figurine was found on a floor surface. Lacking breasts, it is not in the


46 G/11769 (Gilbert-Peretz, “Ceramic Figurines,” Pl. 1:8, Fig 10:13) is a mini human figurine with rounded head, pinched face, and applied button eyes. There is a crack in the arms and body, the figurine is broken in the middle of the pillar, and displays no sign of breasts. There is no break on the torso where the arms (no longer preserved) may have been attached, so it is safe to assume they extended out to the sides.

47 Floor 972 in, Sharon Zuckerman, “Beads and Pendants,” in *Excavations at the City of David, 1978-1985: Directed by Yigal Shiloh: Volume 4: Various Report* (ed. Donald T. Ariel and Alon de Groot; Qedem 35; Jerusalem: the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1996), 288, Fig. 45:3. In the same locus were 2 gems, 1 bead, an animal figurine, and a mollusk shell.
traditional JPF style. A few other figurines were also found in loci dated to pre-Stratum 10 levels. According to Cahill, excavations in two major structures, the Burnt Room and the House of Ahiel, yielded Iron I and early Iron II material in fills and on floors.

5.2.3.2 The House of Ahiel, the Burnt Room, and the House of the Bullae

Shiloh considers the main period of occupation to be the second half of the seventh century to 586 B.C.E. This period includes the “House of Ahiel,” “the Burnt Room,” and the “House of the Bullae.” Many figurines can be assigned to the House of Ahiel. A pillar fragment was found in Locus 790 (St. 10C-B), or the floor of the pillared room, along with 2 ground stones, 2 weights, and botanical remains. A molded head

48 G/11508 (a pinched head with turban and sidelocks) from Locus 960 is dated to Stratum 12B. A few fragments come from Strata 14-10 including, G/15444 and G/17504 (two bases) from Locus 1114, G/4524 (a base) from 787A, and G/5631 (very broken fragment of a molded face) from Locus 850. Only a rudimentary description of Locus 960 is published—a floor surface (Zuckerman, “Beads and Pendants,” 288, Fig. 45:1). The figurine was found along with 1 bead/gem, and 5 zoomorphic fragments. Locus 850 will be discussed below. The loci of the other anthropomorphic fragments are not published, and the figurines could just as easily have come from Stratum 10 as from Strata 14-12.

49 Jane M. Cahill, “Jerusalem at the Time of the United Monarchy: The Archaeological Evidence,” in Jerusalem in Bible and Archaeology: The First Temple Period (ed. Andrew G. Vaughn and Ann E. Killebrew; SBLSymS 18; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003), 56-66. Cahill claims that both structures were actually constructed in the early Iron II, although this supposition remains to be supported by publication of archaeological data. Cahill says that the foundations of these two structures are complex, with parts built on the stepped stone structure directly, parts built on rubble, and parts built on the ribbing and fills of the sub-structure of the stepped mantle. Given this stratigraphy, some of the floors or fills to which Cahill is referring could belong to structures that predate the later buildings but were incorporated into the later construction. Without further stratigraphic evidence, little more can be said.

was found in Pit 850 (Stratum 14-10?) in the same room. Although Shiloh does not discuss this locus, Steiner describes Kenyon’s excavation of the same area. She equates Kenyon’s Pit A/15.13 with Pit 850 of the Shiloh excavations and describes the locus as a plastered pit in the corner made by walls 102 and 103 (or Shiloh Walls 322 and 323). Kenyon’s excavation recovered pottery and animal bones. According to Shiloh’s further excavations, the pit contained 1 weight, extensive botanical remains, and a large cache of fish bones, in addition to 4 zoomorphic fragments, 1 possible rider fragment, and 1 anthropomorphic fragment. Steiner further adds metal fragments and 2 seal impressions. The fact that this pit contains eighth century pottery complicates its relationship to the house, which Shiloh dates to the middle of the seventh century.

51 Locus 850 is published as a pit in Nili Liphschitz and Yoav Waisel, “Macrobotanical Remains,” in Excavations at the City of David, 1978-1985: Directed by Yigal Shiloh: Volume 3: Stratigraphical, Environmental, and Other Reports (ed. Alon de Groot and Donald T. Ariel; Qedem 33; Jerusalem: the Hebrew University, 1992), 117, Table A.1. This publication lists Strata 12B-10C rather than the broader dates listed in the locus list of Volume 4 (14?-10).

52 Steiner, Excavations by Kathleen M. Kenyon in Jerusalem, 63.

53 Steiner (ibid., 63-64) describes seeds and wood remains. See also Hanan Lernau and Omri Lernau, “Fish Remains,” in Excavations at the City of David, 1978-1985: Directed by Yigal Shiloh: Volume 3: Stratigraphical, Environmental, and Other Reports (ed. Alon de Groot and Donald T. Ariel; Qedem 33; Jerusalem: the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1992), 135. Lernau and Lernau also mention several kinds of wood, wheat seeds, grape, olive pits, date pits, and pomegranate peel.

54 Steiner, Excavations by Kathleen M. Kenyon in Jerusalem, 63-64. Because Steiner does not cite the source of this knowledge it is difficult to check its accuracy.

55 Lernau and Lernau (“Fish Remains,” 135) notes that the pit was 1.10 m deep and appeared to serve as refuse disposal for two different periods with a possible floor separating the two phases. Unfortunately, eighth and seventh through sixth century pottery were found in all layers, making it difficult to separate phases.
A body fragment was also found in Wall 329 (St. 10C-B), which forms the northern side of the house’s lower courtyard. The figurine was uncovered along with botanical remains, fish bones, 1 zoomorphic fragment, and 1 mollusk shell. Two more fragments (1 base and 1 pinched head with possible turban) were uncovered in Locus 906=Wall 369 (10C). This wall lies immediately to the south of Wall 329, also forming the northern border of the lower courtyard area. The relationship between the walls is unclear from the plan, other than the fact that Wall 369 is dated to the earlier phase. Also in the locus were 3 zoomorphic fragments and charred wood remains.

Another figurine fragment was almost certainly associated with the house, found in Locus 793 (10C-B), described as the “latrine cesspit.” This latrine, with its stone toilet seat, was uncovered in Room 789 on the north end of the building. Shiloh says the cesspit was ca. 2.60 m deep. Locus 793 included 1 pillar/base, botanical remains, and 6 fish bones.

A final fragment possibly associated with the same house is in Locus 804 (Stratum 10C-B), described as “collapse on top of a staircase.” Two of the three

---

56 Shiloh, *Excavations at the City of David 1*, 19. G/11067 is a badly broken torso with breaks in the neck, arms, part of breasts, and pillar. Gilbert-Peretz assumed each hand was originally under a breast; but she is unsure, and no pictures or drawings were published.


58 Ibid.

59 Shiloh, *Excavations at the City of David 1*, 18.

60 Hovers, “Groundstone Industry,” 182, Table 5.
staircases on the plan are associated with the House of Ahiel. This locus contained 1 pillar base in addition to 2 ground stones, 3 zoomorphic fragments, 1 broken relief fragment, 1 stone weight, botanical remains, and fish bones. Thus, in total, the House of Ahiel accounts for at least 7 of the Stratum 10 figurines.

The second structure was called the “Burnt Room,” because it contained carbonized remains of wooden beams. Shiloh gives only minimal information about any objects found in the space or about any possible floor layers. The third structure was called the “House of the Bullae,” so named because of 53 clay bullae in the northern corner. Very little of this house was excavated. None of the figurine loci can be associated with the Burnt Room, given the present state of publication; and only 1 base fragment can tentatively be attributed to the House of the Bullae.

61 Shiloh, Excavations at the City of David 1, 57, Fig. 20. One is in between Wall 335 and 334 on the southern end of the building, and the other is adjacent to Wall 329 in the lower terrace of the northern end. The third staircase is in the “Burnt Room” (Wall 343).

62 Ibid., Plate 33:2 lists 10 arrow heads from the room, and Plate 34:1 lists 11 fragments of furniture and carved wood. According to the locus list in Volume 4 of the excavations, the main floor locus of the room (997) contained many finds, including extensive botanical remains (probably the wood), 5 loom weights, 1 bead/gem, 2 ground stones, 1 mollusk shell, and 2 fish bones. No anthropomorphic or zoomorphic figurines were listed in this space.

63 According to Yair Shoham, two of the bullae were unreadable; and another two were combined together, producing 49 total bullae. See Yair Shoham, “A Group of Hebrew Bullae from Yigal Shiloh’s Excavations in the City of David,” in Ancient Jerusalem Revealed (ed. Hillel Geva (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1994), 56.

64 Ibid., 18.

65 According to a section drawing for the House of Bullae, Locus 975 was located in between Wall 753, the western retaining wall/external wall of the House of the Bullae, and Wall 776 of the rest of Area G. No description of this locus is published, and it seems more likely that the fragment is the result of collapse from the buildings on the higher terrace rather than accumulation from the adjacent House of the Bullae. The section is published in Shoham, “Group of Hebrew Bullae,” 56.
5.2.3.3 Stratum 10 figurines without complete locus data

Shiloh notes that most Area G structures had two phases, as indicated by slight modifications to floors or walls. The first phase was called Stratum 10C and the second 10B, but 10B was also a destruction level from 586 B.C.E. Many of the finds were associated with the destruction and collapse of second storey walls. As per Table 15 in Appendix A, once the 4 known fragments from 10C-B are subtracted, 3 from 10B and 1 from 10C-B remain unaccounted for and may be part of the area’s destruction level. These figurines can be associated with the domestic structures of Area G in general, but no further detail can be ascertained.

Additionally, the exact spatial locations of another 16 fragments from Stratum 10C are unaccounted for. Most of the information must be based on the objects found in the same locus as the figurines. Table 16 in Appendix A reveals that most loci have only one anthropomorphic figurine, usually accompanied by zoomorphic figurines and botanical remains. In a few cases the loci also contain fish bones. Locus 824, containing 1 body fragment, is identified as a “floor.” The surface also contained 9 zoomorphic

66 Ibid.

67 Two of these (1 base and 1 pinched head) are from Locus 872 which is described as a floor (Liphschitz and Waisel, “Macrobotanical Remains,” 117, Table A1). Also in the same locus were 2 zoomorphic fragments and botanical remains. The third fragment (a molded head) is from Locus 858 called “stone collapse” (ibid.) along with 1 zoomorphic fragment and botanical remains (wood).

68 See above for 2 fragments from 906=Wall 369 in the lower terrace of the House of Ahiel.

69 Liphschitz and Waisel, “Macrobotanical Remains, 118, Table A1.
fragments, 1 weight, and charred wood. That does not mean that all these figurines were associated with floor surfaces. For example, Locus 922, containing 1 body fragment, is described as “fill,” as are Locus 927, with 1 base fragment, and Locus 908, with 1 body fragment.70

The most idiosyncratic locus in Stratum 10C is Pit 903, with 9 anthropomorphic fragments and a large number of other figurines (including couch/chair fragments), botanical remains, and fish bones, in addition to 1 stone weight. This locus is published as a “pit”;71 so the figurines may represent some sort of activity but were not associated with a floor surface. None of the other objects (other than figurines) suggest a specialized function for the pit; and the large number of organic materials along with the stone weight suggest a mundane function, perhaps general household garbage.

5.2.3.4 Interpretation of Area G figurines

The benefit of Area G is its short term of occupation ending in destruction. Further, much of the structures were covered over in the Persian or Hellenistic periods, limiting the amount of time the Iron Age structures stood exposed.72 This reduces the possibility that the objects resulted from long-term post-occupational dumping. As a

70 Ibid. Locus 922 also contained 1 zoomorphic figurine, 1 rider fragment, 1 unidentified pillar fragment, 1 unidentified body fragment, and botanical remains, while Locus 927 contained botanical remains and 1 zoomorphic fragment. Locus 908 also contained 4 zoomorphic fragments and botanical remains (charred wood).

71 Ibid., 117, Table A1.

72 Shiloh, Excavations at the City of David 1, 62, Plan 27.
result, the Area G figurines can be used to address several interpretive issues, including the domestic nature of assemblages, figurine usage in elite neighborhoods, and the Kenyon street deposit.

While the data do not support an exact spatial interpretation of many figurine fragments, they do suggest that these fragments (including zoomorphic fragments) were clearly associated with the inhabitants of the buildings and are the result of domestic garbage. The “domestic” character of the assemblage is further undergirded by the large number of fish bones found in the same loci with the figurines, as well as the loom weights and ground stones.

Although the pottery for the area is not published, the published small finds do not include any objects (other than figurines) that suggest a specialized cultic function for the identified provenience areas or any of the caches of figurines. Where the figurines can be associated with the House of Ahiel, they are distributed throughout the structure, including the lower terrace, the pillared courtyard/room, and the cesspit. They are found in loci with a few zoomorphic figurines, loom weights, ground stones, charred wood, and fish bones. Because of their stratigraphic designation (primarily Stratum 10C-B) they may represent objects discarded by the inhabitants or they could be the result of destruction and collapse.73

Shiloh suggests that the structures built here were of a better quality than those of Area E. He also posits that the House of the Bullae may signify a public or official

73 Lernau and Lernau (“Fish Remains,” 136) conclude, for example, that the fish bones in the cesspit were not digested but thrown there as part of household refuse.
function for the structures. The units were certainly used for domestic activity. The possibility that they represent a wealthy residential area is supported by the use of dressed limestone ashlars in the House of Ahiel, the size of the house, the large number of storage jars in that space, and the toilet installation. Steiner also believes the house had wealthy inhabitants. Further, the adjacent structures contained unusual and possibly elite objects such as the large cache of bullae in the House of the Bullae and the carved wooden ornaments from the Burnt Room, as well pieces of bone and ivory inlay. Finally, Lernau notes that the large amount of fish bones in Area G, particularly in the House of Ahiel, suggests a high standard of living. Thus, even people of relatively high socio-economic status were using clay anthropomorphic and zoomorphic images.

Furthermore, there is reason to believe that at least some of the inhabitants in this area were associated with the Jerusalem royal house or temple elite. Shiloh notes that the cache of bullae suggests some administrative connection with the area. One of the bullae specifically names “Germaryahu son of Shaphan, the scribe,” also mentioned

---

74 Shiloh, Excavations at the City of David 1, 29.

75 Steiner (Excavations by Kathleen M. Kenyon, 78) references the Kenyon excavations of this building where they found several pieces of iron near the doorway interpreted as possible mounting for the wooden door, as well as the objects in Pit 15.13 (=Shiloh L850) and 2 scarabs.

76 Shiloh, Excavations at the City of David 1, 19-20.

77 Lernau and Lernau, “Fish Remains,” 135. Part of the significance rests on the fact that fish had to be traded from some distance, increasing their market value. They also note that the inhabitants were consuming seven different species in the same period, which further undergirds the interpretation of the inhabitants’ status.

78 Shiloh, Excavations at the City of David 1, 19.
several times in the book of Jeremiah (Jer 36:10-12, 25). Another belongs to “Azayahu son of Ḥilqiyahu,” attested in 1 Chr 5:29-41 and 9:10-22. Even more intriguing, seal 6 reads “(Belonging) [to Ṭbšlm] son of Zkr, the Healer,” suggesting some connection between temple officials and medical officials similar to the asû or the āšipu from Neo-Assyrian temples and figurine rituals.

This elite Area G neighborhood also contains a high frequency of figurines for a relatively small excavation area and short time period (ca. forty years). Kenyon had already uncovered every structure that Shiloh excavated, though in most cases she excavated only to the latest Iron II floor surfaces. Thus, the figurines in Iron II contexts must have been recovered principally from one of the three known buildings on the stepped-stone structure, between the highest and lowest Iron II floors. Because these buildings have two main occupation phases, many of the figurines must have resulted from coterminous use. Furthermore, if the biblical account of exile is to be trusted and if this area was inhabited by the wealthy citizens associated with administration or

79 Ibid., 20.


82 Although Cahill (“Jerusalem at the Time of the United Monarchy,” 57-58) has suggested the Burnt Room and the House of Ahiel were constructed in the early Iron II, given the present state of publication this suggestion rests on little more than the identification of floor surfaces in the same general areas. The Burnt Room produced Stratum 14, Stratum 13, and Stratum 12b floors; and the House of Ahiel had two floors in this time period, the earlier dated to Stratum 14. She does not address the date of the later floor in the House nor does she explain whether the house saw a gap in occupation between the early Iron II and the final quarter of the seventh century.
temple, they may have already been deported in 597 (2 Kgs 24:1-16), partially abandoning the neighborhood until the 586 destruction. In other words, the period of occupation for this neighborhood could have been as short as twenty-seven years.

Additionally, the Area G figurines display a high degree of design variety. The Iron Age figurines in Area G contained 4 molded heads and 7 pinched heads. The molded heads are fairly idiosyncratic. Fragment G/5723 is the only normal, JPF style face. Fragment G/5618 is not a regular JPF, with an uncommonly long neck and long pieces of applied clay on either side of the head for hair or sidelocks.\(^{83}\) Fragment G/4471 is also not a regular JPF, having a very small impressed face with plenty of excess clay around the mold line.\(^{84}\) Finally, G/5631 is badly broken, and no picture or drawing is published; but Kletter did not consider it a normal JPF.\(^{85}\)

The handmade heads from Stratum 10 consist of 2 simple pinched heads (G/5751, G/11481), 1 head with turban and sidelocks (G/11147), another head with turban and possible sidelocks (G/8227),\(^{86}\) and 1 head with turban (G/11026).\(^{87}\) The pinched heads

---

\(^{83}\) Gilbert-Peretz, “Ceramic Figurines,” Fig.11:17, Pl. 2:18. It appears that the head was regularly molded, complete with the hairline on the forehead and short hair along the sides of the face. Afterwards excess clay was applied to either side of the head and neck.

\(^{84}\) Ibid., Fig. 11:15, Pl. 2:15-16.


\(^{86}\) Kletter (Addenda to Appendix 2, 649A.2) does not see sidelocks; but the drawing, and especially the photograph, appear to show broken pieces of clay on either side of the head beneath the turban (Gilbert-Peretz, “Ceramic Figurines,” Fig.10:17, Pl.1:12).

\(^{87}\) Gilbert-Peretz describes this headpiece as a scarf-like covering; but in the drawing and photograph it appears to be a minor variation on the turban, perhaps poorly formed (ibid., Fig. 10:18, Pl.1:13). Kletter (*Judean Pillar-Figurines*, Addenda to Appendix 2 ,650A.2) also considers it a turban.
from earlier strata, G/11508 (pinched head with turban and sidelocks) and G/11769 (mini human figurine), were dealt with above. When the pinched heads are compared with the molded heads from Stratum 10 loci alone, Area G contained 3 molded heads and 5 pinched heads. Of those molded heads, 2 were non-JPFs; though all of the pinched heads were of the regular variety.

The bodies from Area G included several typical JPF style bodies. Fragments G/11076, G/11953, and G/8228 all contain breasts with the arms joined under the bosom. Fragments G/4931, G/11067, and G/5797 have broken arms and breasts. There are also a few exceptional fragments. Figurines G/11059 and G/11152 are both holding objects in their arms, perhaps a child, and do not display breasts.88 Thus, on the whole, both types of heads, as well as body fragments, show a high degree of diversity in design. This may be associated with the higher socio-economic standing of the neighborhood or the period of renewed prosperity marking the end of the seventh century in general (see Chapter 6 for further comments).

Thus, if the inhabitants of this area were associated with the royal house or the temple complex, then it is impossible to claim that only the regular, non-elite population was using figurines. Rather, the occupants of these structures appear to have used figurines with some frequency, given the length of occupation and the number of different figurine variations. Further, the consistent distribution of figurines from Stratum

88 For G/11059 see (Gilbert-Peretz, “Ceramic Figurines,” Fig. 12:12, Pl. 3:10), and for G/11152 see (ibid., Fig. 12:15, Pl. 3:13). For G/11152, Kletter (Judean Pillar-Figurines, Addenda to Appendix 2, 854C.2.D?) suggests the object may be a disc; but it is too thin and long for that to be the case.
10C, or the last quarter of the seventh century, until the destruction of Jerusalem suggests that no iconoclastic destruction of figurines occurred, even in this central city of Judah.

Finally, the Shiloh data can be brought to bear on the Kenyon street deposit. The main period of occupation for this neighborhood occurs well after the city wall was constructed. The ceramic evidence dates Stratum 10 to the last quarter of the seventh century, which should include Kenyon’s Buildings 1, 2, and 4, otherwise known as the House of Ahiel and the Burnt Room. Because all of Kenyon’s buildings appear to be built with the same plan, the entire Kenyon/Shiloh neighborhood was probably inhabited primarily at the end of the seventh century. Kenyon’s Northern and Southern Buildings and Caves I and II date to the second half of the eighth century with the city wall construction around the end of the eighth century, creating a gap of seventy-five years between the construction of the city wall and most of this neighborhood inside it.

In addition to ceramic evidence, this supposition is supported by comparing the proximity of the buildings to the city wall in Areas E and G. Area E was inhabited immediately after the wall’s construction (and possibly before). As a result, many of its structures include rooms incorporated into the city wall. In contrast, the neighborhood excavated in Kenyon’s trench left a 6.0 m gap between the edge of the excavated

---

89 Margreet Steiner also assumes that most of the buildings excavated by Kenyon should be synchronized with the Shiloh excavations, producing one neighborhood built after the stepped stone structure went out of use, no earlier than the late eighth century (with the construction of the city wall) and probably in the seventh century. See Margreet Steiner, “The Evidence from Kenyon’s Excavations in Jerusalem: A Response Essay,” in Jerusalem in Bible and Archaeology: The First Temple Period (ed. Andrew G. Vaughn and Ann E. Killebrew; SBLSymS 18; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003), 359-60. Steiner shows that the majority of pottery from Kenyon’s earliest floors was eighth century. Where a few Iron IIA sherds were found in association with a floor (Building 2), the sherds resulted from cutting into earlier terraces during the construction of later structures.
structures and the city wall.\textsuperscript{90} Thus, it is even less likely that the figurines on the city street resulted from domestic garbage travelling down the slope or discarded over the walls, rather than a potential market targeting foot traffic outside the city.

5.3 Area E

Area E was the largest area,\textsuperscript{91} excavated continuously from 1978 to 1985. It is located in the middle of the eastern slope, near and to the W/NW of Area D2. The total area was subdivided according to elevation into Areas E1, E2, and E3. The majority of the area was within the Iron Age fortification line, although parts of E2 were extramural, as in D1 and D2.\textsuperscript{92}

The original publications list 54 anthropomorphic fragments from E1 in Iron Age contexts, 14 from E2, and 21 from E3. Of these, 51 from E1 can be double-checked with the new stratigraphic report, along with 4 from E2 and 15 from E3. Thus, 70 out of 90 fragments have context data (see Table 14 in Appendix A).

Because of the stratigraphic complexity, de Groot chose to reorganize Area E into four regions, E North, South, West, and East. All of E1 and E3 are included in these reports and most of E2, with the exception of extramural areas re-designated E East.\textsuperscript{93} In

\begin{footnotes}
\begin{itemize}
\item\textsuperscript{90} Steiner, \textit{Excavations by Kathleen M. Kenyon}, 85.
\item\textsuperscript{91} De Groot and Bernick Greenberg (\textit{Excavations at the City of David}, 2) say the area is 1400 m\textsuperscript{2}, making it larger than any other area.
\item\textsuperscript{92} Ibid., 3.
\item\textsuperscript{93} Ibid., 4.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotes}
accordance, the following discussion is arranged by the same sub-areas. This is especially necessary because the stratigraphic sequence from one area cannot necessarily be coordinated with the stratigraphic sequences from the others.

5.3.1 Area E East

E East comprises the area of E2 outside of the city wall on the lower terrace. Shiloh describes this area as a series of walls, fills, and floors dated to Stratum 12 on analogy with Area D1. The structures are called dwellings and buildings and are believed to have been abandoned after Stratum 12, though they sat exposed until Stratum 8.94

Little can be said about the figurines from this area. Two pinched heads from Stratum 12 and 1 body from Stratum 11 were found in loci not discussed in the either the earlier reports or the new Area E report. The only registered objects in Locus 1450 are a simple pinched head (E2/7381) and a weight. A pinched head with applied eyes (E2/7352) was found in Locus 1447 along with an animal figurine fragment. This miniature fragment is not a typical JPF, with applied features; it also lacks breasts,95 and the arms meet in front of the torso. Typologically, it is very similar to G/11769 from Area G, dated to Stratum 13. Finally, a female torso fragment from Locus 1705 was found with 1 zoomorphic fragment and 1 ground stone. Without stratigraphic information, little more can be said about E East, save the extremely small number of figurine fragments when

94 Shiloh, *Excavations at the City of David 1*, 9-10. In the locus list this locus is dated to Stratum 14.

95 Gilbert-Peretz, “Ceramic Figurines,” Fig. 10:12, Pl. 1:10.
compared with the extramural neighborhood of Area D2. In both Area D1 and E East the low figurine count may be due to poor preservation and location further down the slope, away from the rest of the city. Finally, if the original stratigraphic designations of the E East loci are secure, the area further corroborates D1 and D2, where pinched heads were present in higher numbers than molded heads.

### 5.3.2 Area E West

Area E West was located at the highest elevation of the Area E excavations. The area yielded Iron II remains, but the dominant building was constructed only at the end of the seventh century. The interpretation of the area is complicated. This main Iron Age structure—the Ashlar House of Stratum 10—was reoccupied in the Persian period.96 Furthermore, the house itself may not have collapsed until sometime in the middle of the Hellenistic period.97 Thus the structure was uncovered for a long period of time and was exposed to various occupation phases and dumping. Furthermore, the Hellenistic layers actually penetrated to the Stratum 10 floors in some parts of the building.98 Finally, the foundation trenches of the Ashlar House cut many of the earlier Iron II phases, making their interpretation complicated as well.


97 Ibid., 15.

98 Ibid., 21.
5.3.2.1 Stratum 14

One hollow body fragment (E1/10126) was found in Locus 1623, a fill dated to either Stratum 14 or Stratum 13 (tenth-ninth centuries). The locus also contained much pottery and 2 zoomorphic fragments. The body fragment has large breasts with evidence that the hands were holding each breast; but it is hollow and wheel-made. The stratigraphic context is surprising for this iconographic style. If secure, the fragment would be a very early exemplar. The fill was cut to the east, however, by a later foundation trench.99 Additionally, Fill 1293B, dated to Stratum 14 on the basis of ceramic evidence, also contained 1 figurine fragment. The locus yielded 1 figurine base, some pottery, and 1 weight. Unfortunately, this locus has no stratigraphic relationship to the rest of the E West structures.100

5.3.2.2 Stratum 13

One body fragment was found in Earthen Fill 1643 of Stratum 13, lying on top of a Stratum 13 floor.101 The locus also contained much pottery, botanical remains, fish bone, 1 zoomorphic fragment, 1 mollusk shell, and 1 weight. The body, described as broken but with hands under the breasts, appears to be a regular JPF (Kletter 684.C.2), which makes its presence in such an early Iron II locus remarkable. Unfortunately, the

99 Ibid., 33.
100 Ibid.
101 Ibid., 32.
locus and the floor underneath were cut by the foundation trench of Wall 235 for the Ashlar House of Stratum 10, making contamination possible.

5.3.2.3 Stratum 12

Stratum 12 largely consisted of fills for the Stratum 11 floors of a structure to the south of the Ashlar House. The excavators note that these fills contained eighth century pottery. Fill 1627 contained 1 pinched head (E1/10257), 1 female body fragment (E1/10244), pottery, fish bones, 1 incised handle, and 1 ground stone. Locus 1303 contained 1 pinched head and body, and 1 molded head (E1/8456), as well as pottery, botanical remains, 1 loom weight, 1 mollusk shell, 1 stone object, 7 weights, 7 zoomorphic fragments, and 1 rectangular fragment. Finally, Fill 1381 contained 1 base, much pottery, 1 bone/ivory fragment, 3 zoomorphic fragments, 3 incised handles, and 1 loom weight. No anthropomorphic figurines were associated with the actual Stratum 11 floors (see Figure 12 and Table 17 in Appendix A).  

102 Ibid., 31-32.
103 E1/8475 has a mass of clay above the left arm.
104 The illustrations included in this chapter are unedited versions of plans from the unpublished report. They are included by permission from Alon de Groot. They have not been redrawn or enhanced in this dissertation, save to highlight features found in the structures but not present on the drawings; and these represent the present author’s attempt to depict the features. The present author has also added approximate locations of the figurines to these plans. It must be emphasized that the points representing figurines do not represent their actual find spot but their general location within a locus, room, or feature.
5.3.2.4 Stratum 10

The main structure in E West was called the Ashlar House (Locus 1269). This 13.0 m by 13.0 m structure was fully excavated in the southern row of rooms and in the eastern row of rooms; but only some of its central rooms were exposed. Most of the construction utilized rough-hewn stones, with more carefully cut blocks in the southwestern corner. Iron Age occupation ended with the Jerusalem destruction and stretched back to the end of the seventh century (with Stratum 10 sherds in the foundation
The excavators describe the structure as a four room house in organization but as a public building in function.

No anthropomorphic figurines were found in any of the rooms of the Ashlar House, although one fragment was located in its foundation trenches. Locus 2157, the foundation trench for Northern Wall 609, contained 1 base, in addition to small amounts of pottery and 1 zoomorphic fragment. The few other figurine fragments were found in loci to the south of the structure. Locus 1394 was an earthen fill, overlaid with stone fill, dipping down the slope. Despite the fact that the fill contains Stratum 11 pottery, it was dated to Stratum 10 because it covered Stratum 11 floor surfaces. The locus is connected with the floor surfaces of the Stratum 11 structure because some sherds from the fill were used to reconstruct pottery from those surfaces; however, no anthropomorphic fragments were found on the floor of the Stratum 11 structure. The fill contained 1 simple pinched head with arms and pillar (E1/9927), 1 metal fragment, 2

106 Ibid., 25.
107 Ibid., 30, 31. The excavators claim that the Ashlar House differs from the residential structures in regards to wall thickness, the laying of the courses, the size of the stones, and their modeling.
108 Ibid., 27.
109 Ibid., 29.
110 Ibid., 31.
111 Gilbert-Peretz, “Ceramic Figurines,” Fig. 10:2, Pl. 1:2. The figurine does not appear to have breasts or broken spots where the breasts should have been.
ground stones, 2 loom weights, much pottery, 1 incised handle, 3 incised sherds, 3 zoomorphic fragments, botanical remains, fish bones, and 4 fragments of bone/ivory.

In addition to the fill layer, Floor 1201 was uncovered in a cave southwest of the Ashlar House; and Tabun 675 was on that floor. The Tabun contained 1 figurine base and a mollusk shell. The segment of the floor at the entrance to the cave was called Locus 1367\textsuperscript{112} and contained 1 pinched head (E1/5839) and 1 body fragment (E1/9284).\textsuperscript{113} The report does not say whether Floors 1201 and 1367 are equal. In addition to the anthropomorphic fragments, Floor 1367 contained pottery and 2 zoomorphic fragments. Two additional zoomorphic fragments were found on Floor 1201 (see Figure 13 and Table 18 in Appendix A).

The lack of anthropomorphic figurines in the large Ashlar House is puzzling. Some remains may have been destroyed by the Babylonians in 586 or by later re-use and construction. In fact, a few figurine fragments were uncovered in Stratum 7 fills;\textsuperscript{114} but it is impossible to identify whether these fills resulted from debris of the Ashlar House or from farther up the slope. Perhaps more telling, none of the Stratum 9 layers (Persian period) contain anthropomorphific figurines, which one might expect if Stratum 9 inhabitants either reused the same space or cleaned out the Iron II debris. The absence of

\textsuperscript{112} De Groot and Bernick Greenberg, *Excavations at the City of David*, 29.

\textsuperscript{113} The pinched head (E1/5839) is badly damaged, lacking its face. The body (E1/9284) is described as possibly holding an infant in Gilbert-Peretz (“Ceramic Figurines,” Appendix C). Kletter (*Judean Pillar-Figurines*, Addenda to Appendix 2, 676C.1) says there is no baby, only bonded arms.

\textsuperscript{114} Locus 1291, Locus 2128, and Locus 1373 contained 1 anthropomorphic fragment each.
pillar figurines in this building and in all the major Stratum 10 structures of Area E is startling when compared with the House of Ahiel in Area G or the older structures in Area E.

Figure 13: Anthropomorphic figurines in Stratum 10 loci, south of the Ashlar House

5.3.3 Area E South

E South comprises remains inside the city wall that spread over the lower terrace on the south side of Area E. It includes all the material from E1 and most of the material from E2.115 The main structures include Structure 1275 (Terrace House), Lane 1325, Structure 1492 (House of the Monolith) to the south of the Terrace House, and North

Structure 1380 to the north of the Terrace House. Most of these structures have multiple phases, though the phases of one structure are not easy to correlate with the phases of the others. For this reason, each structure will be discussed separately.

5.3.3.1 Terrace House

The excavators note an average of three phases in this structure, which they call Strata 12b, 12a, and 11. They warn, however, that some rooms of the structure have fewer than three phases, some have more; and these phases apply only to the Terrace House.116 The Terrace House contained one row of rooms on its east that were incorporated into the city wall (Wall 219).117 The house is built on three terraces with stepped construction and was thus divided into three zones by the excavators.118

In Stratum 12 the entrance to the structure was through stone stairs from Lane 1325 on the structure’s south.119 The earliest construction phases are known from the middle and eastern zones of the structure. The Stratum 12b remains, dated to the first half of the eighth century, constitute walls, fills, and floors; but none contains anthropomorphic fragments.

116 Ibid., 42-43.
117 Ibid., 43.
118 Ibid., 45.
119 Ibid.
In Stratum 12a no loci were uncovered in the western zone, except one fill layer in the southern room. Excavation was discontinued at this point, so the lack of remains may relate to excavation rather than preservation.\textsuperscript{120} In the middle zone, a figurine was found in the middle room on Plaster Floor 631.\textsuperscript{121} The floor contained 1 pillar base fragment, 1 bead, 1 fragment of bone/ivory, 1 zoomorphic fragment, 5 incised handles, 1 inscribed fragment of a storage jar, 1 mollusk shell, 1 metal fragment, 3 ground stones (including 1 mortar), and much pottery, including bowl fragments, 5 cooking pots, and 1 jug.

In 12a of the eastern zone, the area comprised one large room adjacent to the ramparts. Two superimposed floors were found in the northern section of this long room that were cut in the south by Hellenistic levels.\textsuperscript{122} In the lower of these two floors (619 B) was found 1 simple pinched head (E1/3646), along with pottery and 2 zoomorphic fragments (see Figure 14).

In Stratum 11, the western zone was divided into two rooms; and in the northern room excavators uncovered Floor 663A, cut in the east by Pit 663B. The pit, ca. 80 cm in depth, was full of stones, which the excavators interpret as further stone collapse from the room (Locus 642). Because this collapse is also dated to Stratum 11, the structure does

\textsuperscript{120} Ibid., 48. In the northern room of the western zone the Stratum 11 floors were laid on bedrock, so it is possible that no further floors from Stratum 12a exist in this zone.

\textsuperscript{121} Ibid., 49.

\textsuperscript{122} Ibid., 50.
not appear to have been exposed to dumping or post-occupational activity for a prolonged period.\textsuperscript{123} The pit contained 1 base fragment and pottery, 1 piece of which was incised.

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure14.png}
\caption{Anthropomorphic figurines in Stratum 12a of the Terrace House}
\end{figure}

In the northwest corner of the structure excavators uncovered a passage or lane along which stairs would have been constructed. It is technically outside the building. Fill 698 covered this space to bedrock and contained 1 pinched head with turban (E1/5948), 1 female body fragment (E1/5902), 1 unidentified fragment, and pottery.\textsuperscript{124}

The middle zone of Stratum 11 consisted of three rooms. The middle room contained many fill layers from the Iron Age, including Locus 661, a white layer 3 to 4

\ \begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{123} Ibid., 45.
\textsuperscript{124} Ibid., 48.
\end{flushright}
cm thick. The layer contained 1 anthropomorphic female body fragment (E1/4128), 1 pillar base, and minimal pottery. In the upper floor of this room (Locus 699), which continues into the eastern zone, was found 1 broken molded head (E1/5954), pottery, botanical remains, and 2 incised handles. This floor covers the floor of the previous phase (631), which also had 1 base fragment. Tabun 1206, associated with the Stratum 11 floor, also contained 1 zoomorphic fragment.

In summary, the Terrace House contained only 8 anthropomorphic fragments, with 2 in Phase 12a and 6 in Phase 11. Fragments were found in all three of the terraced zones, with half (4) in the middle zone, particularly the middle room. This middle room included two superimposed floor surfaces where anthropomorphic figurines were found with regular domestic items, such as pottery (some of which was incised), especially cooking pots and bowls, food items, and ground stones, as well as zoomorphic fragments. Most of these surfaces were covered over by Iron Age fill or floor surfaces, so the objects can be associated with the domestic garbage of the inhabitants. The structures passed out of use by Stratum 10, or the end of the seventh century (see Figure 15 and Table 19 in Appendix A).

---

125 Ibid., 47.
126 Ibid.
Figure 15: Anthropomorphic figurines in Stratum 11 of the Terrace House

5.3.3.2 Drainage Channel 618

Immediately to the north of the Terrace House was a plaster-coated drainage channel (Locus 618), running from west to east through City Wall 219. Structure 1380 lies to the north of the drainage channel. The channel is ca. 60 cm wide and was uncovered up to 6.50 m west of the city wall. The channel was full of soft, brown-grey fill, with much charred organic material and much pottery. The excavators date most of this pottery to the eighth century and say that Stratum 10 sherds (end of the seventh century to 586) were totally absent. Because the structures on either side were abandoned
by Stratum 10, it is possible the drainage channel went out of use by that time.\textsuperscript{127} In addition to the large amount of pottery, the 1.68 m deep fill of the drainage channel included 4 incised handles, botanical remains, 1 metal fragment, 15 zoormorphic fragments, and 3 anthropomorphic fragments (2 molded heads and 1 base). Head E1/3664 was badly broken, and head E1/3416 was badly molded with excess clay in the back of the head.

### 5.3.3.3 Northern Structure 1380

This building was excavated north of Drainage Channel 618. Only the southern part was cleared, and no remains were preserved to the north of the structure. According to the excavators, the building has two architectural phases. The earlier phase is called Stratum 12b, which comprises one large space. In the later phase (Str. 12a/11) Wall 226 divided the space into two rooms. Within this later phase the western room contained five floors and the eastern room three. The excavators posit a tentative stratigraphic connection between the two rooms.\textsuperscript{128}

In Stratum 12b the structure was covered by Floor 1380 on the west and Floor 665 on the east. They are one and the same.\textsuperscript{129} Locus 665 contained 1 pillar base and minimal pottery; and Locus 1380 contained minimal pottery, 1 zoomorphic fragment, and

\textsuperscript{127}Ibid., 53-55.  
\textsuperscript{128}Ibid., 55.  
\textsuperscript{129}Ibid., 57.
1 rider fragment (see Figure 16). During Stratum 12a the room of 12b was divided into two rooms. On top of Floor 665 was Floor 630C. In the room to the west, on top of Floor 1380 was Floor 1324, itself covered by another 12a surface, Locus 1322. Floor 1324 contained several figurine fragments, including 3 pillar/base fragments, 1 fragmentary simple pinched head (E1/4118), 6 zoomorphic fragments, 1 ground stone, and pottery, including 1 incised handle (see Figure 17).

Figure 16: Anthropomorphic figurines in Stratum 12b of Northern Structure 1380

In Stratum 11 excavators identified three floors in the western room. Above 1322 of Stratum 12a was Floor 1321, then Floor 1310B, and finally Floor 1310A. This upper floor contained 1 molded head (E1/9329), as well as 1 fragment of bone/ivory, 1 ground stone, 1 zoomorphic fragment, and 1 unidentified fragment, along with pottery that included 1 complete bowl and fragments of bowls, cooking pots, jugs, and juglets.\textsuperscript{131}

\textsuperscript{130} Ibid., 56-57.
\textsuperscript{131} Ibid., 56.
On top of the western part of the Northern Structure was Fill 617, ca. 38 cm thick, containing stones, gravel, and Iron Age pottery. It covered the structure’s floor as well as the drainage channel. This fill also contained 1 pillar base, 1 unidentifiable fragment, 2 zoomorphic fragments, 1 inscription, and 1 ground stone. If the excavators are correct to date the fill to Stratum 11, then the remains preserved beneath would have been protected from excessive post-occupational activity (see Figure 18).

In summary, the Northern Structure yielded 7 anthropomorphic fragments, found in every phase of occupation. Six of the 7 were associated with floor surfaces, with 1 on a Phase 11 floor, 4 on a Phase 12a floor, and 1 on a Phase 12b floor. They are found with regular domestic pottery, ground stones, and zoomorphic fragments (see Table 20 in Appendix A).

---

132 Ibid., 55.
5.3.3.4 Lane 1325

To the south of the Terrace House was lane 1325, which facilitated the major entry point to the Terrace House in the early phases of its use. It also provided a passage way between the Terrace House on the north and the House of the Monoliths in the south. The lane was blocked in Stratum 11 when the entrance to the Terrace House moved to its north side.\textsuperscript{133}

Stratum 12 contained two phases and represents the lane’s period of use before being blocked in Stratum 11. No figurines were uncovered in 12b; but in 12a excavators found a floor, Locus 621A, in the east of the lane.\textsuperscript{134} This locus contained 1 pinched head

\textsuperscript{133} Ibid., 57.

\textsuperscript{134} Ibid., 58.
figurine E1/3436,\textsuperscript{135} 1 female body fragment (E1/3481), and a small quantity of pottery (see Figure 19).

**Figure 19: Anthropomorphic figurines in Stratum 12a of Lane 1324**

In Stratum 11 the lane was blocked by Wall 228, which runs perpendicular to the Terrace House. On the west side of this wall excavators uncovered Surface 615.\textsuperscript{136} The locus contained 1 female body fragment (E1/6143) and minimal pottery (see Figure 20).

**Figure 20: Anthropomorphic figurines in Stratum 11 of Lane 1324**

Covered by Hellenistic refuse layers were several Iron Age earth levels dated to Stratum 10. These Iron Age loci covered the lane. Of these, Locus 601, ca. 62 cm thick,

\textsuperscript{135} Gilbert-Peretz (“Ceramic Figurines,” Fig. 10:3, Pl. 1:3) shows the head melding into the body with no neck, a strange diagonal ridge running from the left arm to the right side of the pillar, and no evidence of breasts or that the hands were meant to support the breasts.

\textsuperscript{136} De Groot and Bernick Greenberg, *Excavations at the City of David*, 58.
contained 1 base, 1 female body fragment (E2/3301), pottery, including 1 incised handle and 1 inscribed piece, 1 bead, and 5 zoomorphic fragments. Another Stratum 10 fill (23 cm thick), Locus 1312, contained 1 female body fragment (E1/8520), 1 zoomorphic fragment, pottery, 1 scarab/seal, and 1 weight.\textsuperscript{137}

In summary, a total of 6 fragments came from the area of the lane, with 3 in Stratum 10 fill layers, 1 in Stratum 11 after the lane went out of use, and 2 in Stratum 12a while the lane served as an access point to the Terrace House and the House of the Monoliths. Figurines are found along with minimal pottery during the lane’s phases of use (see Table 21 in Appendix A).

5.3.3.5 Structure 1492: the House of the Monoliths

South of Lane 1325, the excavators uncovered Structure 1492, which incorporated a number of monoliths into its walls. Only the northeastern section, or one room, was uncovered; it measures 2.30 m by 2.50 m. The excavators isolated five different floor surfaces, which they attempted to correlate with the three construction phases noticed in the Terrace House and the Northern Structure.\textsuperscript{138}

The earliest locus associated with anthropomorphic fragments is the top floor of Stratum 12a that covers two lower floors in this phase. Floor 1492 was made of white lime and was identified only in the northern part of the room. Its northwestern corner was

\textsuperscript{137} Ibid., 57-58.

\textsuperscript{138} Ibid., 59.
cut by Pit 1497, dated to the following phase (Stratum 11). The floor contained 1 pillar base fragment, as well as some pottery, 2 fragments with incised handles, and 1 ceramic object with “wave-shaped” sides (see Figure 21).

Figure 21: Anthropomorphic figurines in Stratum 12a of the House of the Monoliths

Two floors were attributed to Stratum 11; the upper one was Floor 1489, made of white lime. It abuts the western wall but was damaged by Pit 565 in the eastern part of the room. Floor 1489 contained 1 female body fragment (E1/3526), 1 base fragment, minimal pottery, and 7 zoomorphic fragments.

Cutting the structure’s floors was a stone-lined pit, tentatively dated to either Stratum 10 or 11. The pit was almost 2.0 m deep and was divided into two loci. The

139 Ibid., 60.
140 Ibid.
141 Ibid., 59.
lower pit fill, Locus 565, contained 3 pillar base fragments, minimal pottery, and 1 stone object, while the upper portion (539A) contained 1 imported stamp handle. The excavators were unable to identify the stratigraphic relationship of this pit to the floor, except to suggest some later phase in Stratum 11 or 10 (Figure 22).

![Figure 22: Anthropomorphic figurines in Strata 11 and 11/10 in the House of the Monoliths](image)

In summary, the House of the Monoliths contained a total of 6 fragments, 5 bases and 1 body fragment. Two of the fragments were associated with floor surfaces. Other artifacts on those floors include small amounts of pottery and zoomorphic fragments. Unfortunately, the structure was not excavated to its fullest extent; and where floors were observed, they were often incomplete or cut by pits (see Table 22 in Appendix A).
5.3.3.6 Miscellaneous loci

Two loci from E2 were located in E South in the locus list but were not discussed in the text. Locus 544, dated to Stratum 11, is listed as a “fill,” ca. 1.09 m thick. The locus contained a large number of objects including, pottery, 1 loom weight, 4 inscribed handles, 1 faience fragment, 12 zoomorphic fragments, 1 couch fragment, 1 unidentified fragment, 1 simple pinched head (E2/2640), 2 female torsos (E2/1997; E2/1939), 4 pillar/base fragments, and 1 rider fragment. Fill 572 was also dated to Stratum 11 and located in the same quadrant. At 40 cm in depth, the locus included minimal pottery, 1 bead, 1 mollusk, 2 inscribed handles, 1 zoomorphic fragment, and 2 idiosyncratic pillar bodies (E1/2711; E1/2723). According to the listed coordinates and the extant plans for E South, these fills were located somewhere to the southwest of the House of the Monoliths; but no more information is available.

5.3.4 Area E North

Area E North begins at the northern edge of E South, where the bedrock is considerably higher. The area produced terraces from the Hellenistic period and a columbarium from the early Hellenistic period, as well as a large Stratum 10 structure and two structures from Stratum12. The area also contained tenth century remains, as
well as structures from the Middle Bronze Age and Early Bronze Age. In some cases the Hellenistic period remains cut into Stratum 10 floors or Stratum 12 floors.

5.3.4.1 Strata 15-14

Strata 15-14 were represented in three structures, as well as fills. Structure 1655, underneath the Stratum 12 Pavement Structure, contained an area the excavators identified as a cultic corner. This cultic corner is in the same area as the cultic corner of Stratum 12. The interpretation rests on little other than a reddish floor with some sherds, including two chalices. Unlike the later phase, Locus 1616 did not include any figurine fragments.

One figurine fragment was found in Strata 15-14, in Fill 1957 to the north of Structure 2091. The fill overlays Middle Bronze remains but contained pottery dating it to Strata 15-14. The fill contained 1 hollow female torso (E3/15924), some pottery, 3 zoomorphic fragments, 1 incised handle, and 1 weight.

142 Ibid., 64.
143 Ibid., 70.
144 Ibid., 96.
145 Ibid., 96-97.
146 The new report admits that the cultic interpretation was “not firmly based.” The authors do suggest that the hypothesized Stratum 12 cultic corner makes the earlier cultic corner more plausible. Given the tenuous identification of the later cultic corner this argument is circular at best (ibid., 7).
147 Ibid., 98-99.
5.3.4.2 Strata 12-11

Stratum 12 was badly disturbed by the Stratum 10 Structure 2011, as well as the Hellenistic remains. Furthermore, the high bedrock in the south of the area created challenges for preservation and excavation. Nevertheless, a large complex of rooms was detected in the south, called the Pavement Structure.\footnote{Ibid., 82.} In addition, Structure 1927 was built adjacent to the city wall in the east of the area.\footnote{Ibid., 90.} A row of rooms were also uncovered in the north side of the area.\footnote{Ibid., 93.} Most of these structures have only one primary phase of occupation; and the figurines are primarily from that phase rather than distributed across multiple phases, as in E south.

5.3.4.2.1 The Pavement Structure

Covering the southern area of E North was the southern complex, or Pavement Structure. Abutting the city wall in some places, the building is characterized by thick walls, large rooms, and stone floors. On these architectural grounds, the excavators hypothesize that the structure is public.\footnote{Ibid., 82.} The structure covers two areas of differing elevation. The lower level consists of one long room, and the upper level contains five or six rooms. This upper level was not excavated to its full extent; and the excavators

\footnote{Ibid., 82.}
assume that the row of rooms probably continue along the western boundary, later
Terrace Wall 667.\textsuperscript{152}

No anthropomorphic figurines were found in the lower level, adjacent to the city wall. There were also no anthropomorphic figurines in the southern row of rooms, though these rooms were badly preserved. This absence is striking, because the excavators posit a cult corner, Installation 1667, in one of these rooms. Room 1618 contained many objects including, much pottery, 1 bead, botanical remains, 1 concentric circle handle impression, 1 incised handle, 1 mollusk shell, 1 ground stone, 1 weight, and 7 zoomorphic fragments. The installation, which consisted of two walls with stones set in plaster on their narrow sides, contained a 10 cm layer of ash, only a few sherds, and 1 ground stone.\textsuperscript{153} Excavators liken the stones to standings stones and note the presence of a decorated stand “nearby.”\textsuperscript{154} Other than the stand, none of these finds associated with the shrine are out of the ordinary for a regular domestic assemblage. There were no anthropomorphic fragments.

North of this room was Locus 1604, a long narrow corridor, exposed for 5.5 m. The area was filled with “homogenous layers of gravelly earth” and contained abundant pottery.\textsuperscript{155} Locus 1604 reached a depth of 2.0 m and contained 2 pillar base fragments

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{152} Ibid., 83.
\textsuperscript{153} Ibid., 85-86.
\textsuperscript{154} Ibid., 21.
\textsuperscript{155} Ibid., 86.
\end{flushleft}
and 2 molded heads (E1/10143 and E1/10527). The locus also produced 1 bone/ivory fragment, 1 concentric circle handle, 14 incised handles, 1 inscription, 1 piece of inscribed pottery, 4 weights, 55 zoomorphic fragments, 3 couch/bed/chair fragments, 1 fragmentary cylindrical object, 1 relief fragment of a hand, and 2 unidentifiable fragments. Further, underneath Locus 1604 was another fill, Locus 1646, which reached down to the Strata 15-16 remains (Iron I-Late Bronze). It contained more pottery, 1 fish bone, 1 incised handle, 1 weight, 16 more zoomorphic fragments, and 1 unidentified fragment. The excavators did not find any floor levels in either of these fills to correlate to the Stratum 12 buildings on either side of the corridor.

The absence of anthropomorphic fragments is striking. Only 4 fragments were found in the large fill deposit of 1604, none were found in the room to south of the corridor, and none were found in the room to its north, though that room does contain zoomorphic fragments. Thus, if these spaces are somehow associated with cultic activity, that activity, by and large, did not involve anthropomorphic figurines. This absence is only tentatively significant, however, as there is little reason to connect the fill

---

156 E1/10143 is a typical molded JPF style head, but E1/10527 was considered a male head in Gilbert-Peretz, “Ceramic Figurines,” Fig. 11:16, Pl. 2:17. Based on the drawing and picture it is possible that this is not a typical JPF head, though it is also possible that it is a badly molded head. It has no pointed chin to indicate a beard.

157 De Groot and Bernick Greenberg, Excavations at the City of David, 86.

158 Locus 2015 contained much pottery, 1 bone/ivory fragment, 1 fish bone, 2 loom weights, 1 stone object, 3 weights, 5 zoomorphic fragments, and 1 couch/bed fragment.
in 1604 with any cultic function.\textsuperscript{159} The pottery from the area does not include a single vessel that might be interpreted as cultic in nature.\textsuperscript{160}

North of Room 2015 was Room 2035, which was preserved in better condition though still disturbed by some pits and the foundation trenches of Structure 2011. The room was 3.80 m wide and excavated to 7.80 m. Its main floor (2035) was paved with large cobbles.\textsuperscript{161} This floor yielded 1 figurine base, much pottery, 1 fish bone, 10 zoomorphic fragments, and 1 stone object. There were no anthropomorphic figurines in the three rooms to the north of Room 2035, though this could be due to the fact that no floors survived the later construction.

To summarize Stratum 12, very few anthropomorphic figurines were found associated with the Pavement Structure. The only fragment found in association with a floor was a base fragment in Room 2035. Further, 2 base fragments and 2 molded heads were associated with the long corridor running through the Pavement Structure, which pale in comparison to a ca. 76 zoomorphic fragments (see Figure 23).

\textsuperscript{159} De Groot and Bernick Greenberg (Excavations at the City of David, 22) note that the presence of figurines in this locus should not be taken as evidence that the adjacent area is a cultic site, citing the fact that figurines appear in every structure in Jerusalem in the eighth-seventh centuries. While this may be a slight over-exaggeration, the ubiquitous nature of figurines cannot be taken to indicate a cultic installation nearby. This cautionary moment notwithstanding, elsewhere the authors interpret the figurines as evidence of a “domestic cult,” suggesting that the “domestic cult” stood alongside the central cult (ibid., 24).

\textsuperscript{160} 47 bowls, 10 cooking pots, 9 jugs, 1 juglet, 1 jar, 3 holemouth jars, 5 storage jars, 5 kraters, 2 baking trays, and 3 lamps (ibid., Fig. 5.33: 1-27, 5.35: 1-29; Fig. 5.34: 1-30).

\textsuperscript{161} Ibid., 86.
Figure 23: Anthropomorphic figurines in Stratum 12 of the Pavement Structure

The material from Stratum 11 is interpreted as secondary use of the earlier Pavement Structure, and the layers pre-date the construction of Stratum 10 Structure 2011. Beaten Earth Floor 2009 was preserved only in a small section and covered part of the paved floor of Stratum 12. It contained 1 figurine base, 2 zoomorphic fragments, and minimal pottery. Floor 2079 was also dated to this stratum, covering the paved floor of Stratum 12. It was made of plaster and beaten earth. It contained 1 human shoulder fragment (E1/16759), minimal pottery, 1 bead, 1 zoomorphic fragment, and 1 glass fragment. Finally, Fill 2028 was dated to this stratum; it appears to be the fill for Floor

---

162 Ibid., 81.

163 This figurine is missing from the new locus list for Area E but is present in both Gilbert-Peretz, “Ceramic Figurines,” 47 and in the Volume 4 locus list.
The fill (54 cm deep) contained 2 female body fragments (E1/16284; E1/16360), much pottery, 19 zoomorphic fragments, 2 mollusk shells, and 2 metal fragments (see Figure 24 and Table 23 in Appendix A).

Figure 24: Anthropomorphic figurines in Stratum 11 reuse of the Pavement Structure

5.3.4.2.2 Structure 1927

Used in Stratum 12, Structure 1927 was uncovered adjacent to the hypothesized line of the city wall (the city wall was not preserved to the Iron Age levels in this area). Six rooms were exposed in the structure, with three in the western space, two in the

164 De Groot and Bernick Greenberg, *Excavations at the City of David*, 81-82.
middle space, and one in the eastern space (next to the city wall). The structure suffered from later disturbances, particularly the Hellenistic columbarium and the Ottoman period sewage channel.  

No anthropomorphic figurines were found in the western space. The central space consisted of two rooms separated by a thin wall. Two floors were observed in the northern room. The upper floor of beaten earth (Locus 1927) contained much pottery, including, decanters, amphorae, and oil lamps. The locus also yielded 3 base fragments, 2 simple pinched heads (E3/15705, E3/15706), and 1 malformed body fragment (E3/15634), as well as 1 bone/ivory fragment, fish bones, 10 zoomorphic fragments, 3 incised handles, 1 piece of inscribed pottery, and 1 metal fragment.

Furthermore, on top of this floor was Tabun 1951, which also contained 1 pillar base fragment, as well as 2 pieces of pottery.

The eastern space consisted of one long room adjacent to the hypothesized city wall. The upper floor, 1935, was made of “limey material” and was covered with a “conflagration layer” (Locus 1923). The excavators say this floor surface is coterminous with the lower floor surfaces of the adjacent rooms. Floor 1935 contained 2 pillar base fragments.

---

165 Ibid., 91.

166 Ibid., 91-92.

167 Gilbert-Peretz (“Ceramic Figurines,” Fig. 12:13, Pl. 3:11) suggests the body fragment has an unusually large right arm/shoulder, which may suggest the figurine is holding an object. Based on the drawing and photograph the “object” is unclear, and the figurine could just be malformed. The two arms meet in front of the torso. Kletter (Judean Pillar-Figurines, Addenda to Appendix 2, 653C.2) did not believe that the figurine was holding an object but that the lump was merely misshapen and that the arms meet under the breasts. In contrast, from personal examination of the fragment, no breasts were visible.
fragments, along with some pottery, 6 zoomorphic fragments, and 1 couch/bed fragment. On top of the floor, Locus 1923 was a layer of brown earth “containing charcoal and other traces of conflagration.”\textsuperscript{168} The locus yielded 2 simple pinched heads (E3/15643 and E3/15736), as well as 1 female body fragment (E3/15592), minimal pottery, 2 bone/ivory fragments, 6 zoomorphic fragments, and 1 incised handle (see Figure 25).

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure25.png}
\caption{Anthropomorphic figurines in Stratum 12 of Structure 1927}
\end{figure}

Finally, north of Structure 1927 were a series of floors and walls on the very northern edge of the excavation area. The excavators believe them to be a separate structure though their connection with Structure 1927 cannot be ruled out. In this line of

\textsuperscript{168} De Groot and Bernick Greenberg, \textit{Excavations at the City of David}, 92.
rooms, excavators found another toilet seat, similar to the Area G installation. In the western area of this line, Fill 1901 was uncovered. The excavators are unsure whether this fill is from a pit or whether it should be subdivided into two separate living surfaces. The locus (1.40 m in depth) contained 1 possible molded head, badly broken (E3/12999), much pottery, including oil lamps, bowls, and juglets, 3 zoomorphic fragments, 6 ground stones, and 1 weight (Figure 25 above).

In summary, a number of anthropomorphic fragments came from this structure, including 6 bases, 4 pinched heads, 2 body fragments, and, if the northern rooms are associated with Structure 1927, 1 molded head. This total of 13 anthropomorphic fragments is larger than the number from any other structure in Area E, even if all construction phases were combined. In addition to the regular pottery and zoomorphic fragments, these loci also had incised handles, fish bones, and bone/ivory fragments (see Table 24 in Appendix A).

5.3.4.3 Stratum 10

The main building of Stratum 10 was Structure 2011. The excavators liken it to the Ashlar House in the way it disregards the alignment of the earlier structures, cutting them with its foundation trenches. The excavated portion of the structure was 10.20 m

169 Ibid., 93-94.
170 Ibid., 94.
171 Ibid., 76.
in length and 4.80 m in width, consisting of two long rooms.\textsuperscript{172} Despite the existence of many floors, no anthropomorphic fragments were found in this structure.

A number of walls and surfaces were excavated that could not be related to any major structure. Adjacent to the city wall, Locus 1355, a stone floor, was uncovered and dated to Stratum 10. It was overlaid with 15 cm of ash and plaster and was cut in the south and west by Hellenistic disturbances.\textsuperscript{173} The locus contained 1 simple pinched head (E1/9524), some pottery, and 2 weights. Another surface, Locus 1606A, was uncovered east of the southern rooms of the Pavement Structure and is dated to Stratum 10 or 11 due to the ceramics rather than the stratigraphic relationship with adjacent structures.\textsuperscript{174} It yielded 1 pinched head, possibly male (E1/10127), as well as minimal pottery. In the same general area was Fill 1297, also tentatively dated to Stratum 10. It yielded only 1 simple pinched head (E1/7930), as well as 1 mollusk shell, despite being 54 cm deep. There is also a pit (2063) discussed as part of Stratum 10,\textsuperscript{175} though elsewhere it is called a “Hellenistic disturbance.”\textsuperscript{176} It contained 1 base fragment, pottery, 1 eye of Horus, and 1 metal fragment (see Figure 26 and Table 25 in Appendix A).

\textsuperscript{172} Ibid., 77.
\textsuperscript{173} Ibid., 79.
\textsuperscript{174} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{175} Ibid., 80-81.
\textsuperscript{176} Ibid., 95.
5.3.4.4 Miscellaneous loci

Fill 1650 of Stratum 12 was not discussed in the text; but, according to the locus list coordinates, it should be located somewhere in the vicinity of the Pavement Structure’s southwest corner. The fill was 1.38 m in depth and contained 1 pinched head (E1/14516), 1 loom weight, pottery, 3 zoomorphic fragments, 1 weight, and fish bones. Fill 1955 was dated to Strata 12-13 and was probably located east of Structure 1927, perhaps in the void left by the missing Iron II city wall. The locus was only 13 cm deep and produced 1 pillar base fragment. Also in Stratum 12, the locus list includes Floor
1910, apparently located somewhere near Fill 1901. This floor contained minimal pottery, 1 zoomorphic fragment, and 1 worn female body fragment (E3/13192). In Stratum 11-12, the excavators uncovered another possible floor, Locus 1902, located in the northwest corner of Structure 1927. The locus contained 3 simple pinched heads (E3/13109; E3/13115; E3/13138), 1 loom weight, minimal pottery, including 1 inscribed handle, and 1 zoomorphic fragment. Finally, the locus list includes Fill 1562, dated tentatively to Stratum 10. Because the locus list is missing the actual square letter, all that can be said is that it is located in E North. The 1.02 m fill included 1 female torso holding an object (E3/13037), some pottery, 1 inscribed handle, and 4 zoomorphic fragments.

5.4. Conclusions

5.4.1. Chronological developments

According to the excavators, Stratum 12 saw the gradual increase of Jerusalem’s population. At the very end of the eighth century many of the neighborhoods, like Area D2, D1, Kenyon Phase 4, and Avigad Area A, were abandoned, following which time fortifications were constructed; and a thriving neighborhood took hold inside the city wall. Subsequently, Stratum 11 witnessed the decline in settlement in Jerusalem with

---

177 Considerable confusion surrounds Locus 1901 (ibid., 94-95). The excavators were unsure whether it was a pottery filled pit or whether it contained two floor surfaces with sub-floor make-up. It is possible that 1910 should be related to this problematic locus; but nothing definite can be postulated.

178 There is some argument over whether these neighborhoods (D1, D2, and E South) were extramural. Ronny Reich and Eli Shukron uncovered a segment of city wall, which they date to the eighth century, lower on the slope below the Area D and E South neighborhoods. Thus, Reich and Shukron claim that these neighborhoods were not extra-mural but that they were part of a fortified neighborhood abandoned at
recovery only in Stratum 10. At that time, instead of a crowded settlement extending over the eastern slope, the zone east of City Wall 219 was abandoned; and only three structures were left in Area E. According to de Groot and Bernick Greenberg, “Sennacherib’s campaign delivered a severe blow to the state. It was followed by a spell of prostration, and only towards the end of the period was there a measure of recovery. This applies to Judah in general, and to Jerusalem in particular.”

Despite these drastic changes, Jerusalem inhabitants continued to utilize the same general types of figurine designs. The endurance of pinched head varieties suggests that the style rose in the second half of the eighth century in Jerusalem and maintained its

the end of the eighth century. Their argument is based on ceramic evidence. In both the neighborhoods and in the “strata associated with newly discovered line of fortifications” excavators found Lachish III forms. See, Ronny Reich and Eli Shukron, “The Urban Development of Jerusalem in the Late Eighth Century B.C.E.,” in Jerusalem in Bible and Archaeology (ed. Anrew G. Vaughn and Ann E. Killebrew; SBLSymS 18; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003), 211-13. Reich and Shukron note that de Groot and Ariel disagree with their claims, drawing attention to the fact that there is no stratigraphic relationship between the neighborhoods and the Reich-Shukron wall. De Groot and Ariel conclude, rather, that the Reich-Shukron wall was constructed after the neighborhoods already existed. See Donald T. Ariel and Alon de Groot, “The Iron Age Extramural Occupation at the City of David and Additional Observations on the Siloam Tunnel,” in Excavations at the City of David, 1978-1985: Directed by Yigal Shiloh: Volume 5: Extramural Area (ed. Donald T. Ariel; Qedem 40; Jerusalem: the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 2000), 164. Reich and Shukron counter this argument by emphasizing the Lachish III forms in both the neighborhood and the wall; but, in so doing, they ignore the fact that Ariel and de Groot suggest the neighborhoods here begin as early as the eleventh through tenth centuries (Ariel and de Groot, “Iron Age Extramural Occupation,” 158, 162). Thus, while the domestic structures of Stratum 12 were dated to the eighth century, the neighborhood was occupied before this point, a fact that Reich and Shukron ignore. Finally, Reich and Shukron include no locus descriptions for their pottery, other than “strata associated with” their fortification line. Without evidence from a foundation trench in particular, the date of the Reich-Shukron wall must remain in question.

179 De Groot and Bernick Greenberg, Excavations at the City of David, 25.

180 Ibid., 28.

181 Ibid., 29.
popularity throughout the occupation there (see Table 26 in Appendix A). Molded heads were also found in both Stratum 12 and Stratum 10, though perpetually less popular than the pinched heads (see Table 27 in Appendix A). This suggests that the preference for pinched heads was a uniquely Jerusalemite phenomenon, which may be in contrast with conventions in other parts of Judah (see Figure 27 and Table 28 in Appendix A).

![Bar chart showing percentages of pinched versus molded heads by stratum in all areas of Shiloh's excavations](image)

**Figure 27: Percentages of pinched versus molded heads by stratum in all areas of Shiloh's excavations**

In addition to this continuity, variation in the total corpus is also visible. First, almost all of the figurines in loci predating Stratum 12 were idiosyncratic in one form or another. A few were miniature in size with pinched heads and applied pellet eyes, lacking breasts. More interesting, the earliest examples of the female pillar figurines were hollow or hollow and wheel-made (E3/15924, E1/10126), suggesting a typology more similar to that in the Shephelah, Phoenicia, or northern Israel. Further, none of the hollow or wheel-made varieties were found in Strata 12-10 loci. This suggests that the Jerusalem figurines...
may have shared more in common with other parts of Israel earlier in the city’s history but developed a distinctive character by the end of the eighth century.

Yet a further chronological development is the degree of variety in design between Stratum 12 and Stratum 10, particularly between Area E and G. This is most evident in the variations of pinched head figurines (see Figure 28 and Table 29 in Appendix A); but it is also visible in the higher number of idiosyncratic molded head figurines in Stratum 10 of Area G, as well as a number of body fragments. As will be discussed in Chapter 6, this variety is also visible in the soil types used for figurine construction.

Figure 28: Variation in pinched head type by strata in all areas of Shiloh's excavations
5.4.2. Spatial and depositional patterns

Excavators describe Strata 12-11 of Area E as an organized neighborhood because the structures and drainage channel are oriented on the same plan.\textsuperscript{182} The fact that the neighborhood was built on a very steep cliff and had sanitary facilities further suggests neighborhood planning rather than random building accumulation.\textsuperscript{183} Furthermore, many of the rooms from Area E structures were integrated into the city wall, suggesting that at least part of the neighborhood was constructed in tandem with the new fortifications.\textsuperscript{184} Finally, because the Stratum 10 buildings totally disregard Strata 12-11 orientation and because Stratum 10 fills sometimes cover earlier structures, excavators suggest the neighborhood may have been abandoned prior to the end of the seventh century.\textsuperscript{185}

This picture should be compared with that of Area G, a late seventh century, equally well-planned neighborhood. Area G has been described as an upper class neighborhood associated with Jerusalem temple or administrative elites. The neighborhood was probably not finished until after the city wall from Kenyon’s Area A, with a possible gap of seventy-five years between them. It remains unclear whether this

\textsuperscript{182} Ibid., 14. This does not mean Area E was uninhabitated prior to this point, only that the majority of Stratum 12 was planned in tandem, possibly building over or incorporating any previously existing architecture in the area.

\textsuperscript{183} Ibid., 15.

\textsuperscript{184} Because the Iron IIB-C city wall is missing in E North, the excavators assume that it continued in this area. In reality, the present state of preservation shows only the remains of the Middle Bronze wall.

\textsuperscript{185} Ibid., 30.
late seventh century neighborhood was meant to replace that in Area E or whether the residents of Area E relocated to Area G. Some status items made from ivory were also found in Area E,\(^{186}\) as were fish bones.\(^{187}\)

That having been said, nothing found in Area E compares with the more cosmopolitan character of the Area G neighborhood. Although Area E is considerably larger than Area G, Area E had only 45 out of 183 (25\%) fish bones in Iron II loci, while Area G had 136 (74\%), with 99 in the House of Ahiel alone. Differing access to elite foods suggests a very different pattern of consumption between the two areas. Further, although ivory objects were found in both areas, 4 out of the 5 bone/ivory pieces found in Area E were located in non-floor loci.\(^{188}\) In Area G, excavators found 20 bone/ivory inlay and furniture pieces; 11 were associated with floor surfaces. Even when all bone and ivory objects are combined together, the larger Area E produced only 30 pieces while the smaller and more abbreviated occupation at Area G produced 39 (see Table 30 in Appendix A).\(^{189}\)

---


\(^{187}\) Lernau and Lernau, “Fish Remains,” 137, Table.

\(^{188}\) The one piece of ivory associated with a floor was in Building 2011 (E1/16391), dated to Stratum 10, after the majority of Area E was abandoned. The building is, however, coterminous with the structures in Area G.

\(^{189}\) Area E does have a larger number of bone spatulas (18) than Area G (16), though it is unlikely that these utilitarian objects should be associated with status in the same way as furniture inlays.
Despite the different characters of the neighborhoods, the depositions in Area E and Area G are quite similar. In both neighborhoods, figurines are found associated with floors as well as extra-structural spaces, like lanes. They are also found in pits, on stairways, and in drainage channels. The main difference between the two neighborhoods is not figurine deposition but design and soil variety. The fact that the coterminous Stratum 10 structures in Area E lack anthropomorphic figurines may be explained by their potential function as public buildings, without regular domestic inhabitants.

Overall, the figurines are found in a number of locus types, from fills to floors, as well as lanes, pits, stairways, cesspits, drainage channels, and tabuns (Table 31 in Appendix A). They are never associated with one part of any domestic structure. Moreover, the only posited cultic corner was totally lacking in anthropomorphic figurines and had very few zoomorphic figurines in the actual installation. In Jerusalem, at least, no evidence suggests that figurines were associated with one permanent domestic shrine, with female activity spaces, or with other cultic paraphernalia. They are, however, found in household spaces rather than the public spaces, suggesting that the figurines were certainly used in the home and neighborhood.

5.4.3. Assemblages containing figurines

Of the 45 different loci that contained figurines in E south, west, and north, 20 are floor surfaces, 18 are fill, 1 is a foundation trench, 2 are tabuns, 3 are pit fills, and 1 is a conflagration layer (see Table 32 in Appendix A). In order to examine the objects found in association with figurines, floor and fill loci are examined separately. Fill loci tend to
be larger in area and depth with higher percentages and a wider range of objects (see Tables 33 and 34 in Appendix A). Floor loci have a smaller range of objects occurring with the figurines and fewer of these objects per locus, with the exception of pottery and zoomorphic fragments, which are higher in frequency in floors than fills (see Figure 29 and Tables 35 and 36 in Appendix A).

The data suggest that anthropomorphic fragments are found randomly disposed with multiple types of domestic objects, though some of these objects are more common than others. In the fills, the highest correlation is between anthropomorphic figurines and pottery (89%), then zoomorphic fragments (67%), followed by incised handles (44%), unidentified figurine fragments/other types (28%), loom weights (28%), and mollusk shells (28%), then weights (22%) and ground stones/stone objects (22%), followed by bone/ivory fragments (17%), metal (17%), botanical remains (17%), fish bones (17%), and inscribed pottery/inscriptions (17%). The least common objects were couch/bed fragments (11%) and beads/gems (11%), followed by horse and rider fragments (6%), glass/faience (6%), scarab/seals (6%), and concentric circle handles (6%).

On floor loci, figurines were found with household pottery most frequently (100% of the time) and with zoomorphic figurines (70% of the time). The next most frequently found objects were incised handles/pottery (30%), followed by ground stones/stone objects (25%), and then bone/ivory fragments (15%). A number of objects also occur with anthropomorphic figurines but less regularly, including beads/gems (10%), fish bones (10%), inscribed pottery/inscriptions (10%), and unidentified figurine fragments (10%). The least common objects are couch/bed fragments (5%), weights (5%), mollusk
shells (5%), metal objects (5%), botanical remains (5%), loom weights (5%), horse and rider fragments (5%), and glass/faience (5%). The complete absence of seals and stamped jar handles is striking.\textsuperscript{190}

Looking at the overall assemblages, it is clear that figurines were found with regular domestic items in both fills (probably constructed from household midden) and floor loci. Nothing suggests specialized treatment or deposition, other than the strong correlation between anthropomorphic and zoomorphic figurines in the same loci. Because many of the floor loci were stratigraphically sealed by later floor layers, it seems safe to assume that the figurine fragments on these surfaces resulted from trash accumulation related to the inhabitants of the building.

\textsuperscript{190} If \textit{lmlk} seals are truly associated with royal resource control or taxation and if the figurines showed a strong correlation with the stamped handles, some connection may link the figurines with state control. As the data stand from the residences on the southeastern hill, no connection is evident. This should be contrasted with figurines on the Kenyon street deposit from Phase 8, where a number of \textit{lmlk} seals were found (Square XIV).
Figure 29: Percentage of loci with anthropomorphic figurines and other objects in Areas E West, South, and North in Strata 12-10
CHAPTER 6: TERRACOTTA PILLAR FIGURINES AND JERUSAMELITE POTTERY PRODUCTION

This chapter interprets the results of a new petrographic study of figurines from Jerusalem’s southeastern hill. After describing previous studies (6.1), the procedure (6.2), and the initial results (6.3), this chapter investigates the implications of the data for interpreting clay figurines from Judah. Specifically, it explores provenience (6.4), production organization (6.5), typology (6.6), chronology (6.7), and spatial distribution (6.8). The results (6.9) produce a number of challenges to accepted interpretations and suggest several more nuanced readings of the archaeological record.

6.1 Previous studies

Petrographic analysis has been used to interpret Israelite remains, including figurines, for several decades.¹ Moreover, figurines from Yigal Shiloh’s City of David excavations have already been subjected to petrographic testing and neutron activation analysis. Unfortunately, several problems plague these tests. First, the previous work investigated a very small sample. The petrographic analysis of the City of David figurines included only 15 fragments, identifying most as terra rossa clay.² The neutron activation

---

¹ For a summary of previous work, see Kletter, Judean Pillar-Figurines, 49-53. Kletter notes that although some smaller studies have been undertaken, no large scale petrographic study of JPFs had been completed at the time of his work.

analysis included a mere 18 figurines and indicated only two clay groups. In contrast, when a considerably larger group was tested in the present study it was found that “only about 20–25% of figurines are made of clay related to terra rossa while nearly 70% are made of more calcareous clay derived from rendzina.” Thus, the new results indicate that sample size is an important factor in petrographic testing and call into question the validity of previous studies.

A second problem with the previous petrographic testing is that it tested very few anthropomorphic fragments (1 rider fragment, 2 body fragments, 1 base fragment, and 1 molded head fragment) and no pinched heads. Without larger samples from each figurine type, it is impossible to draw supportable conclusions about technological style and its correlation with figurine type or chronological change. A third problem is that no consideration was given to the spatial distribution of the samples, making it impossible to compare figurines from different excavation areas or structures. In sum, not only were the results of earlier tests misleading but also could not aid interpretations of the archaeological record.


4 See Appendix B.
6.2 Procedure

The petrographic study, performed by David ben Shlomo of the Hebrew University’s Weitzman Institute, includes 120 items with 66 fragments from Shiloh’s City of David Excavations, 5 45 from Eilat Mazar’s City of David Excavations, 6 and 9 from Nurit Feig’s Mevesseret Excavations. 7 Ben Shlomo took thin-sections of each figurine and pottery specimen and examined them under cross-polarized light at varying magnifications. 8

Several factors contributed to the selection of samples. First, all figurine types are represented including, pinched heads, molded heads, various body fragments, base fragments, and zoomorphic fragments. Second, consideration is given to the samples’ loci and area distributions throughout the City of David with the intent of comparing areas of excavation; the study only includes figurines from datable loci. Third, samples cover the

5 See Chapter 5.

6 The figurines from Eilat Mazar’s excavations all come from soil layers near Shiloh’s Area G excavations. The excavator uncovered six layers of Iron Age fill/dump above Iron IIC walls. Above these Level 4 fills were the Level 5 fills dated to the Exilic and Persian Periods (sixth-fifth centuries). Most figurines come from Level 4. Because the figurines were found in fill or dump loci containing thousands of objects, their context cannot aid in the interpretation of figurine function. Nevertheless, because the fill layers were immediately covered by Exilic and Persian layers, it is safe to assume that the Iron II figurines are the result of activity that took place in Area G rather than from post-occupational dumping. They may have been deposited as part of the natural midden from daily activity in Area G or they could be related to the destruction of the city; but in either case, they were not transported to their excavated location from other parts of the city. Therefore, they can be combined with Area G figurines from Shiloh’s excavations to test statistical validity.

7 See below for more information.

8 For a number of slide illustrations see David Ben Shlomo’s report in Appendix B. For a list of samples arranged by sample number see Table 37 in Appendix A. For a list of samples arranged by area and locus see Tables 38-41 in Appendix A.
stratigraphic sequence established for Shiloh’s excavations, including Strata 14-13, or Iron IIA; Stratum 12, the late eighth century; Stratum 11, the seventh century; Stratum 10, the end of the seventh century through the destruction of Jerusalem; and Stratum 7, fills from the Hellenistic period. Fourth, the study includes the nearby site, Mevesseret, to track the distribution of Jerusalem figurines and to test fragments that were purportedly found near kiln remains. Finally, a small control group of pottery from all three sites is included to compare with the figurine finds.

6.3 Results

The thin-section samples are divided into seven petrographic groups, with the highest concentrations in Groups 1 and 3. Within each group, subdivisions are based on particularities of soil composition and non-plastic inclusions. These subdivisions result in a number of soil subgroups.9

According to Ben Shlomo, “the majority of the figurines are made of a similar calcareous, fossil-rich fabric, which may be derived from local rendzina soils” (67-68 figurine samples).10 He further states that although Group 1 can be subdivided into at least five subgroups (Groups 1a-1e), there is little homogeneity within each subgroup in relation “to firing temperature, levigation, porosity (voids), and frequencies of

9 For more information on the petrographic groups see Appendix B.
10 Ibid.
inclusions” when compared with “most Petrographic groups reflecting common pottery vessels of this period.”

The study found that a less calcareous, more reddish clay (Group 3), also the most common fabric used for pottery vessels sampled, is second in frequency (21 figurine samples). Eight more of the figurines are made of dolomitic motza marl clay (Group 2). Finally, only 5 figurine fragments “seem to come from outside the region of Jerusalem or the central hills,” and these are limited to “figurines made of loess type clay originating in the coastal plains of the Shephelah (Group 5).”

6.4 Provenience

Ben Shlomo suggests that the popular rendzina/calcaceous clay group came from “the vicinity of the City of David, the Kidron Valley, the western slope of Mount Zion, or other places in the area of Jerusalem to the east.” The second most common group, Group 3, probably represents “a terra rossa or some reddish more calcareous soil.” According to Dr. Ben Shlomo, it is “the most popular clay used for regular pottery vessels in this period of this region,” and probably comes from soils of the “Judean Hills in the vicinity of Jerusalem,” “primarily from the west side.” Group 2, the motza marl clay, comes from the Judean Hills; Group 5, consisting of loess soil, comes from the southern coastal

11 Ibid.
12 Ibid.
plains, the Shephelah, or the northern Negev; and both Group 6 and Group 7, from which no figurines were made, come from the Shephelah.\textsuperscript{13}

The provenience data can be used to address a number of questions, including the local nature of figurine production, the distribution of figurines in surrounding areas, and figurine trade across Judah at large. First, the data further confirm that figurines were locally produced within each major city center. In past studies, this interpretation was based on petrography at Tel ‘Ira, where figurines made of local Negev loess soil were found along side pithoi made from Moza clay.\textsuperscript{14} More recently, the petrographic study of the figurines from Moza, a site close to Jerusalem, includes 18 figurines primarily consisting of Moza ware (50%), with only 5 fragments of terra rossa (28%), 2 of moza marl clay mixed with terra rossa clay, and 2 unidentified and probably imported

\textsuperscript{13} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{14} Raz Kletter, “Clay Figurines: Human and Animal Clay Figurines,” in Tel ‘Ira: A Stronghold in the Biblical Negev (ed. Itzhaq Beit-Arieh; Tel Aviv University Sonia and Marco Nadler Institute of Archaeology Monograph Series 15; Tel Aviv: the Institute of Archaeology, Tel Aviv University, 1999), 384. According to Kletter, the petrographic study was completed by Yuval Goren, though it was never published separately. The study has a number of disadvantages. Only 10 fragments were tested—2 molded heads, 1 human vessel, 1 female appliqué, 1 horse and rider, 1 hollow bodied bird, 1 animal leg, and 2 animal heads. Furthermore, the publications do not report stratigraphic contexts necessary to interpret the figurines. For example, Molded Head 4539/1 was found in Area E, Locus 574, described as a “storehouse” from the seventh century. Unfortunately, the locus number appears to encompass all three rooms of the building; no further discussion of the locus number is offered nor any discussion of the objects (other than restorable pithoi) found in the building. See Israel Finkelstein and Itzhaq Beith-Arieh, “Area E,” in Tel ‘Ira: A Stronghold In the Biblical Negev (ed. Itzhaq Beith-Arieh; Tel Aviv University Sonia and Marco Nadler Institute of Archaeology Monograph Series 15: Tel Aviv; the Institute of Archaeology, Tel Aviv University, 1999), 87. Finally, that only 7 pithoi were tested could also affect the results. See Raz Kletter, “Iron Age Pithoi Bearing Potter’s Marks,” in Tel ‘Ira: A Stronghold in the Biblical Negev (ed. Itzhaq Beith-Arieh; Tel Aviv University Sonia and Marco Nadler Institute of Archaeology Monograph Series 15; Tel Aviv: the Institute of Archaeology, Tel Aviv University, 1999), 354-55. In the case of the pithoi, Kletter cites neutron activation analysis performed on similar moza clay pithoi at other Negev locations, suggesting that the moza clay pithoi at Tel ‘Ira were not idiosyncratic, despite the small sample size. Thus, it remains striking that pithoi made from Jerusalem area moza clay come from the same locus as figurines made of local loess soil (Storage Building 574).
fragments. Unfortunately, the study has several drawbacks, including its small sample size; only 18 out of 60 fragments were tested.\textsuperscript{15} Despite these problems, it is worth noting that more moza marl figurines (9) occur in this small sample than in the entire corpus of figurines tested from the City of David and Mevesseret combined (8 of 104 fragments), suggesting that local clays do figure in local figurine production (see Figure 30).

![Figure 30](image)

**Figure 30: Percentage of moza marl clay figurines from moza and the City of David/Mevesseret**

Second, the data virtually guarantees some form of production group serving Jerusalem and perhaps the immediately surrounding areas. The three figurine samples at

\textsuperscript{15} Marie Peterson-Solimany and Raz Kletter, “The Iron Age Clay Figurines and a Possible Scale Weight,” in *Salvage Excavations at Tel Moza: The Bronze and Iron Age Settlements and Later Occupations* (ed. Zvi Greenhut and Alon De-Groot; IAA Reports 39; Jerusalem: Israel Antiquities Authority, forthcoming), 116. In personal communication, Kletter said that this study was performed by Yuval Goren but was not published separately. Only one anthropomorphic fragment was tested and it comes from a pit dated to the post-Byzantine periods. Further, the small sample size may be problematic for conclusions drawn from the data, making it possible that more redzina figurines occupy the Moza assemblage.
Mevesseret, a small settlement near Jerusalem, were all of redzina clay, despite their assumed proximity to a local Iron II kiln. None of the pottery related to the supposed kiln deposit, nor the slag, were made of the same rendzina family. Unlike the other samples, the figurine fragments were not vitrified, so they may not have come from the original kiln deposit and may be the result of post-occupational activity. Surprisingly, these are the only known figurine fragments found near or in a kiln deposit but do not consist of Mevesseret’s terra rossa or moza marl clay; instead they were probably produced in Jerusalem.

According to personal communication with the excavator, Nurit Feig, the three samples include 1 broken torso without breasts/arms (1457) and 2 pillar fragments (1456, 1371-9). Thus, it is unclear whether these fragments were definitely female pillar figurines or whether they contained pinched or molded heads.

The Mevesseret project was a salvage excavation conducted by the Israel Antiquities Authority in the early 1990s. The excavator, Nurit Feig, claims she uncovered a kiln deposit near the settlement’s edge with pottery from the eighth-seventh centuries BCE. The kiln area consisted of three loci. Locus 128, from which one of the pillar fragments came, covered the entire area (combined with Locus 139). It consisted of burnt soil ranging from light orange to dark red. Underneath Locus 128 was Locus 150, a 6/6.5 m by 4.0 m red/dark brown earth layer with concentrated burning in the center. The torso came from this deposit. To the west of the “kiln” was Locus 167, which also produced one pillar fragment and some pottery; underneath was Locus 175, an ash layer with pottery fragments. No architectural remains of the kiln walls were preserved, so the kiln identification rests solely on the earth loci, slag, and vitrified material in those loci. Ethnographic analogy suggests that the lack of architecture is not unusual. See Nicholson and Patterson, “Pottery Making in Upper Egypt,” 231-32. They found that kilns at Deir el-Gharbi are demolished, rebuilt, and often re-sited every five to ten years. All that remains are a “series of bowl shaped voids left in the moulds of ash or sherds where the kilns once stood (ibid., 231-32).” See also Killebrew, “Pottery Kilns from Deir el-Balah and Tel Miqne-Ekron,” 138-39.

In addition to the figurines, Ben Shlomo tested 4 fragments of coarse basins or installations, 1 brick sample, and 1 slab sample. Three of the basin fragments were from Locus 128, which also produced a figurine. The slag and brick and were from Locus 128 as well, while 1 basin fragment came from Locus 175.

Vitrified samples include 2 basin fragments and 1 slag fragment, all from Locus 128. The excavator noted that the “rest of the site” was subsequently resettled and disturbed.
Examination of the 60 figurine samples from Shiloh’s City of David excavations also support the notion of a Jerusalem production center, with 73% (44) from Jerusalem redzina clays, 5% (3) from moza marl clays, 15% (9) from terra rossa clays, and 7% (4) from loess clays. Even when the figurines from Eilat Mazar’s excavations are included to create a larger sample, the relative percentages remain consistent (see Figure 31 and Tables 42-45 in Appendix A). Given the proximity of the Kidron Valley as a source of redzina clay to the City of David, the “locality” of production cannot be doubted.

![Figure 31: Percentages of petrographic groups in Shiloh's City of David excavations and in Shiloh's and Mazar's City of David excavations combined](image)

Third, Raz Kletter has already claimed that Judean style figurines were not exchanged in any significant quantity with neighboring peoples. The petrographic information adds to this fact that figurines were apparently not even exchanged from one part of Judah to the other. The three highest percentages in Jerusalem, redzina clays, terra

---

rossa clays, and moza marl clays, are from the immediate vicinity of the city and the nearby hills with almost no figurines from the Shephelah, Coastal Plain, or Negev. In the very least, it seems figurines were not regularly imported into Jerusalem from other parts of Judah; and the evidence from sites like Tel ‘Ira suggests Jerusalem did not export figurines outside the Judean hills. This should be contrasted with pottery vessels, which were regularly distributed from Jerusalem.

6.5 Petrographic subgroups and production organization

6.5.1 Figurine specialists

Within each clay family, Ben Shlomo identifies various subgroups or clusters, dependent on type and frequency of inclusions. Many scholars have tried to associate clay groups with the organization of production.\(^{21}\) Archaeologists claim that differing

clay recipes result from potters’ choices of clay source combined with choices in temper and levigation. These choices may correlate with differing pottery production groups, as each group would make unique clay choices combined with unique levigation methods.

In the present study, differing clay recipes may be visible within the clay families and their subgroups. For example, not only was the redzina clay used only for figurines and not pottery vessels, but the redzina figurines appear to have been poorly levigated. Ben Shlomo reports that all of the redzina samples were marked by extreme heterogeneity within and among each cluster. In contrast, both Group 3, the terra rossa group, and Group 5, the loess group, seem to include more intentional tempering agents, like limestone. These two groups, in addition to Group 2 (moza marl), have a greater degree of homogeneity among their subgroups.

These varying clay recipes perhaps correlate with different figurine producers. Moreover, the uniqueness of Group 1 clay begs the question of craft specialization, which assumes that pottery vessels and figurines were produced by different artisans. The Production, and Theory,” Journal of Archaeological Research 4 (1996): 178-79; Dean E. Arnold, “Does the Standardization of Ceramic Pastes Really Mean Specialization?” Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory 7(2000): 333-75.

22 Given the presence of some voids, craftspeople may have levigated with straw or other vegetable matter.

23 Ben Shlomo, Appendix B.

24 For the literature on “specialization” see Cathy Lynne Costin, “Craft Specialization: Issues in Defining, Documenting, and Explaining the Organization of Production,” in Archaeological Method and Theory Volume 3 (ed. Michael B. Schiffer; Tucson, Ariz.: University of Arizona Press, 1991), 43-44; and Rice, “Recent Ceramic Analysis: 2,” 176-82. Specialization is primarily concerned with the degree to which craft producers rely upon craft production for subsistence. The issue for Jerusalem is not whether full-time
petrographic study does not support total craft specialization because a number of figurines were created with moza and terra rossa groups, clays also used for pottery production. At most, only the redzina family is unattested in both pottery and figurines.

Complicating any connection between clay recipe and production organization is the fact that a single pottery producer could use more than one clay recipe.\(^{25}\) If the choice of clay is dictated by technological considerations, then a potter might choose to use his or her supply of moza or terra rossa clay for pottery vessels and use lesser quality clay for figurine production. If redzina soil was inadequate and poorly levigated, this may explain why none of the pottery is made of this group. At the same time, because figurines are sometimes made from better clays (terra rossa and moza), the choice of clay for figurines may not always have been dictated by technological considerations alone.

potters existed, as this is largely agreed upon. It would be difficult for potters in the region to keep up with large-scale subsistence agriculture as well as potting because both activities demand the same schedule. At best, certain members of the family may be able to maintain some land while other members produce pottery. Regardless, the main concern at hand is whether full time figurine producers existed distinct from potters. Costin discusses direct and indirect evidence for this type of specialization. Direct evidence entails verifiable production locations, while indirect evidence uses other measures, like standardization, to identify the organization of a craft industry. Rice has suggested a correlation between standardization and craft specialization in “Evolution of Specialized Pottery Production: A Trial Model,” *Current Anthropology* 22 (1981): 223; but Costin and Rice now point out many other factors that could lead to standardized design or production methodology, such as consumer demand and socio-political factors. Thus, although the majority of Jerusalem figurines were created with rendzina clay, appearing to indicate a standardized clay preference for figurine production, both authors caution against making these types of inferences about specialization based only on standardization measures.

Several other factors argue against the existence of specialized figurine producers. The ethnographic and ethnoarchaeological studies of pottery making in the eastern Mediterranean indicate that potters usually produce between April and October with little to no activity in the cold, wet months of December through February. 26 These schedules are dictated by drying and firing requirements, which apply to figurines as well as pottery vessels. Thus pottery and figurine production required the same production schedule. Further, although the clays used for figurines and vessels generally differ, the technological requirements for figurine production—access to pot forming, firing, and decorating equipment—are similar to that of pottery. 27 At the very least, figurines were probably fired by the same potters who owned kilns used for firing other vessels. 28


27 Elizabeth Waraksa also concludes that Egyptian female figurines and vessels were created by the same artisans. See Waraksa, “Female Figurines from the Mut Precincts,” 54. She bases her argument on the shared technological requirements between figurine and pottery production, including incising (ibid., 55), appliqué (ibid., 58), pigmentation (ibid., 61), and polychromatic painting (ibid., 65), not to mention firing and kiln access. See also Dorman, Faces in Clay, 8. Furthermore, based on their work at Balat, the excavators also believe that figurines were produced in the same set of workshops that produced pottery, noting the shared paste types and firing procedures used for both the figurines and other ceramics. See Georges Soukiassian, Michel Wuttmann, and Laure Pantalacci, Balat 3: Les ateliers de potiers d’‘Ayn-Asīl: fin de l’ancien empire première période intermédiaire (Cairo: Institut Français d’archéologie orientale, 1990), 128. The authors claim that figurine production might be most closely associated with one out of the complex’s four workshops, though warn that this conclusion is based on finds associated with this particular workshop’s dumps, which are larger than the others. The authors conclude that all the major terracotta products were being constructed in these related workshops.

28 There is some evidence that occasionally more than one producer shares kiln access or kiln space in neighborhood kilns. See Gloria Anne London, “Standardization and Variation in the Work of Craft
Moreover, other archaeological data,\textsuperscript{29} ethnographic study,\textsuperscript{30} and texts from the ancient Near East\textsuperscript{31} suggest that potters often produced clay objects in addition to vessels and/or shared facilities with other producers of clay objects. Finally, no correlation between the specialists,\textsuperscript{32} in \textit{Ceramic Ethnoarchaeology} (ed. William A. Longacre; Tucson, Ariz.: University of Arizona Press, 1991), 187; London, “On Fig Leaves, Itinerant Potters, and Pottery Production Locations,” 73. See also Dorman (\textit{Faces of Clay}, 59), who states pharaonic kilns were used for pottery as well as bread baking, glass and faience production, and metal manufacture.

\textsuperscript{29} For an earlier parallel see Duistermaat (\textit{Pots and Potters of Assyria}, 354) where an unfired clay wheel was found in a room interpreted as a pottery workshop. This leads Duistermaat to conclude that potters made both vessels and other ceramic objects. Alternatively, Mehdi Mortazavi claims that figurines were fired in kilns separately. He excavated 26 complete and incomplete zoomorphic and anthropomorphic figurines from Tepe Dasht, Iran in January-February 2009. The site appears to have been a manufacturing center for ceramics and figurines used at Shahr-i-Sokhta in Periods II and III. Mortazavi claims that the figurines come from the area of an excavated kiln differing from other kilns at the site, and he claims this kiln was devoted to figurine production. Mehdi Mortazavi, “Figurines of Bronze Age Iran from Tepe Dasht,” (abstract from the annual meeting of ASOR, New Orleans, La., November 2009). Personal communication with the excavator suggests that these conclusions are highly speculative. The figurines were not found in the kiln but at a distance ranging from 20 cm to 2.0 m. The excavator did find burned ceramics but not burned figurines. A preliminary report does little to further the argument. Rather, the text reports figurines were found in a 5.5 m trench at an undisclosed distance from any excavated kilns; and pottery wasters were discovered but none were associated with figurines in particular. The excavator concludes further excavation would be necessary to confirm any possible relationship between the figurines and kiln production. See Mehdi Mortazavi, “Figurines of Bronze Age Iran: Tepe Dasht,” \textit{Newsletter of the Ceroplastic Studies Interest Group} 4 (2010): 11-12. For later archaeological evidence that figurines, even in considerably larger industries, were made in workshops associated with potters, see Agnes N. Stillwell, \textit{Corinth XV: Part I: The Potters' Quarter} (Princeton: the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 1948), 53.

\textsuperscript{30} London (“On Fig Leaves, Itinerant Potters, and Pottery Production Locations,” 78) actually suggests that all clay industries should be investigated together, noting a correlation between potters and brick makers on Cyprus. Taniguchi (“Ethnoarchaeological Research,” 149) shows the same potting family produces both vessels and bread ovens, though the former are made by men while the latter are managed by women. In Bresenham (“Descriptive and Experimental Study of Contemporary and Ancient Pottery Techniques at Busra,” 95), the same potter makes vessels and bread molds.

\textsuperscript{31} See Piotr Steinkeller, “The Organization of Crafts in Third Millennium Babylonia: The Case of Potters,” \textit{AOF} 23 (1996): 243. Ur III texts mention over fifty types of vessels made by potters, in addition to bread ovens. See also, Moorey, \textit{Ancient Mesopotamian Materials and Industries}, 141, 162, 163. Moorey points out that the term “potter” in Mesopotamian literature is used for craftsmen that make pottery, as well as other clay objects, like figures, vessels, and bricks.
rendzina clay families and design characteristics can be ascertained; such a correlation might undergird an argument for craft specialization by providing two independent variables.\textsuperscript{32} Rather, the rendzina group, the terra rossa group, and the moza group were all used to construct the same types of figurines.

Despite the fact that little evidence supports the existence of figurine specialists, the difference between figurines and vessels must still be explained. The petrographic profile and distribution of figurines remain in sharp contrast to the pottery vessels. None of the tested pottery vessels were made of rendzina clay. The petrographic analysis suggests that the pottery tested from the three sites is primarily terra rossa, with some moza marl, and some imported Shephelah/Coastal Plain clays (see Figure 32 and Table 46 in Appendix A).\textsuperscript{33}

Although the present petrographic study tested only 16 pottery fragments, it agrees with other reports on Jerusalem-made pottery. De Groot and Bernick-Greenberg characterize the City of David pottery by the extensive use of wheel-burnishing and moza clay.\textsuperscript{34} Particularly in Stratum 10 of the City of David, the pottery is “characterized by a

\textsuperscript{32} Anna O. Shepherd (\textit{Ceramics for the Archaeologist}, [Washington D. C.: Carnegie Institution of Washington, 1976], 164) suggests that the connection between temper and a potting tradition must be strengthened by correlating differences in temper with other particular features of the object, such as clay type or design. Thus, if two variables correspond, it is more likely that the differing mineralogical signature reflects human decision rather than natural coincidental variation. See also Costin, “Craft Specialization,” 35. Because the rendzina group was used for figurines of all designs and with multiple tempers, there is no conclusive evidence that these figurines were produced by separate craftspeople.

\textsuperscript{33} Eight terra rossa fragments, 3 moza marl fragments, 1 loess fragment, 3 Hamra fragments, and 1 unidentified fragment probably from the Shephelah or Coastal Plain.

\textsuperscript{34} De Groot and Bernick-Greenberg, \textit{Excavations at the City of David}, 35.
high degree of uniformity and a relatively small number of variants,” which leads the authors to posit “a skillful ceramic industry whose center was located in Jerusalem” and which “reached numerous sites in Judah, Philistia, and the north of the country.”35 Thus, both the petrographic characteristics and trade distribution patterns for the figurines are significantly different from those of the Jerusalem pottery.

Figure 32: Percentages of petrographic groups among figurines and vessels

Given the data at hand, the best explanation for the differences between rendzina figurines and pottery vessels is that different functions require different technological capabilities and import/export patterns. If the figurines are understood as apotropaic ritual objects activated by local ritual experts, then the local nature of ritual action would demand local figurines, rather than imported varieties. Unlike mundane pottery vessels that can be used in multiple contexts and whose technological advantages help them

compete with non-moza clay vessels, little would be gained by exporting or importing figurines for ritual purposes.

The prevalence of rendzina clay may be ideological—either ritual need or potters’ tradition.36 The earliest two figurines tested, both from Strata 15-14 (eleventh through tenth/ninth centuries BCE), were made from the rendzina group.37 They were both hollow female body fragments. Given the fact that this clay type remains dominant until the destruction of Jerusalem, perhaps traditional concerns dictated the use of some clay types for figurine production. Ethnographic studies offer many examples of vessel producers preferring certain clays for ritual objects.38 Unfortunately, those responsible for this clay “tradition” cannot be identified by means of petrographic analysis. The data would support either the potters choosing the clay themselves or the more intriguing possibility

36 For example Taniguchi (“Ethnoarchaeological Research,” 146) notes that one potting family has used the same clay source for 65 years, despite the availability of many other clay sources. See also Salem, “Implications of Cultural Tradition,” 69-73.

37 E1/10126 and E3/15924. See Chapter 5 for their archaeological context.

that ritual experts chose the clay and brought the clay to the potters for manufacture. A third possibility is that potters conducted the molding and firing of figurines while ritual experts or other crafts specialists painted the figurines.

6.5.2 Potters, figurines, and gender

Another issue related to figurine production organization is the gender of the producers. As has been noted in Chapter 2, some scholars have assumed that the figurines were produced by women. Alternatively, Duistermaat notes that all known Mesopotamian texts list only male potters; and Waraksa makes the same claim for

39 While many potters procure clay themselves, clay procurement is also practiced by non-potting members of the potter’s family (London, “On Fig Leaves, Itinerant Potters, and Pottery Production Locations,” 75). If the potters are female, male members of the family may retrieve the clay (London, “Standardization and Variation,” 183). Alternatively, at the potting village of Deir el-Gharbi, in Upper Egypt, clay is mined by a separate class of mining specialists who provide potters with clay. In this case, the clay is procured by someone entirely unconnected to the potter’s family (Nicholson and Patterson, “Pottery Making in Upper Egypt,” 224-25).

40 Moorey (Ancient Mesopotamian Materials and Industries, 157) states that the tradition of painted pottery had virtually disappeared with the emergence of state systems, particularly in Mesopotamia and Egypt. This may suggest that painting had passed out of the normal pottery production steps. Waraksa (“Female Figurines from the Mut Precincts,” 69, 73) also notes the possibility that certain types of Egyptian female figurines were painted in other ateliers, rather than the pottery workshop, as a totally separate phase of production. Dorman (Faces in Clay, 69-70, 73, 74-75, 79) suggests that potters and sculptors, as well as painters, collaborated in the molding of some canopic jar lids. That having been said, Dorman distinguishes between these more advanced funerary industries responsible for tomb accoutrements and potters producing daily household wares. JPFs fit more comfortably into the latter category rather than the former.

41 See Duistermaat, Pots and Potters of Assyria, 346-47. She is following Hartmut Waetzoldt, “Compensation of Craft Workers and Officials in the Ur III Period,” in Labor in the Ancient Near East (ed. Marvin A. Powell; trans. Marvin A. Powell; AOS 68; New Haven: American Oriental Society), 121. This is against the position of Barrelet who claims that potters could be female. Her evidence is not texts but possible scenes of pot-making on a small number of seals. As Moorey (Ancient Mesopotamian Materials and Industries, 142) makes clear, the seals are difficult to read; and Barrelet’s conclusions are highly speculative. For more see Barrelet, Figurines et reliefs en terre cuite de la Mésopotamie antique 1, 12-19, Figs. 3-4.
Egyptian potters. Participation was not limited to adult males, however. Mesopotamian textual evidence suggests potting was a family business that included children.

Duistermaat posits that certain phases of production were probably also performed by women, though they were not at the administrative levels of the business. The Mesopotamian texts seem to agree with ethnoarchaeological studies showing a correlation between full-time potting and male control of production. Studies also show that females often remain involved in the process by participating in other production activities.

42 Waraksa, “Female Figurines from the Mut Precincts,” 75. Waraksa supports her argument by noting the male gender of the Egyptian term for “potter” and the lack of a female equivalent. She also cites all of the known relief carvings of potting activity; the potters and apprentices are always male. For more on Old Kingdom tomb carvings of potters see Christopher J. Eyre, “Work and the Organization of Work in the Old Kingdom,” in Labor in the Ancient Near East (ed. Marvin A. Powell; AOS 68; New Haven: American Oriental Society, 1987), 27. Eyre claims that the juxtaposition of potting scenes with baking and brewing scenes indicates that potting was a domestic activity in the Old Kingdom (ibid., 27, 30). If Eyre is correct to claim that the scenes represent domestic production groups, the scenes may be of little use for modeling gender differentiation in more specialized production. Alternatively, it could be claimed that if pottery activity was already gender differentiated in domestic production, the gender division would remain in more specialized production groups, which tend toward male control. Furthermore the distinction between household production and specialized production is difficult to maintain. The temple of Neferirkare was known to have a “gate of the potters,” so even if potters worked out of the home in the Old Kingdom, they may have sold their wares in public spaces (ibid., 30). Finally, because women were depicted in some tomb reliefs brewing, baking, singing, dancing, and winnowing (ibid., 37), their absence in potting activities is not the result of a general censure of female images in tomb art.


44 Stark (“Current Issues in Ceramic Ethnoarchaeology,” 205), Bryan Byrne, (“Access to Subsistence Resources and the Sexual Division of Labor among Potters,” Cross-Cultural Research 28 [1994]: 230-31), and Janet E. Levy (“Gender, Heterarchy, and Hierarchy,” in Handbook of Gender in Archaeology [ed. Sarah Milledge Nelson; Lanham, Md.: AltaMira Press, 2006], 228) support this distinction but Costin (“Use of Ethnoarchaeology,” 395) warns that while some cross-cultural regularities have been observed, there is a large degree of variation in the sexual division of labor. She suggests that interpretive decisions should be couched in the regional context rather than a cross-cultural model. That being the case, Duistermaat and Waraksa have presented some textual evidence to suggest males were in control of pottery production in the ancient Near East. The Near Eastern ethnographic studies are mixed, with females involved in Syria and Jordan (see above), particularly in hand-formed vessels, but totally excluded in Egypt (Nicholson and Patterson, “Pottery Making in Upper Egypt,” 225). This division was also the case in Palestine (Salem, “Implications of Cultural Tradition,” 69-73). The bottom line remains that if figurines were produced in the same production groups making pottery vessels, the possibility of male producers cannot be ruled out.
phases or in the construction of hand-formed vessels. Thus, if the potting industry in Iron II Jerusalem is consistent with general ethnographic trends for state and urban societies and with other locations and time periods in the ancient Near East, it can be assumed that the entire family was engaged in potting activity. One cannot assume, however, that the cheap quality of figurines or their hypothesized use for female concerns requires that they be produced only by female craftspeople. Rather, the limited evidence from texts and ethnographic analogy suggest that males were in charge of production groups with female participation at various production stages.

6.5.3 Pottery producers and the state

A final concern is whether the producers of figurines were “attached” to the state or elites, and if so, to what degree the state controlled production. If it is correct to

---


assume that the figurines and pottery vessels were produced by the same social groups, then certain Mesopotamian texts may be of use. Duistermaat, following Steinkeller, notes that potters, unlike other craftspeople, are largely absent from Mesopotamian texts. The reason may be that many of the texts represent correspondence between state officials and craftspeople or records of food rations and materials given to the craftspeople by the state. The relative absence of potters in these texts suggests that potters procured their own raw materials, working semi-independently from the state, save for completing the state’s orders for ceramic goods. Even in the Ur III period, when potters are better

47 Duistermaat, Pots and Potters of Assyria, 347, 420, 421. See also Steinkeller, “Organization of Crafts,” 233-34, 250; and Moorey, Ancient Mesopotamian Materials and Industries, 141.

48 Duistermaat, Pots and Potters of Assyria, 347, 420, 421; Steinkeller, “Organization of Crafts,” 250. On potters at Ugarit see also Michael Heltzer, “Crafts in the West (Syria, Phoenicia, Palestine, ca. 1500-331 BCE),” AoF 23 (1996): 279. Elsewhere, Heltzer provides some minimal information that at least two potters were assigned to a gt, which he understands as a rural royal storage center for agricultural tools, products, and cattle to be distributed to royal dependents of various professional groups and to villagers who were fulfilling corvée service. He also notes a few texts where potters are referred to as bnš mlk, or men belonging to the King. The small number of potters is dwarfed, however, when compared with artisans of other varieties and metal workers. See Michael Heltzer, “Royal Economy in Ancient Ugarit,” in State and Temple Economy in the Ancient Near East 2: Proceedings of the International Conference organized by the Katholieke Universiteit Leuven from the 10th to the 14th of April 1978 (ed. Edward Lipiński; Leuven: Departement Oriëntalisktie, 1979), 475, 488, 495. Note that in the Ugaritic texts, unlike other types of craftspeople who are designated by the title hrš followed by their specific trade, potters are referred to only by their trade as yṣrm. They are also distinguished from “sculptors” or pslm. For more see Michael Heltzer, “Labour in Ugarit,” in Labor in the Ancient Near East (ed. Marvin A. Powell; AOS 68; New Haven: American Oriental Society, 1987), 243 and ibid., “Royal Economy in Ancient Ugarit,” 493. As for ancient Judah, Heltzer (“Crafts in the West,” 280) also notes biblical texts describing repair work to the temple (2 Kgs 12:11-15; 2 Chr 24:12-24; Ezra 3:6-7). In these texts the administration makes direct payment to the artisans for their work rather than compensating a labor gang or overseer. Unfortunately, none of these texts mention potters specifically. The only possible biblical allusion to potters in royal service comes from 1 Chr 4:23 (see Chapter 8).
represented in the texts, the potters only worked for the state part-time, still controlled resource procurement and distribution, and could hire themselves out for wages.\textsuperscript{49}

Furthermore, there is little evidence that ceramics were considered prestige items for either royal house or temple. Rather, fine textiles, metals, and precious and semi-precious stones appear to have been highly valued and their procurement and production closely controlled.\textsuperscript{50} Moreover, even these known elite sponsored crafts became decentralized beyond palace and temple organization in the first millennium.\textsuperscript{51}

\textsuperscript{49} Steinkeller, “Organization of Crafts,” 247, 249. Stein and Blackman warn that the Mesopotamian textual record probably preserves the limited information of craftspeople working with the state but that the texts omit the larger percentage of crafts industries, particularly in ceramic production, that service the general public. See Gil J. Stein and M. James Blackman, “The Organizational Context of Specialized Craft Production in Early Mesopotamian States,” Research in Economic Anthropology 14 (1993): 49. Moorey also expresses reservations using Mesopotamian literature as an accurate reflection of craft organization because the texts naturally focus on elite sponsorship and workshops over and against daily activity and because the scribes notating the workshop activities had little education in the actual processes they transcribed. See Moorey, Ancient Mesopotamian Materials and Industries, 17. Postgate suggests that the Neo-Assyrian records of craftspeople disproportionately preserve the relationship between craftspeople and the state rather than between craftspeople and the “private sector.” See Postgate, “Employer, Employee, and Employment,” 259.

\textsuperscript{50} Stein and Blackman, “Organizational Context,” 50-55. The authors suggest that the raw materials for ceramics would be difficult to monitor and control, making it impractical for elites to control the production and consumption of clay items. See also Marc van de Mieroop, Crafts in the Early Isin Period: A Study of the Isin Craft Archive from the Reigns of Išbi-Erra and Šú-Iššu (OLA 24; Leuven: Departement Oriënlistiek, 1987). Mieroop discusses the craft archive from Isin and that of Ur, suggesting that the state controlled carpenters, leatherworkers, reedworkers, and felters. The products of these attached craftsmen were distributed as gifts to elite individuals and royals, and they were used in the temple.

\textsuperscript{51} Moorey, Ancient Mesopotamian Materials and Industries, 14. Postgate discusses the changes in the \textit{iškāru} system during the Neo-Assyrian period. Whereas craftsmen originally received raw materials from the state and gave their finished products back to the state, by the seventh century craftsmen were expected to sell off their products and return a payment of silver to the state. He also hypothesizes that the original system was created to serve the needs of the government and temple but had possibly grown beyond the state/temple needs. See Postgate, “Employer, Employee and Employment,” 268. Additionally, although the Neo-Assyrian Empire was known to import craftsmen in order to staff projects in large Assyrian cities, Bustenay Oded’s work, devoted to Assyrian deportation, identifies only one fragmentary letter that mentions potters. The individuals may have been deportees sent to work at Dur-Sharrukin. See, Bustenay Oded, Mass Deportations and Deportees in the Neo-Assyrian Empire (Wiesbaden, Germany: Ludwig Reichert, 1979), 100.
chronological shift also appears to have occurred in Egypt. Although some evidence may connect female figurine production with state or temple complexes in Late Bronze Age Egypt, evidence for this connection in the Third Intermediate and Late periods is lacking.\textsuperscript{52}

Thus, a position, like that of Ryan Byrne, suggesting that the state controlled the production and propagation of JPFs remains un-provable and unlikely.\textsuperscript{53} Moreover, ethnoarchaeological studies show that the relationship between elites and potters is always more complex than the dichotomy “attached” or “independent” suggests.\textsuperscript{54}

\textsuperscript{52} Waraksa, “Female Figurines from the Mut Precincts,” 52, 101, 103. Waraksa is citing the presence of slag and pottery debris at the Mut Precinct and the distribution of some figurines and pottery vessels associated with temple centers. At the same time, even in the Late Bronze Age, potters working toward the construction of elite tombs seemed to be more loosely attached to the state than were other types of craftspeople. Eyre describes the potters employed by the workmen at Deir el Medina as “auxiliary workers” who were paid less than the tomb workmen and had a lower social status. See, Christopher J. Eyre, “Work and the Organization of Work in the New Kingdom,” in \textit{Labor in the Ancient Near East} (ed. Marvin A. Powell; AOS 68; New Haven: American Oriental Society, 1987), 173, 193.

\textsuperscript{53} Byrne, “Lie Back and Think of Judah,” 37-51. The only meager evidence for state run pottery production in Judah may be the \textit{lmlk} jars. Petrographic analysis shows that the jars were made from one major clay source; and scholars have postulated that they are related to royal ownership, taxation, or standardization (Hans Mommsen, I. Perlman and Joseph Yellin, “The Provenience of the \textit{lmlk} Jars,” \textit{IEJ} 34 (1984): 89-113). As has been shown above, the distribution and chemical make-up of these vessels is quite different from that of the figurines. However, Eshel notes that only 10-20\% of this type of jar contained royal stamps or private seal impressions. See Eshel, “Morphological Classification of the Pottery Groups in Caves I and II,” 52. The existence of private stamps on these types of jars, as well as the presence of an unstamped majority, call into question an exclusive association between the jar type and government-run workshops. See also Oded Lipschits, Omer Sergi, and Ido Koch, “Royal Judahite Jar Handles: Reconsidering the Chronology of the \textit{lmlk} Stamp Impressions,” \textit{Tel Aviv} 37 (2010): 18-21. The authors argue that Lachish produced, by far, the largest percentage of \textit{lmlk} stamps in the eighth century, a percentage which plummeted in the seventh century. In comparison, eighth century Jerusalem still produced a larger number of figurines than Lachish, calling into question any relationship between these two object types.

earlier positions that associated paste homogeneity with state control,\textsuperscript{55} ethnographic evidence suggests other reasons—such as access to raw materials, tradition, and consumer demand—for the use of certain pastes, fabrics, and styles.\textsuperscript{56} Yet it is more likely that the conventions governing JPF manufacture were dictated by other factors, like ritual need or social norm, and reflected “grass-roots” distinctions and preferences rather than a “top-down” imposition from palace or temple.

6.6 Soil groups and typology

Petrographic testing does not support a strong correlation between variations in soil group and variations in figurine design. The only soil type that may show a correlation is Group 5, loess soils. Of the Group 5 figurines, 4 out of 5 come from dated loci; two are anthropomorphic representations, both from Area G. Interestingly, Gilbert-Peretz describes both as idiosyncratic,\textsuperscript{57} suggesting that clays originating outside Jerusalem were used to produce figurines that were unusual in Jerusalem iconography.

---

\textsuperscript{55} Rice, “Evolution of Specialized Pottery Production,” 219-40. For her own critical reevaluation of her earlier work see Rice, “Recent Ceramic Analysis: 2,” 177.


\textsuperscript{57} Fragment G/8227 is pinched head with clay strip that may suggest a turban. Broken places on head seem to indicate sidelocks, although Kletter (\textit{Judean Pillar-Figurines}, Addenda to Appendix 2, 649.A.2) does not recognize them as such. Fragment G/4471 is a molded head, poorly pressed into the clay, with much excess clay remaining. The head is very small with what appears to be either a row of tassels or vertical curls over the forehead. The variety of design in this locus alone is quite interesting, with G/8228 a small
Otherwise, there is no correlation between the design of head or body and the clay type used in the Jerusalem anthropomorphic corpus. In general, the clay families cut across the various figurine types with a higher degree of variation where the sample size is larger (see Figure 33 and Tables 47 and 48 in Appendix A). For example, the zoomorphic group, with 39 samples, has the largest degree of clay variation.

![Figure 33: Petrographic groups by figurine type](image)

figurine torso without breasts, G/11061, G/11115, and G/11173 base fragments, G/11481 a pinched head, G/11147 a pinched head with turban, G/11059 a torso holding a baby?, and G/11152 a torso holding an object, perhaps a baby. There were also 3 couch fragments, 5 zoomorphic fragments, 1 unidentified fragment, several botanical remain samples, 1 stone weight, and several fish bones (for more details see Chapter 5 and Appendix I). Further, of the four human figurines tested from Locus 903, the only one represented in rendzina clay is the typical simple pinched head G/11481. Both of the less common torsos carrying objects were of terra rossa, Group 3 clay. The fact that many of the samples from Area G come from this locus could skew the overall findings if the locus is merely idiosyncratic. Yet the degree of heterogeneity in form and fabric is still evident when all of Eilat Mazar’s figurines are added to the Shiloh figurines.
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Despite differences in the number of figurines within each typological category, the ranking of Group 1 as the most numerous followed by Group 3 and Group 2 is consistent in all figurine categories.

These findings have two important implications. First, given their rather schematic appearance, it might be assumed that the pinched head figurines are of less value than the molded figurines. The petrographic study shows that both pinched and molded heads are made of the same variety of clays, and the least valuable soil predominates (see Figure 34). Further, molded heads are not attested in the finer Group 2 clays and are barely attested in the Group 5 clays, though pinched heads are attested in both. This suggests that the pinched heads cannot be explained away as degenerate forms of the molded variety in regards to soil type. Rather, other considerations must dictate which style of figurine is produced (on this point, see Chapters 9 and 10).

58 This was the assumption of Kelso and Thorley who claimed the molded heads at Tell Beit Mirsim were made of better clay than the handmade heads or bodies, partly because proper molding required better clay. See Kelso and Thorley, “Potter’s Technique at Tell Beit Mirsim,” 139.

59 The sole example of a loess clay molded head has been discussed at the beginning of the section.
Second, anthropomorphic figurines are often discussed in isolation from zoomorphic figurines.\(^60\) The petrographic data suggests that the same soil group proportions characterize both anthropomorphic and zoomorphic fragments. Therefore, the petrographic fingerprints agree with the dominant depositional pattern wherein anthropomorphic and zoomorphic figurines are found in the same structures and loci. This, in turn, may suggest that the two styles of figurines shared the same range of functions (see Figure 35).

\(^{60}\) For example, see Kelso and Thorley, “Potter’s Technique at Tell Beit Mirsim,” 142. See also Chapter 2, which reports that the majority of interpreters focus on the anthropomorphic figurines to the exclusion of zoomorphic varieties. Part of the problem is that interpreters focus solely on design rather than on the clay make-up of figurines.
6.7 Chronological implications

Another way of looking at the petrographic variability is assessing its sensitivity to chronological shifts. Overall, the soil families remain consistent from the eighth through the sixth centuries. In all periods Group 1 remains by far the dominant soil choice, followed by Group 3, Group 2, and Group 5 (see Figure 36 and Tables 49 and 50 in Appendix A).
More subtle distinctions may be detectable, however. The excavators of Area E suggest that the settlements of Areas D1 and D2 actually predate that of Area E and that most of Area E is postdated by Area G (see Chapter 5). When this finer chronological distinction is plotted by petrographic group, a pattern of increasing and then decreasing homogeneity becomes visible, with the most variation appearing in Stratum 10 of Area G (see Figure 37 and Table 51 in Appendix A). The second half of the eighth century saw the rise of very local clays in figurine production, which then became the dominating norm at the end of the eighth century through the end of the seventh century, at which time the materials for figurine production became more diversified until the destruction of Jerusalem in 586 B.C.E.

![Figure 37: Petrographic groups by area and strata](image-url)
6.8 Spatial distribution

The spatial patterns can be analyzed by locus, structure, and area. At the locus level, very few of the figurines found together in the same locus were produced the same way. This suggests that the majority of figurines, whether anthropomorphic or zoomorphic, were created separately. These images may also have been procured separately for separate ritual instances. For example, a large number of figurines (mostly zoomorphic) came from corridor 1604, near the location of a hypothesized cultic corner in the Pavement Structure.61 Seven of these figurines were tested showing little repetition of subgroup.62

When figurines from various structures were compared, no clear pattern in subgroup was visible. In regards to the rendzina clays, the variety from Area E structures remains consistent with the variety across all Shiloh strata (See Figures 38 and 39 and Table 52 in Appendix A).

---

61 See Chapter 5 for a review of this locus and the supposed cult-corner.

62 1a, 1b, 1b, 1b/c, 1d, 3a, 5?.
The only observable difference between the Area E structures is that structures in E North (The Pavement Structure and Structure 1927) lacked figurines from Subgroup 1e in contrast with structures in E South (House of the Monoliths, Lane 1324, and the Terrace House) (see Figures 40 and 41) where Subgroup 1e is more dominant (4 fragments). The absence is odd given the much larger number of figurines from E North structures, but the small number of samples precludes drawing strong conclusions based on these data.
The comparison between soil families by area is more complicated. As has been suggested, Areas E and G differ in the soil type diversity, with Area E showing 85% rendzina clay versus only 58% in Area G (see Figure 42).
Given the smaller number of samples in Area G (10 total) the figure was recalibrated to include samples from Eilat Mazar’s excavations in order to test validity. Even with 53 fragments from Area G, Group 1 only represented 53% (see Figure 43 and Tables 53 and 54 in Appendix A). Thus, the pattern is not the idiosyncratic result of a smaller sample size.

This hypothesized diversity of Area G is supported by the design of the figurines. The best indicator of design variation is the pinched-head fragments, where differences between typological categories are more marked. In contrast, the molded heads might be placed in different categories due to poor molding, weathering, or preservation rather
than original design. Eighty-three percent (19) of Area E pinched heads were the simple pinched variety (A.I.a), and only 29% (2) from Area G were simple pinched heads (see Figure 44 and Table 55 in Appendix A).

![Bar chart showing pinched head variety by area in Shiloh's excavations.](chart)

**Figure 44: Pinched head variety by area in Shiloh's excavations**

Again, this variation could result from chronological developments; but when the Stratum 10 figurines from Area E are compared with the Stratum 10 figurines from Area G, it is clear that contemporaneous figurines reflect different style proportions. Whereas 80% of the Stratum 10 Area E pinched heads are simple pinched heads, only 40% of Area G pinched heads are the simple variety (see Figure 45 and Table 56 in Appendix A). As has been shown, larger sample sizes tend toward greater diversity. Thus it is significant that Area E, with the largest number of fragments (35), is considerably more homogenous than Area G, even without the figurines from Mazar’s excavations.
Figure 45: Pinched head variety in Stratum 10 of Area E and Area G of the Shiloh excavations

Two potential causes might be forwarded for this differential pattern. First, the settlement in Area G postdates the period of highest settlement activity in Area E. Thus, the diversity in figurine form and chemical make-up may have developed over time. The period of greatest homogeneity may correspond with the period when Jerusalem was reconstituting its hinterland after the Assyrian attacks. The subsequent increased percentage of figurines from terra rossa soil and the imported loess fragments may have resulted from restored control over Jerusalem’s western side, the Shephelah, and the Negev.

Alternatively, Shiloh and others have described Area G as the home of upper classes, including those associated with the temple and administration. As has been argued in Chapter 5, the possibility that Area G constitutes a wealthy residential area is supported by the use of dressed limestone ashlars in the House of Ahiel, the size of the

---

63 Shiloh, *Excavations at the City of David 1*, 29.
house, the large number of storage jars in that space, and the toilet installation. Steiner also believes the house contained wealthy inhabitants.\(^6^4\) Further, the adjacent structures contained unusual and elite objects, such as the large cache of bullae in the House of the Bullae and the carved wooden ornaments from the Burnt House, as well pieces of bone and ivory inlay.\(^6^5\) Finally, the faunal report notes that the large numbers of fish bones in Area G, particularly the House of Ahiel, suggests a high standard of living.\(^6^6\) Moreover, there is reason to believe that at least some of the inhabitants of this quarter were associated with the Jerusalem royal house or temple elite. Shiloh notes that the cache of 51 bullae suggests some administrative connection with the area,\(^6^7\) with one bulla bearing the name of a scribe also mentioned several times in the book of Jeremiah (Jer 36:10-12, 25).\(^6^8\)

Thus, it is possible that the greater degree of variety in soil type and design could correlate with the economic standing of the inhabitants of Area G versus that of Area E. Ultimately, the temporal and spatial explanations are not mutually exclusive. If the

\(^6^4\) Steiner, *Excavations by Kathleen M. Kenyon in Jerusalem*, 78

\(^6^5\) Shiloh, *Excavations at the City of David 1*, 19-20.

\(^6^6\) Lernau and Lernau, “Fish Remains,” 135. Part of the value of the fish rests on the fact that the fish had to be traded from some distance, increasing their market value. He also notes that the inhabitants were consuming seven different species in the same period, which further undergirds his interpretation of the inhabitant’s status.

\(^6^7\) Yigal Shiloh, *Excavations at the City of David 1*, 19.

\(^6^8\) Ibid., 20.
resulting diversity in the late seventh century assemblage is the result of greater access to areas west and south of Jerusalem and is characterized by some minimal figurine trade or population movement, then the more wealthy inhabitants may have had greater access to those materials.

Finally, other evidence appears to corroborate the Stratum 10/Area G diversity. De Groot and Bernick Greenberg refer to a number of examples supporting Jerusalem’s late Iron Age contacts with regions in Judah and beyond. They cite the South Arabian inscriptions from the City of David, three out of four of which were found in Stratum 10.69 They also mention decorated and undecorated tridachnae (shells) from the Red Sea region, fish bones from the Mediterranean littoral and the area of the Yarkon, wood from northern Syria for decorated furniture found in the Burnt House, and Syrian ivory.70 They also note a peak in the number of pottery vessels imported into Jerusalem from other regions, especially apparent in tomb assemblages.71

6.9 Final conclusions

Petrographic analysis aids in the interpretation of figurines in two ways. First, the data can be used to test previous figurine interpretations. In relation to the figurines as goddesses, petrography does not support an identification of the figurines as major

69 De Groot and Bernick Greenberg, Excavations at the City of David, 34.

70 Ibid., 35. Note, almost all of this material comes from Area G.

71 Ibid., 36.
goddesses. The quality of the majority of figurines is quite poor, with no indication of precious materials or even properly levigated clay types. Even badly formed\textsuperscript{72} and improperly fired figurines\textsuperscript{73} were covered with white wash, indicating that they were used despite errors in production. Furthermore, the anthropomorphic figurines are made of the same materials as the zoomorphic figurines. Rather than proving the JPFs were high goddesses and the zoomorphic fragments were mundane objects, this suggests the two figurine types may have had related functions.

In regards to the popular religion interpretation, petrographic data do not support interpretations claiming the figurines were made by regular inhabitants in the home; nor do the data suggest that the figurines were imported from neighboring people. Instead, the figurines were probably produced as part of an organized ceramic industry in Jerusalem. Further, most of the City of David figurines were produced from clays immediately adjacent to the site. At the same time, there is no evidence that production was controlled by the state or temple; and thus the clays chosen for figurine production and the figurine designs must reflect a broad, popular set of expectations about figurine function.

The figurine soil families do not appear to indicate the socio-economic status of the users. Inhabitants from all quarters of the City of David used figurines. Nor were the


\textsuperscript{73} Almost every samples shows evidence of gray coring, suggesting the figurines were shortsired and/or poorly levigated (Shepherd, Ceramics for the Archaeologist, 21).
poorer clays eschewed by the richer neighborhoods. For example, the largest single group of figurines from Area G was made from rendzina clays. Furthermore, the more complicated figurine designs, such as molded heads or handmade heads with applied features, were also made from rendzina clay rather than finer materials. Thus, the technological style of the figurines is fairly useless as an indicator of socio-economic status for either the figurines’ creators or users. The only data correlating with socio-economic status is the degree of variety by area in figurine fabric and design.

Finally, the petrography does not show any special correlation between the figurine production industry and females. Based on analogy with Near Eastern texts and ethnoarchaeology, the figurines were probably made in workshops run by males, with female and child participation. Furthermore, the similarities of technological style between anthropomorphic and zoomorphic figurines indicate that the design of the female figurines may not be the sole indicator of figurine function; their clay construction may also have been a factor.

The second way this petrographic study adds to the conversation about Jerusalem figurines is that it enables interpreters to ask more complex questions about figurine production and distribution. Figurine production and use was highly local, varying significantly even between settlements of a relatively close distance. Jerusalem had its own figurine producers who serve its population. Thus, figurine analysis must focus on the individual city, rather than Judah at large, given the extremely low number of figurine imports/exports and the local character of clay sources.
Furthermore, there is no correlation between soil type and figurine type; this indicates that pinched heads are not mere degenerations of molded heads. Some other set of principles and/or forces must have dictated when a molded head or a pinched head was made. Moreover, because all of the figurine types yield a similar soil distribution, the choice to produce one style versus another cannot be attributed to technological considerations alone but must be associated with other controlling factors, like ritual need.

Finally, despite the consistent predominance of Group 1 over time, figurines became more heterogeneous from Stratum 12 to 10. One possible explanation of this phenomenon is the change in access to the land surrounding Jerusalem, particularly to its west and south. This change may correlate with the restoration of economic and political autonomy in the aftermath of the Assyrian invasion. Further, the variation between Areas E and G in Shiloh’s excavations may also correlate with the socio-economic status of the inhabitants; wealthier persons associated with administration and temple may have had greater access to the small number of figurine imports and figurines produced from finer clay types.

Above all, the recent petrographic study of figurines from the southeastern hill reveals the complexity of Jerusalem figurine production and the technological properties that affect figurine function. The results suggest that only after assessing the technological characteristics of figurines in their archaeological context can studies move forward to consider Jerusalem figurine rituals in their larger local, regional, and Judean contexts.
CHAPTER 7: THE SOUTHEASTERN HILL AND ITS REGIONAL CONTEXT

The archaeological data from the Kenyon and Shiloh excavations of the southeastern hill can now be combined to review the major interpretations applied to pillar figurines and then to suggest a more nuanced picture of ritual activity in this community during the Iron IIB-C (7.1). Furthermore, the data from these excavations can be compared with materials from earlier excavations on the southeastern hill and the Ophel (7.2), with Avigad’s excavations on the southwestern hill (7.3), and with other excavations in Jerusalem (7.4). Finally, the overall picture can be contextualized in light of the Judean hill country settlements (7.5) and then compared to the regional character of figurine use in the Shephelah and the Negev (7.6).

7.1 Conclusions based on excavations on the southeastern hill

7.1.1 Reviewing the major interpretive paradigms

First, no archaeological evidence supports the interpretation that the figurines are major deities. Two factors bear on this question—archaeological distribution and assemblage. Excavation did not uncover any anthropomorphic figurines in traditionally defined cultic loci. Careful investigation of Cave I materials excavated by Kenyon reveals that the deposit is not connected with formal cultic activity. Rather, the remains were associated with pottery making or storage. Furthermore, the only cultic site in the City of David excavations, the so-called cultic corner in the Pavement Structure, was devoid of anthropomorphic figurines. Even the extensive fill nearby contained only four
anthropomorphic fragments, although it did have scores of zoomorphic fragments. Finally, figurines in domestic structures are not associated with a shrine room or with one part of the structure; they are found throughout, including on floors and in fills, pits, tabuns, passageways, cesspits, stairways, and walls. This does not imply that figurines were not used for ritual purposes, only that their deposition does not suggest they were used as votives or idols in a shrine.

Furthermore, the objects occurring most frequently with figurines are pottery and zoomorphic figurines rather than supposed cultic equipment like chalices, altars, censers, or standing stones. Figurines in domestic contexts are often found with a range of domestic items including, cooking pots, botanical remains, ground stones, loom weights, and stone weights. The southeastern hill provided no discernible evidence that the figurines were treated differently than common household debris (see Table 57 in Appendix A).

When this evidence is considered in combination with the type of clay from which the figurines were made, it is difficult to interpret them as status objects, representing a high deity of the pantheon. All evidence for the construction of images suggests that images representing high deities are designated by the use of certain materials for construction as well as proper handling during and after use. None of these elements characterize the figurines. Instead, whitewash is applied to all figurines, even those with faulty production (double-mold impressions, bent pillars, and firing disfigurement). In other words, if interpreters are correct to assume that Asherah/Astarte was an important part of the Judean pantheon, it is difficult to explain why the regular
rules for the creation of a cultic image would not apply (for more on this point, see Chapters 2, 3, and 8).

Second, none of the material from the southeastern hill suggests that the figurines were used only by the lower echelons of society or that they were illicitly imported from outside Judah. Large numbers of figurines were found in every part of the southeastern hill, from Area E to Area G. Because Area G was probably an upper class neighborhood, the evidence demonstrates that elite personnel never eschewed figurine rituals. Further, the fact that this neighborhood contains a large number of figurines for its brief occupation and area suggests that ritual activity here may have been even more intensive than in the larger, more drawn out occupation of Area E. The larger variety of clay types and design types in Area G also support this conclusion.

At the same time, the figurines were certainly produced locally, probably by a fairly developed ceramic industry in Jerusalem. As such, they were not imported from surrounding religions nor do they result from a “moonshine” industry, frowned upon by the authorities. The very local character of Jerusalem clay for the figurines stretching from the Iron I to Iron IIC suggests a local tradition of figurine production.

Thus, the data support some notion of popular use, if “popular” means the opposite of “state-imposed.” In both production and consumption, the figurines were driven by a local set of expectations rather than government or temple proscriptions. The degree of variety in figurine production and deposition makes the existence of state-attached workshops or standardized ritual use unlikely. Therefore, although the materials from Area G indicate that temple personnel used figurines and may have been
responsible for officiating figurine rituals, figurine production and use were apparently motivated primarily by tradition rather than official demand.

Third, the style of the figurines does not correlate with the socio-economic status of the people using them. Although the figurines are not limited to contexts with elite objects, they are found in elite neighborhoods. Furthermore, in these neighborhoods, the largest percentage of figurines was constructed of poor clays. Moreover, pinched heads, sometimes understood as degenerate forms, dominated in all neighborhoods. Thus, the style of figurine construction must be dictated by other concerns, like ritual need, rather than status.

Fourth, no data from the southeastern hill suggest a unique connection between females and the figurines. As argued in Chapter 6, no evidence connects figurine production singularly with females. In all probability, figurines were produced by workshops under the direction of males. Further, the figurines are found in all parts of the domestic units, with no strong correlation to “female” space, like courtyards. Nor was there a unique correlation with objects often associated with “female work,” such as loom weights or ground stones. Finally, the similarities between zoomorphic and anthropomorphic figurines with respect to deposition and soil variety suggest these objects may have similar functions. In other words, the function of the female figurines was not dictated solely by the presence of breasts.

This does not mean that the figurines were unconnected to domestic structures. Interpreters are correct to claim that figurines were used in the household. In fact, once the contexts in the areas excavated by Kenyon are identified as pottery construction,
storage, or market debris, the remaining contexts for the southeastern hill figurines are limited to the neighborhood or the domestic structures. They are strikingly absent in most public buildings. Thus, although figurines sometimes occur in other contexts, like tombs or water systems, the most common figurine context on the southeastern hill is the domestic unit.

7.1.2 Emerging picture of figurine rituals in the southeastern hill

The southeastern hill figurines can be used to construct a more nuanced picture of ritual activity, particularly in regards to iconographic development and the relationship between anthropomorphic and zoomorphic figurines. To begin with, the figurine bodies and heads develop over time. The female pillar style bodies found in the earliest loci from Shiloh’s excavations (Strata 15-14 Iron I-II and Strata 14-13 Iron IIA) are hollow and sometimes larger than later figurines.\(^1\) Given their construction technique, these bodies would have included molded heads attached by a clay tang.

The Kenyon data corroborate the earlier date of hollow bodies with molded heads. The figurines from the Cave I collapse are the earliest from Area A of Kenyon’s excavations, and many of the bodies are idiosyncratic in design or hollow and wheel-finished.\(^2\) The variety of body types and especially the number of hollow and

---

\(^1\) Gilbert-Peretz, “Ceramic Figurines,” E3/15924, E1/10126.

\(^2\) Holland, “Study of Palestinian Iron Age Baked Clay Figurines,” C775 and C332 were produced through a combination of coiling and the wheel, and C258 is hollow and handmade (Kletter, *Judean Pillar-Figurines*, Appendix 5, 5.1.2.3, 5.1.2.4, and 5.1.2.5). Another torso fragment was partially hollow and bell shaped (Reg. C.335+366/Holland, “Study of Palestinian Iron Age Baked Clay Figurines,” A.XI.38/Kletter, *Judean*
handmade/wheel-finished forms suggests that the earliest deposits show a wider degree of technical variety than the largely homogenous body forms of the late eighth through sixth centuries.  

In regards to figurine heads, although the data from Kenyon’s excavations alone suggests that pinched heads were less common in the eighth century, when both sites are combined the data tell a different story. When the figurines with known provenience from Kenyon’s excavations are added to Shiloh’s, the two sites produce 55 (69%) pinched heads and 25 molded heads (31%). Those relative percentages categorize most of the

---


3 Hollow or wheel-made fragments were also found in later loci. According to Kletter, Kenyon’s excavations uncovered 1 hollow, wheel-made body in the Phase 9 destruction of city street (Reg/ 3341/Kletter, Judean Pillar-Figurines, Appendix 5, 5.1.2.2). One wheel-made base was also uncovered in Stratum 9 of Shiloh’s excavations (G/2409), though this is secondary reuse and says little about the figurine’s original context. This type of variety should not be confused with the variety in later body forms from Area G. In the case of Area G, all the bodies are made in the dominant technological style—solid pillars with applied features. It is the type of applied features which vary. The figurines earlier in the horizon vary in their basic construction techniques, with solid examples, wheel-made examples, coils finished by hand, and coils finished on the wheel.
periods of occupation, from the late eighth century through the sixth. Furthermore, pinched heads were found in eighth century loci in D1, D2, and Area E in Shiloh’s excavations. Thus, the data suggest pinched head figurines were represented in the eighth century and that they outnumbered molded heads (see Tables 58, 59, and 60 in Appendix A).

At the same time, shifts between the two styles are also visible. Overall, the end of the seventh century through 586 produced a larger percentage of pinched heads (75%) versus molded heads (25%) than in the eighth and seventh centuries. This suggests that pinched heads gained in popularity and molded heads decreased through the course of habitation at the site (see Figure 46 and Table 59 in Appendix A).

Furthermore, it is possible that molded heads with female pillar bodies predate pinched heads with female pillar bodies. While the molded heads in Cave I must be dated to the second half of the eighth century broadly, some of the deposit could be dated earlier in that century, perhaps coterminous with Shiloh’s Stratum 12b. At the very least, several body fragments found in the same deposit indicate an earlier horizon than typical late eighth century body types. If such is the case, then the molded heads associated with Cave I may actually represent an earlier horizon of the pillar figurine tradition in Jerusalem.

---

4 For this calculation the Kenyon street deposit was omitted because the figurines could come from the eighth through the sixth centuries.
This supposition is also supported by the style of heads associated with hollow and/or wheel-made bases. Almost without exception, this style of body contained a molded head attached by means of a clay tang. In several cases a hole in the neck of figurines, where the head was attached, is still visible. Thus, the technological and morphological evidence of figurine bodies and molded heads in early contexts suggests that molded heads occurred early in the Jerusalem corpus but became less popular over time.

The pinched heads tell a slightly different story. In the Shiloh excavations, the earliest pinched head figurines occur in Stratum 15 (Iron I) in Area D1\(^5\) and Stratum 13

---

\(^5\) D1/13251 in Gilbert-Peretz, “Ceramic Figurines,” Fig. 18:11; Pl. 9:8-9. This is an “ashdoda type” solid figurine, with a flattened head, a large nose, and applied button eyes.
(ninth century) in Area G. Both are hand-pinched, solid figurines with applied button/pellet eyes. The “ashdoda” figurine in Area D1 was preserved only to the neck, but the figurine in Area G shows breaks indicating the arms must have stretched out to the sides. In the Kenyon excavations, the earliest datable “pinched head” came from the collapse in the Northern Building, which should be dated before the construction of the city wall, probably from the middle to the end of the eighth century. This figurine was described as a male pinched-head figurine holding a sack on its back and carrying a log.

Thus, pinched heads are found in earlier loci than molded heads but not associated with typical female pillar bodies. Perhaps potters began producing a composite type of figurine, which quickly became the most prominent type of figurine used in the neighborhood toward the end of the eighth century. This pinched-head style was largely the simple variety, with the common variations of turban or turban and sidelocks growing in popularity in the seventh century.

This chronological pattern suggests that the pinched heads are not the result of a Josianic reform iconoclasm. The pinched head figurines were developed and popular much earlier than the reform movements mentioned in the Hebrew Bible. Nor did the

---

6 G/11769 (Gilbert-Peretz, “Ceramic Figurines,” Plate 1:8, Fig 10:13) is a mini human figurine with rounded head, pinched face, and applied button eyes. There is a crack in the arms and body, and the figurine is broken in the middle, containing no sign of breasts. There is no break on the torso where the arms (no longer preserved) may have been attached, so it is safe to assume they extended out to the sides.


8 The exception is G/11508 dated to Stratum 12b; but without the stratigraphic report for Area G, little more can be said about this early exemplar. Of the other five examples from Iron Age contexts, 1 was found in Stratum 11 and the rest in Stratum 10.
molded heads suddenly cease in the mid-seventh century. Furthermore, neither type can be dismissed as an import, since the petrographic data show both types were constructed of local clay in all periods of occupation.

The relationship between the anthropomorphic and zoomorphic fragments is also more complex than has often been claimed. Zoomorphic fragments occur earlier than most of the anthropomorphic figurines and continue to outnumber them throughout occupation at the southeastern hill. At the same time, the petrographic study shows that both zoomorphic and anthropomorphic fragments were made from the same clay types. The relationship between them is also corroborated by distribution data. Zoomorphic figurines are found in the same loci that contained anthropomorphic figurines 67% of the time in fill loci and 70% on floors. The only more common correlation is anthropomorphic figurines and pottery; and the next most common correlation, with incised handles, occurs only 44% of the time in fills and 30% on floors.

The large gap between the correlation figures indicates the distribution of anthropomorphic and zoomorphic images together is not a mistake of archaeological preservation. It seems safe to conclude, in the least, that the same houses used both figurine types and, at most, they were used in related ritual practices. Furthermore, the

---

9 Raz Kletter, *Judean Pillar-Figurines*, 65. Kletter claims no evidence connects the animal figurines and JPFs; but Kletter did not study every registered object in the same locus or structures as the JPFs. For example, he lists only 17 loci where JPFs and zoomorphic fragments occurred together. The overwhelming data from the present study challenge Kletter’s claim, suggesting, instead, a high correlation between zoomorphic and anthropomorphic fragments.

production and/or market context from Kenyon’s Southern Building, Cave I, and the street debris seems to suggest that all types of figurines were sold, if not produced, by groups sharing the same production/market space.

When compared with the information about figurine deposition from the Neo-Assyrian texts, the archaeological data from the southeastern hill appear to correlate with many elements of those rituals. Anthropomorphic figurines, of many varieties, are found dispersed throughout the domestic and neighborhood spaces along with large numbers of zoomorphic figurines. Furthermore, the Assyrian texts suggest that figurine rituals may not produce discernible elements beyond the figurines themselves, questioning whether, if figurines were found in ritual contexts, they would be identifiable as such. Thus, the absence of ritual materials, other than figurines, does not eliminate the possibility that figurines were used and discarded as part of ritual action in the southeastern hill. Rather, the unusually high correlation between the anthropomorphic and zoomorphic figurines may be all that is left to suggest a ritual function.

7.2 Other sites in the City of David and on the Ophel

Kenyon and Shiloh were certainly not the first to excavate on the southeastern hill of Jerusalem. The present work has focused on the Shiloh and Kenyon excavations, in part, because of the problematic methodologies and publications of earlier excavators. Still, it should be noted that pillar figurines were found in earlier excavations, even if those figurines cannot be dated or located within their archaeological context (see Table 61 in Appendix A).
Kletter notes that 2 figurines came from the Bliss and Dickey (1894-1897) excavations: 1 pinched head and 1 pillar body. Because the excavators restrict their remarks to architectural remains, little more can be said. Father Louis-Hughes (1909-1911) Vincent also recorded anthropomorphic figurines, including 2 molded heads and 1 hollow body fragment with hands under the breasts. Kletter lists the context for the heads as the “Ophel Hill” Jerusalem, and the context for the third is lost. Given the nature of Vincent’s activities, these fragments could have come from the surface or from the underground water system.

Macalister and Duncan (1923-1925) published a number of figurines, including 4 pinched heads, 4 molded heads, and 2 bodies. Macalister and Duncan uncovered

---

11 Kletter, *Judean Pillar-Figurines*, Appendix 2, 287.Ac.1.Ap; 288.C.2. See also Frederick Jones Bliss, *Excavations at Jerusalem, 1894-1897* (London: Committee of the Palestine Exploration Fund, 1898), 264, Pl. 27:49-50. Bliss and Dickie excavated on Mt. Zion, the Pool of Siloam, and a small area near the southern loop of Hezekiah’s tunnel. It is difficult to ascertain which of these areas produced the figurines.


15 One of these is from Duncan (*Digging Up Biblical History* 2, Pl. opposite 77). Kletter (*Judean Pillar-Figurines*, Appendix 2, 281.B) calls it a molded head figurine with breasts. The “molded head” is very difficult to discern from the published photographs. In all likelihood both pictures in Duncan (bottom left and bottom center) are of the same figurine; in neither case is the molding clear. More importantly, although the molded face is conjectural at best, the figurine does not have breasts visible in the picture. Further, Duncan’s description of the figurine notes that it is lacking breasts (Duncan, *Digging Up Biblical History* 2, 88). The other 3 are published in Robert Alexander Stewart Macalister and John Garrow Duncan, *Excavations on the Hill of Ophel, Jerusalem, 1923-1925* (PEFA 1923-1925; London: Harrison and
Iron Age remains, but in most cases the find spots are poorly reported. Recent study of the excavation records shows that Macalister and Duncan worked at the top of the stepped stone structure (later Shiloh Area G); and Duncan, himself, claims that at least 4 pinched heads and some “pedestal figurines” were recovered from Ophel, along with a large number of zoomorphic fragments among “numberless fragments of Astarte figurines.” Unfortunately, the mixed nature of the loci provides no further spatial or chronological specificity for the site’s small finds.

---

16 One of these (Kletter, Judean Pillar-Figurines, Appendix 2, 291.B.4.B) is from Duncan (Digging Up Biblical History 2, Pl. opposite 77) and the other (Kletter, Judean Pillar-Figurines, Appendix 2, 290.C.1) is from Macalister and Duncan, Excavations on the Hill of Ophel, 184, Fig. 194.

17 Garth Gilmour, “An Iron Age II Pictorial Inscription from Jerusalem Illustrating Yahweh and Asherah,” PEQ 141 (2009): 89-90. These same pages also illustrate how hopeless the stratigraphic situation was and why the excavations remain unhelpful for future investigations of the small finds.

18 Duncan, Digging Up Biblical History 2, 86, 93. These include zoomorphic heads, legs, torsos, long snouted heads with disc eyes, models of camels or horses with saddles, 1bull’s head, 4 bird-faced figurines, 2 heads of bulls, and a number of horse figurines with riders. Duncan also alludes to bird-heads with “bulging eyes” found on the Ophel. Further, the list includes late figurines like a terra-cotta lion’s head, a late Egyptian influenced female head, and a female head from the Greek or Roman period. These attest to the mixed nature of the deposits. Earlier in the text he describes the Astarte figurines of the “pedestal” variety that he found on the Ophel (ibid., 85-86). Duncan’s account of the pillar figurines must be contrasted with Macalister and Duncan, where the authors only note that “a few rude figures of animals and Asherah figures of the ‘pillar’ type’’ had been found (Excavations on the Hill of Ophel, 184). They also mention that no plaque figurines had been recovered.

19 For example, the excavators uncovered large fills including periods from the Islamic through the Neolithic. J. Garrow Duncan, Digging up Biblical History: Recent Archaeology in Palestine and Its
The final excavation associated with the area is Benjamin Mazar’s work on the Temple Mount. The report includes very rough context data for 5 figurines, and a photograph of a sixth figurine is included in the independent report of Meir Ben-Dov. These include 2 hand-modeled figurines, 3 molded heads, and 1 body fragment. Unfortunately, only 2 of these fragments have significant context information.

According to Nadelman, 27 fragments of figurines (both zoomorphic and anthropomorphic) were recovered from the separate expeditions on the Temple Mount (1968-1977 under Benjamin Mazar, and 1986-1987 under Eilat Mazar). None were found complete, and each fragment came from a different figurine. Nadelman notes that 10 figurine fragments were recovered from Locus 6015. Because this locus is the only one

---

_Bearing on the Old Testament: Vol.1_ (New York: Macmillan, 1931), 206-7; 212-13. Macalister also claims that they found only minimal “Hebrew pottery” and concludes that some occupation on the eastern hill dated to 1000 B.C.E. but that most of it had been obliterated prior to the Maccabaean period. (Macalister and Duncan, _Excavations on the Hill of Ophel_, 185).


21 Categorizing these figurines is complicated. The locus list describes the first piece (Reg. 1469) as a solid, hand-modeled fragment of a female figurine; but no drawings or pictures were published, and the locus designation is in question. Kletter tentatively puts the piece in his “hand-made head” category (Kletter, _Judean Pillar-Figurines_, Appendix 2, 438.A?). The second piece is described as solid, hand-modeled pinched male head with conical helmet and as “Assyriazing” in comparison with the Lachish reliefs. See Nadelman, “Iron Age II Clay Figurine Fragments,” 123. Not only is the description idiosyncratic, but the registration number (194) is actually used to refer to 3 figurine fragments—the hand-made head, a horse head, and an animal torso.


23 Kletter says that the breasts on the body fragment (Reg. 746/10) are small and were added separately (Kletter, _Judean Pillar-Figurines_, Appendix 2, 439.C.2).
described in the report, 17 figurine fragments are relatively unaccounted for, including the hand-modeled female figurine and 2 molded heads. Nadelman justifies the state of publication, claiming no figurines were found on floors; but were all surface finds or from fills. If Nadelman is correct, no figurines were found in the monumental architecture discovered in other areas of excavation, including the “royal building” or gate (Building C).24

Returning to Locus 6015, this feature was begun as a tomb but was never completed. It had an entrance shaft, a chimney, and a bench running along one wall. Underneath later materials, excavators uncovered a layer of Iron Age remains dated to the mid-eighth through mid-seventh centuries. This fill included pottery sherds, restorable vessels, 1 female body, and 1 “male” pinched-head, in addition to 8 zoomorphic fragments. The excavators conclude that the unfinished tomb was used as a repository or “private store room” for vessels.25

As a whole, the older excavations in the City of David and the Ophel produced 7 pinched heads, 9 molded heads, and 5 bodies, including 1 hollow body. Other than the material from Benjamin Mazar’s excavations, none of these figurines can be associated with archaeological context or date. Nor can the older excavations be used to examine the balance between pinched and molded heads, since the molded heads were published


much more frequently. If these numbers are indicative at all, they suggest that figurines were absent or minimal in most of the large public contexts, like the monumental water system, fortifications, and the large public buildings.

### 7.3 The southwestern hill

According to Yezerski and Geva, over 250 clay figurines (including 8 zoomorphic vessels) were uncovered in the Jewish Quarter Excavations.\(^{26}\) With three exceptions, all the figurines were fragmentary. The authors note that the figurines were not found *in situ* but were located in earth fills, with the majority from Iron Age II strata and others from Second Temple or Byzantine strata. Figurines were also found in other areas of the Jewish Quarter that are not yet published.\(^{27}\)

#### 7.3.1 Chronological patterns

Stratum 9 (eighth century) of Area A and Strata 8-7 (late eighth-seventh centuries) produced a similar number of total figurines (45 and 54 respectively), although anthropomorphific figurines decreased into the seventh century. The excavators note that the figurines were found with organic materials and household vessels.\(^{28}\)

---

\(^{26}\) According to the report, 179 came from Area A, 53 from Area W, and 18 from Area X-2. See Yezerski and Geva, “Iron Age II Clay Figurines,” 64.

\(^{27}\) Ibid.

\(^{28}\) Yezerski and Geva, “Iron Age II Clay Figurines,” 67, 68, Table 3.2.
W, and X-2 combined, they report 194 zoomorphic fragments (77.6%), 36 anthropomorphic fragments (14.4%), 5 bed/couch figurines (2%) and 15 unidentified fragments (16%). Thus, as in the Shiloh and Kenyon excavations, zoomorphic fragments vastly outnumber the anthropomorphic variety.\(^{29}\)

Unfortunately, these statistics do not distinguish between pinched and molded heads. According to the excavation report, which supplies the locus context for ca. 34 of the anthropomorphic fragments, the excavations produced only 4 pinched heads and 10 molded heads, in addition to 20 body fragments without heads (see Tables 62, 63, and 64 in Appendix A). Of the pinched heads, 1 lacks context data,\(^{30}\) 1 dates from the middle to the end of the eighth century,\(^{31}\) 1 dates to the eighth through seventh centuries (Area A Strata 9–7),\(^{32}\) and a fourth came from Area X-2, also dated to the eighth through seventh centuries.\(^{33}\) Because at least one of these (F 39) was in a locus cut by the Broad Wall constructed at the end of the eighth century, it is safe to assume that pinched-head figurines were present on the southwestern hill in the mid-to-late eighth century, as they were on the southeastern hill. The small number of pinched heads may be due to the

\(^{29}\) Ibid.

\(^{30}\) F 163/Reg. 3962, described as a “complete female pinched head figurine with hands (or breasts) extended forward” (ibid., 73; Pl. 3.3) has no context, which is unfortunate because the figurine is quite idiosyncratic. In the picture and drawing, the arms (rather than breasts) appear adjacent and stretching forward as if to offer up an offering or to supplicate.

\(^{31}\) Pinched Head, F39/Reg. 3926/1 (Yezerski and Geva, “Iron Age II Clay Figurines,” 70, Pl. 3.3).

\(^{32}\) F18/Reg. 3342/1, a pinched head (ibid., 69, Pl. 3.3).

\(^{33}\) F 241/Reg.34494, a third pinched head (ibid., 76, Pl. 3.3).
limited occupation in the southwestern hill and the fact that many of the domestic units went out of use at the end of the eighth century.\(^{34}\)

As for the molded heads, 8 came from Area A, 1 came from Area W, and 1 from X-2; but 3 Area A molded heads were found in later fills (Strata 5 and 6).\(^{35}\) Thus, in Area A, 5 molded heads were recovered from Iron II loci. Four came from the mid to late eighth century (Stratum 9),\(^ {36}\) and one came from the eighth through seventh centuries (Strata 9-7).\(^ {37}\) The figurine in Area W is from the end of the eighth century,\(^ {38}\) and the molded head from X-2 is from the eighth through seventh centuries.\(^ {39}\) In sum, 4 molded heads and only 1 pinched head are from the mid-to-late eighth century, 2 of each are from

---


\(^{35}\) F3/Reg. 2675/1 (Yezerski and Geva, “Iron Age II Clay Figurines,” 69, Pl. 3.1) is described as a “molded female head covered by cap pointed to the back.” Upon closer examination the “cap” is probably only excess clay left un-smoothed by the potter. The same phenomenon is attested in the figurines from Shiloh’s excavations. F17/Reg. 3299/1 (ibid., 69, Pl. 3.1) is described as “a molded female head covered by a cap pointed upwards and to the back.” The curls are represented by horizontal lines, with only 1-2 rows on the head and along the side of the face. F9/Reg. 3361/1 (ibid., 69, Pl. 3.1), found in a Stratum 6 fill, is described as hollow and molded.

\(^{36}\) F57/Reg. 8433/5 (Kletter, \textit{Judean Pillar-Figurines}, Appendix 2, 308.Bc.2.A) is a complete figurine with molded head (Yezerski and Geva, “Iron Age II Clay Figurines,” 70, Pl. 3.1). F53/Reg. 3913/1 (ibid.) is a rounded molded female head. Pinched Head F39 was found in a related fill layer. F55/Reg. 8431/1 (ibid.) is a molded head with “cap.” F61/Reg. 8442/1 (ibid., 70; 3.2) is an unusual molded head with a very pointed face and thin almond eyes. The excavators describe it as having long hair, though the “hair” is difficult to see in the photograph.

\(^{37}\) F25/Reg. 3400/1 (ibid., 69, Pl. 3.1) is described as a molded female head covered by “cap.”

\(^{38}\) F211/Reg. 615/1 (ibid., 75, Pl. 3.2) is described as a rounded molded female head covered by “cap.”

\(^{39}\) F238/Reg. 34312 (ibid., 75, Pl. 3.2) is a molded rounded head with long neck.
eighth through seventh century loci, and 1 molded head is from a seventh century fill locus.

The construction of the Broad Wall cut earlier structures, providing an opportunity to distinguish between materials dated to the end of the eighth century and those dated before the end of the eighth century. Four of the molded heads came from loci dated to the second half of the eighth century (rather than the end), while only one of the pinched heads is from that stratum. This seems to agree with the figurines from Cave I, which were also stratigraphically sealed by the late eighth century city wall. Thus, the data from the Jewish Quarter excavations correlate with those from the southeastern hill, where molded heads with female pillar bodies are produced as early as the middle of the eighth century in the Jerusalem corpus and decrease in popularity. The larger number of loci dated before the end of the eighth century accounts for the larger number of molded heads in the Jewish Quarter. Further, the fact that the domestic areas were not intensely inhabited in the late eighth century and were largely abandoned through the seventh and into the sixth centuries accounts for the low number of pinched heads.

Of the 20 body fragments, 14 came from Area A, 3 came from Area X-2, and 3 came from Area W. Five of the Area A bodies were found in later strata, leaving 9 in Iron II strata, with 2 from the seventh century to the beginning of the sixth century (Stratum 7), 3 from the eighth-seventh centuries (Strata 8-7), including 1 wheel-made

\[40\] F1/Reg. 2385/1 in Stratum 6 (ibid., 69, Pl 3.2); F33/Reg. 3786/1 in Stratum 6 (ibid., 70); F137/Reg. 8846 in Stratum 6 (ibid., 72); F138/Reg. 8850 in Stratum 6 (ibid.); and F4/Reg. 2725/2 in Stratum 5 (ibid., 69).

\[41\] F29/Reg. 3853/1 (ibid.); F30/Reg. 3853/2 (ibid.).
pillar, and 4, including a wheel-made pillar, from Stratum 9 or the second half of the eighth century.\textsuperscript{43} In Area X-2 all 3 were found in the same locus in Stratum 9, dated to the eighth through the seventh centuries.\textsuperscript{44} Finally, in Area W, 1 wheel-made pillar was from a later stratum,\textsuperscript{45} 1 fragment came from the eighth through seventh centuries (Strata 7-6),\textsuperscript{46} and 1 from the seventh century (Stratum 6).\textsuperscript{47}

The data from the Jewish Quarter do not contribute to the discussion of hollow, wheel-made bodies, save that at least one example was preserved from Stratum 9, dated to the mid to late eighth century. Similar to the material from the Shiloh excavations, a large number of pillars and bases were retrieved by the excavators; and some whitewash was preserved on almost all fragments. Unlike Kenyon and Shiloh, the excavators did not report any idiosyncratic body forms, other than 1 pinched-head figurine lacking provenience.\textsuperscript{48} None of the bodies hold objects, and none suggest the arms were raised to the side.

\textsuperscript{42} F34/Reg. 3763/1 (ibid., 70, Pl. 3.2); F105/Reg. 8620/1 (ibid., 72, Pl. 3.3); F70/Reg. 8474/1 (ibid., 71), a wheel-made pillar.

\textsuperscript{43} F143/Reg. 8902/1 (ibid., 73, Pl. 3.2); F63/Reg. 8436/1 (ibid., 70); F58/Reg. 8435/1 (ibid., Pl. 3.3) a wheel-made base; F59/Reg. 8435/5 (ibid., 70).

\textsuperscript{44} F234/Reg. 34305/1 (ibid., 75); F235/Reg. 34305/2 (ibid.); F236/Reg. 34308/1 (ibid.).

\textsuperscript{45} F179/Reg. 490/1 (ibid., 74), wheel-made pillar.

\textsuperscript{46} F209/Reg. 600 (ibid.).

\textsuperscript{47} F226/Reg. 970 (ibid., 75).

\textsuperscript{48} See above for the description.
7.3.2 Spatial patterns

Beginning with the areas that contained fewest figurines, Area X-2 produced only 5 figurines in Iron II loci, as well as limited and fragmentary pottery remains (see Table 65 in Appendix A). Thus, the ceramic material was only able to date the major construction (Fortification 4220-4221) generally to the seventh century. All other loci are dated to the eighth through seventh centuries, and it is assumed they predate the construction of Fortification 4220-4221.\(^\text{49}\) Further, excavators note that Iron Age remains in X-2 were exposed in a limited area, and none showed any direct stratigraphic relationship to the fortification.\(^\text{50}\)

All of the figurine finds came from areas unrelated to Fortification 4220-4221; and excavators suggest the various fill and sub-floor loci are the remains of an original building dated to the end of the eighth century that fell out of use by the time the fortification was constructed.\(^\text{51}\) Thus, 1 pinched head (F241) came from fill above bedrock; and 1 molded head (F238) and 3 body fragments (F234, F235, F236) came from sub-floor bedding layers for the late eighth century building.\(^\text{52}\)


\(^{50}\) Geva and Avigad, ―Area X-2,‖ 210.

\(^{51}\) Ibid., 211.

\(^{52}\) Loci 5443 and 5441 are two different layers in the same bedding for Floor 5441 (ibid., 210).
Area W produced only 3 figurine fragments in Iron IIB-C loci (see Table 66 in Appendix A). Area W is plagued by the same fragmentary remains as those in Area X-2. Stratum 7 remains are dated to the eighth century and consist of poorly preserved structures that predate the later Israelite Tower. One molded head (F211) came from the fragmentary remains of a wall and associated floor surface; the figurine was from the sub-floor makeup. A pillar base (F209) was recovered from a thick fill, also lacking stratigraphic relationship to the Israelite Tower (4006-4030). The excavators suggest this fill accumulated in the seventh century. Finally, 1 pillar fragment (F226) came from a foundation trench for one of the walls of the Israelite Tower and was thus dated to the seventh century.

Area A produced the largest number of figurines—16 fragments—in Iron II loci (see Table 67 in Appendix A). The area included an earlier eighth century neighborhood, destroyed by the Broad Wall that was constructed at the end of the eighth century. A few


55 Locus 3071 was uncovered in a small, deep probe to the north of the excavation trench and has no stratigraphic relationship to the Israelite Tower (Geva and Avigad, “Area W,” 145-46).

56 The fill consisted of a number of layers, including Locus 3070 above bedrock. The locus also contained 4 animal fragments, 3 animal fragments with traces of riders, 2 unidentified fragments, 1 bed fragment, and 1 piece of incised pottery. The date of the fill relies on the relative elevations rather than ceramic analysis or stratigraphic relationship (ibid., 158).

57 Ibid., 148. Locus 3117 is a foundation trench for Wall 4030.
seventh century remains also rested on the Broad Wall after it fell out of use. Many of the figurine fragments come from materials predating the Broad Wall. A series of fill layers, totaling 2.2 m and cut by the foundation trench of the Broad Wall included both Locus 161 and Locus 166; these yielded 1 pinched head (F39) and 1 molded head (F53), respectively. Excavators assume this fill comprised waste material dumped on the hill before the city wall’s construction.

Excavation also uncovered a series of walls and floors cut by the foundation trench of the Broad Wall. One molded head (F61) was uncovered in Locus 174, either a floor of crushed and beaten limestone (174a) or its sub-floor fill (174b). A torso (F143) was recovered from Locus 369, subdivided into two floors and a fill beneath. Finally, the most substantial structure of this phase is Structure 363, with two main stages. In the earlier stage the structure included a roofed cell, Locus 176, which produced 1 pillar...
base (F63). In the building’s later stage, Fill 172 yielded 1 complete figurine with molded head (F57), another molded head (F55), 1 wheel-made concave pillar base (F58), and 1 “female pillar figurine” (F59).

A few figurines were contemporaneous with the Broad Wall. One pillar (F105) and 1 wheel-made pillar (F70) were recovered to the west and outside the city wall. It appears that these fragments were found in a fill 2.0 m thick, overlaying a beaten limestone floor. The excavators suggest this floor (Locus 179C) was a road or a ramp. The road was overlaid with organic material (Locus 179B), which was in turn covered by the fill of 179A, dating from the end of the eighth century through the seventh century. Excavators claim that the material began accumulating while the wall was still in use. Because the small finds were listed under Locus 179 generally, their exact location in these three loci can only be surmised. Excavators also uncovered a floor of beaten earth and limestone that produced 1 torso (F34) dated to the end of the eighth through the seventh centuries.

---

63 The space was only 45 cm by 80 cm but contained a door jamb and a lintel that were blocked in the building’s later stage. The only other registered find is an architectural fragment (ibid). The excavators are unclear about the cell’s function but tentatively suggest a passageway beneath the structure (ibid., 76). Because the Locus refers to the entire space, it is impossible to associate the figurine fragment with the actual use of the cell or with the earth that filled up the cell after it was blocked.

64 Ibid., 78. The 95 cm fill also produced 1 stone object, 1 piece of incised pottery, 1 zoomorphic fragment, and 2 bed fragments.

65 Ibid., 63.

66 Ibid. The other objects listed in Locus 179 include 8 pieces of incised pottery, 3 stone objects, 1 piece of glass, 44 zoomorphic fragments, 5 unidentified fragments, and 2 horse/rider fragments. With the anthropomorphic fragments, Locus 179 yielded 53 figurine fragments.

67 Floor 159 also produced 1 piece of incised pottery, 1 stone object, and 1 zoomorphic fragment (ibid., 64).
Other floors and fills were dated broadly from Stratum 9 through Stratum 7. One pinched head (F18) was recovered from either Floor 122a or the fill underneath (122b).\textsuperscript{68} One molded head (F25) came from a 1.5 m fill dated to the same time span.\textsuperscript{69} Finally, 2 pillar fragments (F29, F30) were recovered from a seventh through sixth century fill found in the robber trench of the Broad Wall.\textsuperscript{70}

In summary, the Jewish Quarter excavations produced few figurines on floors, with the majority in fills or sub-floor material. The nature of the publications precludes detailed reconstruction of archaeological context and limits the ability to determine total finds in each locus. Based on the number of registered objects, figurines were frequently found with zoomorphic fragments. Less common were incised pottery, stone objects, and faunal remains.

As in the Shiloh excavations, the number of figurines was highest in areas with the most domestic remains; and with the exception of one fragment from a foundation trench, none of the figurines came from the fortifications. This suggests, once again, that figurines are not normally associated with large public works. Of further interest, large numbers of zoomorphic figurines, in addition to 2 anthropomorphic figurines, were found in the fill overlaying the Broad Wall’s adjacent street. This fill was dated from the eighth through seventh centuries. In comparison with the extra-mural street deposit from

\textsuperscript{68} Ibid., 72. A horse head figurine was also found in Locus 122.

\textsuperscript{69} Ibid. Also in the fill were faunal remains, 1 piece of incised pottery, 1 stone object, 1 bird pillar fragment, and 4 zoomorphic fragments.

\textsuperscript{70} Ibid., 80. The fill, 82 cm thick, also yielded 1 horse and rider fragment.
Kenyon’s excavations, the small percentage of anthropomorphic fragments is puzzling. Unfortunately, because the fill continued to accumulate after the city wall went out of use, it is difficult to identify which figurines may have been used on the street and which accumulated in dumps.

Geva describes the southwestern hill’s structures as “simple and of a domestic nature.” He points out the absence of “elaborate official construction,” sophisticated ashlar masonry, capitals, or rich finds such as those recovered on the southeastern hill. Thus, he concludes that the wealthy Jerusalemites established their neighborhood in the City of David not on the southwestern hill. Geva’s characterization supports the correlation between figurine design variety and the wealth of the neighborhood, as has been observed in Area G. The smaller range of figurine types from the Jewish Quarter excavations may be because of the more humble economic status of its residents.

---


72 Faust (“Settlement of Jerusalem's Western Hill,” 103, 105) attempts to argue that the proximity between the southwestern hill and the tombs from the Valley of Hinnom proves the quarter housed the mid to upper class. He also claims that palaces, public buildings, and elite residences must have existed on the southwestern hill but their remains were obliterated by later construction. As Geva points out, Faust’s hypothesis lacks any archaeological evidence. Geva further argues that the method of construction for the majority of tombs in the Valley of Hinnom is “unremarkable,” probably meaning the tombs were for people of a lower social status (Geva, “Settlement on the Southwester Hill of Jerusalem,” 147-48).
7.4 Other Jerusalem excavations

Crowfoot and Fitzgerald published a few figurine fragments from their site in the Tyropoeon Valley, including 1 pinched head, 73 3 molded heads, 74 and 3 bodies/bases (see Table 68 in Appendix A). 75 According to the excavators, they uncovered only two building levels, one spanning from the Bronze Age through the first century C.E. (Titus), and the second dating from 300 to 600 C.E. 76 All of the published molded heads and bodies belong to the “Lower Level” and the pinched head to the “Upper Level.” This “Lower Level” mainly consisted of debris from the Hellenistic period and the Iron Age, the latter including, “Jewish lamps, pebble-burnished pot-rims and hole-mouthed jars, and rude female and animal figures.” 77 In another area, excavators uncovered broken figurines mixed with stamped jar handles from the Iron Age, Persian period, and Hellenistic periods. 78


75 Kletter, Judean Pillar-Figurines, Appendix 2, 297.C.1.C (Crowfoot and Fitzgerald, Excavations in the Tyropoeon Valley, Pl. XI.2); Kletter, Judean Pillar-Figurines, Appendix 2, 299.C.3 and ibid., 298.C.2 were not published in the publication report but were reported by Holland (Holland, “Typological and Archaeological Study of Human and Animal Representations,” A.XI.43 and A.X.b.45).

76 Crowfoot and Fitzgerald, Excavations in the Tyropoeon Valley, 10.

77 Ibid., 20.

The excavators note that both the “female figurines and heads” and the “animal figurines” belong to the period of the “Jewish Monarchy.” They say that the figurines were numerous in the Lower Level, citing 4 fragments of female figures, 4 heads, and 16 animal figurine fragments.\(^79\) Thus, 3 body fragments and 1 female head are missing from the plates, raising the total number to 1 pinched head, 4 molded heads, and 4 bodies/bases.\(^80\) Like figurines from other sites, almost all these fragments bear traces of white slip;\(^81\) and the zoomorphic fragments outnumber female fragments.

Clermont Ganneau also noted 1 body fragment found on the bedrock in the Muslim Quarter.\(^82\) Another pinched head, still unpublished, was recovered from the surface of the western slope on the western hill.\(^83\) In addition to these surface finds, Amiran and Eitan found 1 pinched head fragment in their excavations in the courtyard of the Citadel in 1968-1969. The excavators uncovered a very small area, immediately above bedrock, dated to the Iron IIC. Five superimposed floors, with a 50 cm “ash pit” in the top floor, were excavated. The text reports pottery from the seventh century and animal figurines in these loci; however, the associated plate also shows 1 pinched human

---

\(79\) Ibid., 66.

\(80\) Thus, at least 1 head and 1 body fragment are missing from both Kletter and Holland.


\(82\) Kletter, *Judean Pillar-Figurines*, Addenda to Appendix 2, 835.C.2. See also Charles Clermont-Ganneau, *Archaeological Researches in Palestine during the Years 1873-1874: Vol. 1* (trans. Aubrey Stewart; London: Committee of the Palestine Exploration Fund, 1899), 82. Based on the drawing, which does not show any breaks on the breasts, the hands do not appear to be holding the breasts.

\(83\) Kletter, *Judean Pillar-Figurines*, Addenda to Appendix 2, 799.A.2? Kletter describes the figurine as having a flattened upper part with protrusions at the sides.
head, not mentioned in the text. Presumably it is from the same set of loci.\textsuperscript{84} No further locus descriptions are given; so it remains unclear whether the head and the zoomorphic fragments were found in the same loci, or whether they came from one of the floors or the ash pit. Later excavations in the Citadel by Sivan and Solar also uncovered a series of eighth through seventh century walls built on top of the stone quarry; but the excavators did not mention any figurines, nor did they excavate a large enough area to interpret the remains.\textsuperscript{85}

Not far from the Citadel, Lux excavated in the Muristan area of the Christian Quarter and uncovered 3 pinched heads,\textsuperscript{86} along with \textit{lmlk} stamped handles, rosette handles, and Iron II pottery. All finds came from a large fill layer dating from the seventh century B.C.E to the first century C.E.\textsuperscript{87} Other figurine remains come from Broshi’s excavations of the Chapel of St. Vartan in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre.\textsuperscript{88} A portion of the excavation was undertaken by the Patriarchate and, in the process, a number of


\textsuperscript{87} Ibid., 191-92.

\textsuperscript{88} Magen Broshi, “Iron Age Remains in the Chapel of St. Vartan in the Church of the Holy Sepulcher,” in \textit{Ancient Jerusalem Revealed} (ed. Hillel Geva; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1994), 82-83.
Iron II remains were dumped with the excavated earth. These include 1 “bird-head” figurine fragment (a simple pinched head) and 3 zoomorphic fragments, along with pottery. Broshi and Barkay conclude that the remains consist of a resettled Iron Age quarry.

A number of figurines have been found on Mount Zion. Kletter lists 2 body fragments from IAA excavations at the site. More significantly, Kletter reports that several figurine fragments come from Broshi’s excavations there: 3 pinched heads, 4 molded heads, and 28 body/base fragments. Kletter also cites a list of finds included in Gabriel Barkay’s unpublished dissertation. The present author was given permission to view several of the figurine fragments from Broshi’s excavation, as well as an unpublished catalogue of figurine finds. The number of molded heads in Kletter’s list


90 Ibid., 117-18.


92 Ibid., 804.A-806.A.

93 Ibid., 800.B-802.B.

94 Ibid., 807-834.C.

95 See Gabriel Barkay, “Northern and Western Jerusalem in the End of the Iron Age,” (Ph.D. diss., Tel Aviv University, 1985), 208.

can be raised to 5. The 3 pinched heads can be verified; though 1 pinched head also has a turban and long sidelocks, and one may have included a cap. Finally, 12 body fragments were examined. The hands of all of them were on or under the breasts, and the breasts range in size. The bodies themselves also range in size, with one or two very small examples.

Unfortunately, almost none of the original contexts were preserved; and given the large chronological range at the site, it is difficult to establish whether the figurines came from the Iron Age extra-mural settlement or from fills of the later periods. Broshi and Gibson claim that Iron Age remains, dated to the eighth through the sixth centuries, include stone quarries, three burial caves (two of which were robbed), an agricultural terrace with a small watchtower, and an “industrial” building. Broshi and Gibson posit an extra-mural suburb dating to the seventh through sixth centuries. As for the industrial building, it consisted of six rooms with plastered floors, fire-pits, raised

97 Ibid., Reg. numbers 6041/1; 122/1; 2002/1; 207/2; and one surface find. Other than the surface finds, which were listed as “in the area of the industrial building,” none of the contexts for the other figurines were listed.

98 Ibid., Reg. 782/1, a pinched head with turban and long sidelocks; 2008/1 shows and indentation in the back of the head where a cap may have been; 1153/1, a simple pinched head.

99 Ibid., Reg. numbers 2034/1, 1143/1, 1074/1, 868/1 are fairly complete pillar figurines without heads. Numbers 1104/10, 2027, 609/17, 79/1, 807, 408/1, 76/1 (a possible hollow fragment), and 1908/1 were all fragments from the middle part of the body.

100 Magen Broshi and Shimon Gibson, “Excavations along the Western and Southern Walls of the Old City of Jerusalem,” in Ancient Jerusalem Revealed (ed. Hillel Geva; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1994), 147.

101 Ibid., 150.
plastered platforms, and a rectangular bath and drains.\textsuperscript{102} Broshi states that “typical Israelite remains” were uncovered in almost every area where the excavation reached bedrock, noting the presence of restorable pottery and “human and animal figurines.”\textsuperscript{103}

Despite Broshi’s statement, all the figurines may not have come from these Iron II levels. At least 2 fragments are labeled surface finds in the unpublished catalogue. Further, the site yielded results similar to the Kenyon/Tushingham excavations in the Armenian Quarter, producing a “network of consolidation walls with massive earth fills between them which formed a raised platform for Herod’s palace.”\textsuperscript{104} As noted in Chapter 4, Tushingham’s excavations yielded at least 16 anthropomorphic fragments, most of them from Hellenistic or Roman construction fills. These are probably the same as the fills encountered by Lux in Muristan. Thus, some of the figurines from Broshi’s excavations probably originated in the same seventh century material used for later monumental building projects.

Finally, a few figurines have been found in tomb contexts (see below). Broshi has argued that Jerusalem’s limits in the Iron II were marked by the surrounding cemeteries. These include the tombs on the slopes of Mount Zion descending to the Hinnom Valley, the Mamilla tombs, and tombs from Suleiman Street, the Garden Tomb, and St. Étienne’s

\textsuperscript{102} Ibid.


\textsuperscript{104} Broshi and Gibson, “Excavations Along the Western and Southern Walls,” 152.
in the north of the city.\textsuperscript{105} To these tombs can be added the burial caves recorded by David Ussishkin in the village of Silwan.\textsuperscript{106}

None of the figurines listed from the Temple Mount excavations came from the cemeteries, and no figurines were listed in the two robbed tombs recorded by Broshi on the slope of Mount Zion. Further, Kloner and Davis do not report any figurines from the three burial caves discovered when a retaining wall on the western slope of Mount Zion was dismantled.\textsuperscript{107} Two body fragments were recorded in relation to other Mount Zion tombs.

To the north of the city, no figurines were noted in Cave Complex I from the St. Étienne Monastery,\textsuperscript{108} nor were any recovered from Complex II.\textsuperscript{109} Two more burial caves were excavated in 1937 north of the Damascus Gate, on present-day Sultan

\textsuperscript{105} Broshi, “Iron Age Remains in the Chapel of St. Vartan,” 84.

\textsuperscript{106} David Ussishkin, The Village of Silwan: The Necropolis from the Period of the Judean Kingdom (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society and Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi, 1993). These tombs were incorporated into the village of Siloam, and in many cases were used as parts of the modern houses. Ussishkin, whose investigation was based entirely on architectural features because no original deposits remained in the tombs, demonstrates that the caves had been used at least as early as the nineteenth century (ibid., 1-2).

\textsuperscript{107} Amos Kloner and David Davis, “A Burial Cave of the Late First Temple Period on the Slope of Mount Zion,” in Ancient Jerusalem Revealed (ed. Hillel Geva; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1994), 107-9. Admittedly, two of the caves were disturbed by later use; but the third preserved the remains of five burials, \textit{in situ}, as well as the remains of previous inhabitants. A number of burial goods and pottery came from this cave, but no figurines are noted.

\textsuperscript{108} Gabriel Barkay, Amos Kloner, and Amihai Mazar, “The Northern Necropolis of Jerusalem during the First Temple Period,” in Ancient Jerusalem Revealed (ed. Hillel Geva; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1994), 119-20. The cave was initially “excavated” after its discovery in 1885, so any remains may have been lost.

\textsuperscript{109} Barkay, Kloner, and Mazar, “Northern Necropolis,” 122. Again, the finds could have been lost either once the cave was initially discovered, or they could have been disturbed by later use during the Byzantine period.
Suleiman Street; but although excavators recorded pottery dating from the eighth through the seventh centuries, as well as an alabaster bottle, no figurines were noted.\textsuperscript{110} Furthermore, none of the other burial caves in this area produced figurine remains. Of course it must be remembered that many of these tombs have been disturbed throughout their history.\textsuperscript{111}

Unlike the tombs north of Jerusalem, at least two of the many tombs excavated in Mamilla were undisturbed.\textsuperscript{112} According to Kletter, 4 figurine fragments were recovered from the Mamilla complex. With the exception of 1 molded head found in the remains of the Byzantine bath,\textsuperscript{113} only body fragments—3 of them—came from Mamilla tombs. One body fragment was published by Amiran, when two caves were found in the area in 1927 and 1935.\textsuperscript{114} The other 2 body fragments come from the recent excavations of Tomb 5. Kletter says they were found on the ―floor of the central collection area.‖\textsuperscript{115} Reich dates Tomb 5 to the eighth century, suggesting it was abandoned during the early part of the seventh century.\textsuperscript{116} He also notes that the ―inferior‖ level of workmanship, the paucity of

\textsuperscript{110} Ibid., 124-25.

\textsuperscript{111} Ibid., 126.

\textsuperscript{112} Ronny Reich, ―The Ancient Burial Ground in Mamilla Neighborhood, Jerusalem,‖ in \textit{Ancient Jerusalem Revealed} (ed. Hillel Geva; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1994), 111-12.

\textsuperscript{113} Kletter, \textit{Judean Pillar-Figurines}, Appendix 2, 473.B.2-3.A?.

\textsuperscript{114} Ibid., 469.C.1.

\textsuperscript{115} Ibid., 467.C.1, 468.C.1.

\textsuperscript{116} Reich, ―Ancient Burial Ground in Mamilla,‖ 115. Reich does not mention any objects in the tomb other than black juglets and brown clay juglets. Thus, the context data presented here are taken from Kletter’s publication.
jewelry, and the scarcity of objects, other than pottery; suggest these tombs belonged to the lower classes of Jerusalem.\footnote{117}

By far the largest number of figurines comes from the tombs at Ketef Hinnom. These include 1 pinched head with turban,\footnote{118} 2 molded heads,\footnote{119} and 6 body/base fragments.\footnote{120} The site includes seven burial caves dating to the Iron Age II-III, though all the tombs were damaged by later quarrying.\footnote{121} Barkay admits that most of the original contents of these caves had been removed in antiquity. Further, most Iron Age objects were found “jumbled together” with later objects.\footnote{122}

Barkay describes the objects from the best preserved context, the repository of Chamber 25 in Cave 24; but he does not mention any figurines in the assemblage.\footnote{123} Thus, one must assume that all of the figurines were recovered from these other “jumbled contexts.” Kletter’s locus data seem to confirm this assumption. For example, Kletter’s fragment 792.A.2.A was found in “Tomb 34,” a cave used from the First Temple period

\footnotesize

\footnote{117} Ibid., 113.
\footnote{118} Kletter, Judean Pillar-Figurines, Addenda to Appendix 2, 792.A.2
\footnote{119} Ibid., 790.B.2-4?, 791.B.3-4
\footnote{120} Ibid., 793.C-798.C.
\footnote{122} Barkay, “Excavations at Ketef Hinnom,” 95-96.
\footnote{123} Ibid., 95-105.
into the Late Roman period.\textsuperscript{124} The ceilings of the Iron II-III tombs were almost totally missing, making it is impossible to determine whether the figurines were part of the original deposition with the deceased or from later activity.\textsuperscript{125}

Thus, from all the burial caves uncovered in the Jerusalem area only 11 figurines can be attributed to burial loci. Of those, 2 were in Mt. Zion, 2 were in Tomb 5 at Mamilla, and a third was found in a Mamilla tomb in 1920-1930. Six were associated with Ketef Hinnom but may have fallen into the caves anytime from the Persian period through the modern era. In comparison with the number of figurines found in the City of David excavations (both Shiloh and Kenyon), Benjamin Mazar’s excavations, the Mt. Zion excavations, and the Jewish Quarter excavations, this small number of figurines does not support any significant interpretation. Once again, the absence of figurines could have resulted from tomb robbing or disturbance in antiquity. Nevertheless, the evidence that remains from undisturbed tomb assemblages does not suggest that pillar figurines in Jerusalem were commonly interred with the dead or used in tomb contexts.

7.4.1 Recent excavations

In her most recent excavations, Eilat Mazar recovered ca. 42 figurines from Area G of Shiloh’s excavations. These include 2 pinched heads, 3 molded heads, 11 bodies, 2

\textsuperscript{124} Ibid., 91. Compare with Kletter, \textit{Judean Pillar-Figurines}, Addenda to Appendix 2, 792.A.2.A. It is assumed that Kletters “Tomb 34” is equivalent to Barkay’s “Cave 34.”

\textsuperscript{125} On the ceilings, see Barkay (“Excavations at Ketef Hinnom,” 93).
horse and rider fragments, and 24 zoomorphic fragments. The excavation uncovered six layers of Iron Age fill/dump above Iron IIC walls. Above these Level 4 fills were the Level 5 fills dated to the exilic and Persian periods (sixth-fifth centuries). Most figurines come from Level 4. Because the figurines were found in fill or dump loci containing thousands of objects, their context cannot aid in the interpretation of figurine function. Nevertheless, because the fill layers were immediately covered by Exilic and Persian layers, it is safe to assume that the presence of Iron II figurines resulted from activity that took place in Area G, rather than post-occupational dumping. They may have been deposited as part of the natural midden from daily activity in Area G, or in some activity related to the destruction of the city; but, in either case, they were not transported to their excavated location from other parts of the city.126

Shlomit Weksler-Bdotlah also uncovered a number of figurines in the northwestern part of the Western Wall plaza. The earliest activity there entailed quarrying, which was sealed by earthen fills dated from the eighth through the sixth centuries. The next level consisted of seventh century buildings and an alleyway, including one large building with a” four-room house” plan. It was abandoned before the end of the Iron IIC. After the destruction of Jerusalem, the building was filled with earthen debris from higher up the slope of the southwestern hill. The debris was significant, filling the entire building to the top of its 5.0 m walls. Thus, it is not surprising that the debris includes ca. 450 fragments of female and animal figurines in

126 Personal communication with the excavator and included with her approval.
addition to Hebrew seals, graffiti, *lmlk* jar handles, concentric circle jar handles, a scarab, and local pottery.\(^{127}\) While these figurines will improve general knowledge of iconographic variability, they add little to the investigation of context and function.

### 7.5 Jerusalem figurines in regional context

#### 7.5.1 Mevesseret and Moza

A number of sites in the hill country have also produced figurines. Five, in particular, represent sites that have some agricultural or administrative connection with Jerusalem.\(^ {128}\) The site of Mevesseret has already been discussed in Chapter 6. It yielded 2 pillar fragments and 1 broken torso without breasts or arms. The excavator claims to have identified kiln debris from the eighth through seventh centuries. It has also been suggested that Mevesseret existed, in part, to protect the larger Moza settlement nearby.\(^ {129}\)

---

127 Shlomit Weksler-Bdolah et al., “Jerusalem, The Western Wall Plaza Excavations, 2005-2009,” *Hadashot Arkheologiyot* 121 (2009), n.p. [Cited 24 May 2011]. Online: [http://www.hadashot-esi.org.il/report_detail_eng.asp?id=1219&mag_id=115](http://www.hadashot-esi.org.il/report_detail_eng.asp?id=1219&mag_id=115). According to personal communication with the excavator, a large number of these figurines are anthropomorphic; but no final analysis had been completed at the time of correspondence. If the excavation is consistent with the other material from the southwestern hill, it is reasonable to expect at least 75\% of these figurines are zoomorphic.

128 De Groot suggests that the settlements surrounding Jerusalem are defined by their relationship to the capital city, specifically mentioning Khirbet el-Burg (Ramot), Moza, Ramat Rachel, and Gibeon. See de Groot and Bernick Greenberg, *Excavations at the City of David*, 19. Further, Lipschits, Sergi, and Koch (“Royal Judahite Jar Handles, 19-20) argue that the distribution of *lmlk* stamp handles proves an administrative relationship existed between Jerusalem, Ramat, Rahel, Gibeon, and Mizpah, particularly in the seventh century.

Excavations in the 1990s at the site of Moza, near present day Mevasseret Zion, yielded 5 female pillar figurine fragments, including 2 molded heads, 1 pinched head and bust, and 2 body fragments, in addition to 6 horses and riders, 34 solid quadrupeds, 1 solid bird, 7 hollow zoomorphic figurines, and 7 miscellaneous fragments. Another handmade body was retrieved from the surface and was published in Kletter’s catalogue (See Table 69 in Appendix A).

Unlike the Jerusalem figurines, none of the female fragments were found in loci with other figurine types. Of the 5 with known provenience, 2 came from later levels, and 1 came from a deep probe lacking stratigraphy. The remaining pinched head with bust (B10496) and body (B32979) were both dated to the seventh through the beginning of the sixth centuries. Unfortunately, the head came from one layer of a combined fill locus, ca. 44 cm thick in Area A. No other remains were listed in the locus chart, though the text describes a “construction fill” for the “Pavement Structure” containing material from the Neolithic through the seventh-sixth centuries.

---

130 B10090 (Peterson-Solimany and Kletter, “Iron Age Clay Figurines,” 116, Fig. 4.1:1) and B60019 (Peterson-Solimany and Kletter, “Iron Age Clay Figurines,” 122, Fig.4.3:60).
131 B10496 (ibid., 118, Fig. 4.1:2).
132 B2014/A (ibid., 118, Fig. 4.1:4) and B32979 (ibid., 18, Fig. 4.1:3).
133 Kletter, Judean Pillar-Figurines, Appendix 2, 474.C.2.
The second figurine was found in a pit along with an incised handle, a bone/ivory fragment, and three pieces of flint. The pit is not discussed in the text, but its location in Square K-17 indicates it stands outside the main building of this phase in Area B. The main building (Building 500) is interpreted as a public building with a cultic function. Similar to the “Cultic Shrine” in Shiloh’s Pavement Structure, the only figurines in the building itself are zoomorphic.\(^{135}\)

The excavators describe Moza as a “provincial administrative settlement” charged with marketing agricultural produce to the inhabitants of Jerusalem.\(^ {136}\) The 37 silo pits associated with grain storage and the 523 holemouth jars of the eighth through sixth centuries support this interpretation.\(^ {137}\) Given the relative lack of sickle blades and stone tools as well as the large amount of storage space, the excavators conclude that Moza was not producing grain for its own consumption but was an administrative re-distribution center for Jerusalem.\(^ {138}\)

7.5.2 Ramot

Not far from Moza, the site of Ramot in the northern part of modern Ramot was excavated as a salvage operation. The site is notable for its large number of wine storage

\(^{135}\) Ibid., 50-54.


\(^{137}\) Ibid., 217-20.

\(^{138}\) Ibid., 224.
facilities. Kletter lists 12 figurine fragments in his catalogue from Ramot including, 1 pinched head, 1 molded head, and 10 bodies/bases (see Table 70 in Appendix A). According to the excavator, the site was badly damaged by military activity but has yielded Mamluk, Medieval, Persian, Iron and Middle Bronze remains. The limited excavations revealed Iron and Persian materials; and the Iron levels begin in the late ninth or early eighth century. Remains consisted of one full building and parts of many others, bell-shaped cisterns with Iron Age debris, wine presses, and over twenty wine storage areas. The site was especially prominent in the eighth and seventh centuries and produced anthropomorphic figurines, many zoomorphic figurines, some rosette handles, and a dozen or more lmlk handles.

The locus data for 3 figurines Kletter associated with this site could not be confirmed. Context data was available for a number of other figurines that he connects with this site. According to the excavator, one pinched head was found in a cistern, along with zoomorphic fragments and a hammerstone; and, not far away, 2 base fragments came from a possible floor of an eroded building along with pottery, 2 zoomorphic figurines, 1 grinding stone, and 1 stone weight. A base fragment was found in another cistern with pottery and bones. The molded head came from “accumulation” above a


“living surface” with minimal pottery. Three of the body/base fragments were associated with the best preserved building; one came from fill along with pottery, and 2 were found in the courtyard or “open space.” Finally, 1 base was found in the area of the “winery;” but it was in “late accumulation” partly covering one of the cisterns.

Thus, figurines were found dispersed throughout the area, in cisterns, fills, and courtyards along with pottery, bones, and zoomorphic fragments. Only one of the figurines came from the “wine production” area and it was in a later context. The majority of figurines came from the fragmentary remains of domestic structures.

7.5.3 Ramat Rachel

Ramat Rachel is located on the south border of modern Jerusalem, adjacent to Kibbutz Ramat Rachel. Excavated from 1958-1962 by Aharoni, the site was interpreted as a Judean royal compound. More recently researchers from the University of Tel Aviv have been excavating several areas of the site. Kletter reports 11 figurines from Ramat Rachel, including 5 pinched head figurines, 2 molded head figurines, and 4 bodies. An additional pinched head with beard and pointed cap was recorded in Holland’s typology (see Table 71 in Appendix A). Of Kletter’s figurines, 3 were not published in Aharoni’s reports on the site and thus have no context information. These include 1 handmade head and 2 body fragments. Further, reexamination of Aharoni’s locus cards by the

143 Kletter, Judean Pillar-Figurines, Addenda to Appendix 2, 586.A.1.A is the pinched head and 587.C.2 and 588.C.2 are the body fragments.
University of Tel Aviv excavations reveals a total of 83 figurines from the site, though most cards do not designate between zoomorphic or anthropomorphic styles (see Table 72 in Appendix A).\textsuperscript{144}

Eight of the published figurines can be assigned generally to a storeroom or a nearby “courtyard” in the site’s citadel. The storeroom was uncovered in a building close to the north casemate wall.\textsuperscript{145} This room was excavated in two different seasons. The original 10 m by 3 m hall was called Locus 329 and produced a large amount of pottery, as well as figurines.\textsuperscript{146} According to Kletter, 3 fragments were uncovered in this room; but Aharoni places 2 of these in Locus 340, elsewhere described as “courtyard 340” to the east of Storeroom 329.\textsuperscript{147}

Subsequently, Hall 329 was found to be the western part of a larger room whose eastern half was designated Locus 477. Locus 477 yielded fragments of another 200

\textsuperscript{144} Included by permission of Yuval Gadot. The list includes at least 21 figurines labeled “animal” figurines, but the remaining 62 fragments may be either animals or humans. A yet unpublished catalogue completed by Raz Kletter is the result of a further analysis of the figurine corpus and confirms that all the anthropomorphic fragments from Aharoni’s excavations were already published either in the two volume excavation report or in Kletter’s earlier catalogue. See Raz Kletter and Katri Saarelainen, “Iron Age Figurines from Aharoni’s Excavations at Ramat Rahel,” forthcoming. Included by permission from Oded Lipschitz.


bowls along with other pottery types. This side of the room also produced another 5 fragments of anthropomorphic figurines in addition to more zoomorphic fragments and a few lmlk seals. The locus cards note a total of 17 figurines.

Fragments of zoomorphic figurines were also uncovered in Locus 297, described as the southern part of Locus 329, “under the floor.” In addition to 5 lmlk handles with two wings and 2 more handles with incised circles, the locus cards note 7 figurines. Thus, in total, the loci in this space produced ca. 34 figurine fragments, 41% of the known figurines from Aharoni’s excavations. At least 6 were anthropomorphic and the rest appear to be zoomorphic.

The total space was originally interpreted as one room in a larger storage building heterogeneously constructed of undressed stones. Based on the presence of imported forms, Aharoni concludes that the room contained “household” utensils from the royal household, primarily dated to 608-587 B.C.E. The one remaining figurine, a pinched


149 Aharoni, Excavations at Ramat Rachel: Seasons 1959 and 1960, 41.

150 The other 49 figurines come from 31 different loci. No other single area produced the same concentration of figurines.


152 Ibid., 29-30. For more on the validity of Aharoni’s interpretation see Chapter 4 comments on the characterization of the Cave I assemblage by Eshel.
head and torso holding a disc, came from a threshold at the entrance of the “secret
passage” in the northern casemate wall of the citadel.\textsuperscript{153} This passage was not far from
Store Room 329/477.\textsuperscript{154}

Renewed excavation at the site by the University of Tel Aviv drastically alters
Aharoni’s interpretation of the site plan, but the date of the relevant construction remains
the end of the Iron Age.\textsuperscript{155} Personal communication with the excavator, Yuval Gadot,
revealed that only a few fragments of anthropomorphic figurines have been recovered in
the new excavations, offering little change from the published materials. Thus, the date of
the site and its relationship to figurine form is still significant. Similar to the figurine
corpus from Jerusalem, pinched heads are predominate in a context that is dated to the
end of the seventh century through the sixth century. Furthermore, the pinched heads
from Ramat Rachel show a large degree of variety, with only 2 simple pinched heads,\textsuperscript{156}
1 head with turban,\textsuperscript{157} 1 pinched head holding a disc or drum,\textsuperscript{158} 1 head with incised eyes

\textsuperscript{153} Aharoni, \textit{Excavations at Ramat Rachel: Seasons 1959 and 1960}, 11-12.

Rachel: Seasons 1959 and 1960}, Pl. 5).


\textsuperscript{156} Kletter, \textit{Judean Pillar-Figurines}, Addenda to Appendix 2, 586.A.1.A; Appendix 2, 116.A?.1.A.

\textsuperscript{157} Ibid., 117.A.2.A.

\textsuperscript{158} Ibid., 188.A+.1.Ap.
and a spiral incision around the body,\textsuperscript{159} and 1 pinched head with beard and cap.\textsuperscript{160} Aharoni’s excavation published only 2 molded heads.\textsuperscript{161}

The current excavators have doubts about whether the assemblage in 477/329 is primary, but no major changes were made to the plan of the Northern Building in which the room is situated.\textsuperscript{162} If Aharoni’s interpretation of the Store Room stands, it is yet another storage context where figurines are mixed with a large number of pottery vessels. Furthermore, figurines (both anthropomorphic and zoomorphic) associated with this building represent almost half of the entire known figurine count from the larger site. Thus, the assemblage is not entirely unlike that of Cave I, though the Store Room contained a much smaller number of vessels than did Cave I. Furthermore, if the buildings at Ramat Rachel should be connected with the Judean monarchy, the site provides further proof that figurines, both anthropomorphic and zoomorphic, were used by those in positions of power.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{159} Ibid., 119.Ac.1.C.
\item \textsuperscript{160} Holland, “Typological and Archaeological Study of Human and Animal Representations,” B.I.c.2; not in Kletter.
\item \textsuperscript{161} Kletter, \textit{Judean Pillar-Figurines}, Appendix 2, 121.B.3.A, 120.B.3.A.
\item \textsuperscript{162} Communication with Yuval Gadot, July 16, 2007. Gadot noted that many of the artifacts associated with the space were found in elevations lower than Aharoni’s “floor,” casting doubt on whether Aharoni actually found the floor of the storeroom. Gadot also pointed out that only restorable vessels were published, and thus the relative percentages of pottery types within the room could change with the publication of broken sherds. Although Gadot noted difficulties with Aharoni’s plans for the Western and Southeastern Buildings in the citadel, the plans of the Northern Building, of which Room 477/329 is a part, appears to be correct.
\end{itemize}
7.5.4 Gibeon

Located ca. 10 km north of the center of Jerusalem, Gibeon has an enormous public pool near the city wall, two large industrial complexes for the production and storage of wine, a residential quarter, and tombs. Similar to Moza and Ramot, none of the figurine finds were associated with the industrial or storage complexes, despite the fact that these complexes cover a large area and contained many other artifacts. Nor were any anthropomorphic figurines discovered in the actual residential neighborhood. Like the Jerusalem corpus, figurines were not uncovered in any of the tombs, despite the fact that a number of tombs still contained significant remains. The site’s copious figurine finds actually came from the fill of the monumental pool.

Following Holland’s figurine catalogue, Kletter lists 27 fragments of anthropomorphic figurines at Gibeon, all from the great pool. Pritchard’s report on the water system contradicts this number. Although the plates depict 27 figurines, the pool actually produced 54 fragments. These include 14 pinched heads, 8 molded heads, 1 exceptional head, and 31 bodies. Thus, Kletter’s total count for Gibeon is missing 27 fragments (see Table 73 in Appendix A).

163 Pritchard, *Gibeon*, 82-98.
164 Ibid., 104-7.
165 Ibid., 125.
Most of the published pinched heads are simple; but 2 wear a kind of cap with tassels, and the “exceptional” one has a protrusion of clay at the back of the head. The molded heads are of the regular variety. Finally, the published bodies all appear to be the normal types, although one of the pinched heads with a torso may be holding a disc. Pritchard also notes that 70 zoomorphic figurines came from the pool, many from the same levels as the majority of figurines and inscribed jar handles.

Although the archaeological context is complicated for such a large deposit, Pritchard postulates that the layers of refuse accumulated over time, beginning as early as the eighth century. Interestingly, almost all of the heads in the lowest levels are mold-made; and the lowest pinched head does not have the typical female pillar body but is


169 Holland did think one body was hollow; but Kletter does not separate the figurine into his “hollow” category, and Pritchard’s report does not describe the figurine as hollow (Holland, “Typological and Archaeological Study of Human and Animal Representations,” B.VII.2/Kletter, Judean Pillar-Figurines, Addenda to Appendix 2, 579.C.2) (Pritchard, Water System, Pl. 39:285).

170 Pritchard (ibid., 16) says the figurine is holding a cake of bread, disc, or tambourine. Holland did not separate the figurine into his “figurines with disc” category, and the picture is difficult to interpret (Holland, “Typological and Archaeological Study of Human and Animal Representations,” A.I.a.10/Kletter, Judean Pillar-Figurines, Appendix 2, 45.A+1.A) (Pritchard, Water System, Pl. 41:557).

171 Ibid., 117-18.

172 Ibid., 22-23.

173 Kletter, Judean Pillar-Figurines, Appendix 2, 60.B at 16.50-17.50 m, 56.B.1-2.A at 10.30-10.70 m, and 55.B.1-2.A at 9.00-9.80 m. Note that most of the figurine fragments lack elevation data. The argument is based on the remains that do contain this data.
holding an object. All of these figurines are below the level to which 54 of the 56 inscribed Gibeon jar handles are attributed (4.60-7.60 m). Above this level are 9 handmade heads, including one of the heads wearing a cap, but only 4 molded heads. Further, the capped head and another pinched head are in the highest levels of the fill (4.45-5.00 m). Pritchard estimates that the pool was already filled by the sixth century, if not the late seventh century. In combination with the data in Jerusalem, the fill may further confirm the fact that molded heads occurred earlier in the record, as did pinched heads without female pillar bodies, and that pinched heads were more popular late in the eighth and the seventh centuries.

Pritchard notes that the fill resulted from centuries of dumping by the inhabitants. Evidence for domestic debris includes cooking utensils, plates, jars, juglets, clothing pins, cosmetic applicators, and tools, as well as weaving implements, private seals, and weights. The large number of Gibeon storage jars found in the pool attests to its use as a dump for the industrial quarters as well. Finally, the curious absence of anthropomorphic figurines in the domestic structures may further suggest that the figurines were not used in primary or permanent shrines in the homes. Rather, two options remain. Either they were used in the houses and disposed of along with other

---

177 Ibid., 114-15, 118-19.
178 Ibid., 47-50.
household garbage, or the figurine rituals involved disposal of the figurines in the public watersystem/dump.

7.5.5 Tell en Nasbeh

Located ca. 12 km northwest of Jerusalem, Tell en Nasbeh is a large walled settlement with a number of domestic structures and industrial installations, particularly cisterns/silos. According to Kletter, the site produced ca. 36 pinched heads, 31 molded heads, 66 bodies, and 23 bases. Unfortunately, Kletter misread the excavation report, inflating his total by ca. 29 body fragments. Once those 29 fragments are subtracted, Kletter’s total is 128 (see Table 74 in Appendix A). Based upon new data from the Badè Museum’s collection of Nasbeh artifacts, the number of heads remains consistent; but the number of bodies and bases change. The new data entail ca. 22 torsos, 3 torsos plus bases, and 13 base fragments, bringing the total to 31 partial torsos, 6 torsos with bases, and 36 base fragments, or 74 bodies/bases total (see Table 75 in Appendix A). Thus, the overall figurine count reaches ca. 141 pieces. The only site with a higher number of fragments is Jerusalem itself.

179 McCowan, *Tell en-Nasbeh*, 246. Despite the fact that the total number is listed as ca. “120,” Kletter still adds scores more figurines to the count (McCowan, *Tell en-Nasbeh*, 245). This appears to be due to a misreading of the sentence in McCowan’s Appendix A, “Human Torsos Pedestal Bases; Two compete and 39 fragmentary specimens, fairly whole but for the missing head, 29 of chest only.” The sentence indicates that of 41 body fragments, 29 were of the chest only. Kletter understood the 29 to refer to an additional 29 figurines instead and added these to the number he derived from the published pictures and Zorn’s dissertation (“Tell en Nasbeh: A Reevaluation”). In light of the Badè Museum collection (see below) and the published appendix, the 120 total did not appear to include bases, which raise the total number of figurines at the site.
Based on the material in Kletter’s catalogue and Zorn’s dissertation (see below), ca. 70 figurines can be associated with known loci; and only one is later than the Persian period. Another 17 have very general area information, though they are not associated with a given structure. Seven more are listed as surface finds, including 6 base fragments. In fact, the majority of unprovenienced fragments are body and base fragments.

An unpublished catalogue of the Tell en Nasbeh figurines furnished to the present author by the Badè Museum includes area or locus information for another 6 pinched head fragments, leaving 4 pinched heads from Kletter’s list without any context. Neither of the 2 molded heads included in the Badè catalogue have context information, though they may be associated with 2 molded heads reported in the original publications not included in Kletter or Holland. Additionally, the Badè catalogue includes the locus or area for 1 torso with base, 15 torsos, and 12 bases. In sum the Badè Museum information adds locus contexts for 24 fragments and area contexts for 9 fragments, bringing the total to 94 fragments with locus information and 26 fragments with area information.

Of the figurines with locus information, at least 33 different building are represented, along with 8 silos/cisterns not associated with a building, 1 cave and 1

---

180 Included by permission from the Badè Museum of Biblical Archaeology at the Pacific School of Religion in Berkeley, California.

181 Building 73.02 (ibid., 408-9, 411); Building 74.02 (ibid., 428-49); Building 74.03 (ibid., 429-31); Building 74.06 (ibid., 285, 437, 439); Building 90.04 (ibid., 475, 478); Building 93.02 (ibid., 492-94); Building 93.03 (ibid., 165, 501-3); Building 109.01 (ibid., 532-34); Building 124.01 (ibid., 558-61); Building 124.02? (ibid., 561-62); Building 125.03 (ibid., 572-74); Building 125.04 (ibid., 228, 574-77); Building 125.05 (ibid., 577-79); Building 126.01 (ibid., 586-87); Building 127.05? (ibid., 609); Building 141.01 (ibid., 621-25); Building 141.03 (ibid., 628-31); Building 141.04 or 141.05 (ibid., 632-36); Building 142.01 (ibid., 644-49); Building 142.03 (ibid., 651-53); Building 142.04 (ibid., 653-56); Building 142.06 (ibid., 659-61); Building 142.09 (ibid., 665-66); Building 145.02 (ibid., 165, 710-14); Building 159.02
cave tomb (secondary), and 5 rooms/spaces with unclear plans (see Table 76 in Appendix A). At least another 5 fragments were found in dumps. In the majority of cases (45 loci), only 1 figurine was found per structure (including buildings and isolated cisterns). In another 10 cases, 2-3 figurines were uncovered per structure; and only a handful of structures contained 4 to 8 fragments. In other words, only 8 loci contained more than one anthropomorphic fragment. Thus, the vast majority of figurines were found individually rather than in groups, whether in a room, cistern/silo, or building.

At least half of the buildings are identified as “probable domestic” structures. Additionally, another 11 buildings have an “industrial” function in addition to possible domestic activity. Thus, unlike the industrial grain storage at Moza or the wine production facilities at Ramot and Gibeon, where figurines were absent, many of the

---

182 Cistern 78 (ibid., 917, 919); Cistern 216 (ibid., 445, 1439), Cistern 152 (ibid., 281, 886-88); Cistern 153 (ibid., 886-66); Cistern 128 (ibid., 902, 906, 1433); Silo/Cistern 92 (ibid., 917-19); Silo 249 (ibid., 488); Silo 145 (ibid., 886-88). In addition to these loci, the Badè list included Cistern 331 with 1 pinched head, Cistern 304 with 1 pinched head, Cistern 15 with 1 torso, and Cistern 1 with 1 torso.

183 Cave Tomb 5 or 6 produced one molded head, not mentioned in either Kletter or Holland (McCowan, Tell en-Nasbeh, 5). The majority of the burial contents were dated to the Early Bronze Age, making the figurines’ presence unusual. McCowan notes, later, that the ceiling of the tomb was cut by Silo 3 from the Iron I-II and that the tombs had been disturbed by grave robbers (ibid., 68).

184 Room 132 (Zorn, “Tell en Nasbeh: A Reevaluation,” 166, 416-17); Room Group or Road 161, 163, and 165 (ibid., 486-87); Room or Road 146 (ibid., 484, 486); Room 551 (ibid., 148-50, 1575); Space/Plaza? between Building 145.01 and the inner gate building 145.01 (ibid., 714, 1499). A few more fragments were found in rooms as listed on the Badè register including 1 torso in Room 402, 1 base in Room 360, 1 upper torso in Room 453, 1 torso in Room 432, and 1 pinched head in Room 271. None of these rooms are in the same structures already listed with figurines.
agricultural production spaces contained anthropomorphic fragments at Nasbeh. Because several of these were also domestic units, it is difficult to determine whether the figurines resulted from agricultural/industrial activities or regular domestic activities. It must be concluded that the differences between the sites are related to the degree to which people lived and worked in the same spaces.

Figurines were found on floors of rooms, in courtyards, and in silos and cisterns most frequently, as well as in open spaces and the outer gate. They were not, however, found in tombs,\textsuperscript{185} in keeping with the situation in the Jerusalem area and at Gibeon. When found in cisterns (at least 31 figurines from 20 cisterns or silos),\textsuperscript{186} figurines were associated with other objects. For example, Household Cistern 370 contained 4 anthropomorphic figurine fragments, and also a large amount of pottery, an inscribed weight (M2552), a bone pendant (M2558), a bone spoon? (M2542), a bronze ring (M2555), two bone spatulas (M2550, M2549), and Iron arrow/spearhead (X44), a horse and rider fragment (X217), two zoomorphic fragments (X212, X60), one rattle (X167),

\textsuperscript{185} McCowan, \textit{Tell en-Nasbeh}, 68-73. McCowan notes that a number of tombs were excavated and not all were totally robbed. Other than the secondary figurine in Tomb5/6 (discussed in Note 183), 1 figurine fragment was found near Cave 193 on the slope outside the city (Kletter, \textit{Judean Pillar-Figurines}, Appendix 2, 167.B.1.B); and 1 was found at the entrance to the cave (ibid.,143.B). The cave was used for burial in the Early Bronze Age but had occupation debris from the Iron Age. The excavators also note the presence of Persian period yhd seals (McCowan, \textit{Tell en-Nasbeh}, 73). Zorn notes that the moat and fortifications did not block the entrance to the cave in the Iron IIB, suggesting that the cave’s location was known and preserved. Citing Holladay, he suggests the cave may have served a cultic function, based on the presence of materials inside the cave; see Zorn “Tell en Nasbeh: A Reevaluation,” 809-11. Other objects include an Iron “lancelet,” (M881), an eye of Horus seal (M904), and a couch fragment (M938). Given the mixed nature of the debris, little evidence exists to associate this cave with a cultic site. Furthermore, the figurines were not found in the cave but in the outside area. Nor did the excavator consider the cave a cultic site based on the debris found within.

\textsuperscript{186} Seven of these cisterns were parts of buildings, while 9 were in open areas of cisterns and silos. Four more were not identified.
and fibulae (X117, X209, X112), seemingly the result of building debris randomly distributed in the open cistern.

More specificity is impossible for the site because of the lack of published artifacts. For example, the first publication report mentions at least 30 horse and rider fragments, 92 animal bodies, 60 animal heads, 14 birds, and 13 rattles. The locus information for these other figurine types is almost totally absent. Thus, for most loci a list of the objects found in the same locus is not comprehensive at the present time. Furthermore, it is impossible to identify whether figurines were excavated in fills, on floors, or in sub-floor make-up since only the room numbers of the figurines are given. These difficulties with recorded data would likely lead to misidentification of most spaces, outside of very broad generalizations.

That having been said, two loci require further mention. One molded head figurine was uncovered in the outer gate (Kletter’s fragment 165.B.srt) along with what the excavators call an “altar fragment” (T-23). Because cultic installations are known from other gates, for example at Tell Dan and Arad, the presence of these two objects may be significant. However, Zorn notes that the gate was built in the Iron IIB but was used into Stratum II, the Babylonian/Persian period; it was blocked in the fifth century. Zorn further remarks the gate contained 40 to 60 cm of debris that may have accumulated


on the stepped street. Conversely, the debris could be related to the later blocking.\textsuperscript{190} Thus, at best, the figurine fragment can only be associated with random street debris. At worst, it was transported to the gate from an unknown location in order to block the structure in the Babylonian/Persian period. For the moment, no more can be said about the possibility of an organized gate complex in this locus.

Another important locus is Room 616, which has the plan or a regular dwelling according to Zorn.\textsuperscript{191} The unusual objects found in this room merit consideration: 2 simple pinched heads\textsuperscript{192} a cylindrical stand (M818), one skull, a cosmetic mortar (M2819), fragments of bowls, cooking pots, and storage jars along with a small fireplace.\textsuperscript{193} Zorn stops short of calling the locus cultic, suggesting only a “specialized function.” In actuality, many of the remains in Room 616 fall within the normal range of domestic objects. Furthermore, Building 142.04, of which Room 616 is a part, was badly damaged by Stratum II construction.\textsuperscript{194}

Even if Room 616 did host cultic activity, the presence of only 2 fragmentary pinched heads indicates that the figurines did not function as the main cultic statues in this space. Rather, in a fashion similar to the cultic niche of the Pavement Structure in the City of David and Building 500 from Moza, anthropomorphic figurines were much more

\textsuperscript{190} Ibid., 493.
\textsuperscript{191} Ibid., 656.
\textsuperscript{193} Zorn, “Tell en Nasbeh: A Reevaluation,” 655.
\textsuperscript{194} Ibid., 653.
numerous in other structures, not associated with cultic space proper. In comparison with Industrial Building 160.04, which contained 8 anthropomorphic fragments,\textsuperscript{195} and Domestic Building 177.01 with 7 fragments,\textsuperscript{196} the remains in Room 616 do not strongly support an interpretation of the space as a cultic area.

Although Nasbeh offers interesting comparanda with Jerusalem, the chronological spread at the site is complicated. Zorn dates most buildings to Strata IIIA-C, which cover 1000-586 B.C.E. Further, most of the structures are dated by architectural style and stratigraphic relationship between walls, rather than by pottery or earth loci. Thus, a building’s orientation on the site’s ring road and its construction of single-stone walls is enough evidence to assign it to the Iron IIA. Even assuming the dating on architectural grounds is correct, most structures were in use for the duration of the Iron II, providing no chronological specificity for the eighth through sixth centuries. Finally, because the site was not destroyed in 586 B.C.E., most of the structures survived into Stratum II, or the Babylonian-Persian periods, and were thus open to post-occupational debris for an undetermined amount of time.\textsuperscript{197}

\textsuperscript{195} Ibid., 771-74. Zorn hypothesizes that the building’s sole function was an olive press.

\textsuperscript{196} Ibid., 824-29.

\textsuperscript{197} Zorn does not conclude that a building ended its use at the end of Iron IIC unless the structure was cut by a Stratum II building. Thus, many of the structures dated from “Iron IIA-Iron IIC/Bab or Pers” could certainly have fallen vacant at the end of the Iron IIC rather than in the subsequent period. Zorn is simply being cautious.
Four structures constructed at the beginning of Stratum II produced figurines: 2 body fragments, 2 molded heads, and 1 pinched head with turban and sidelocks. Thus, like Area G in the City of David, molded heads did extend into the sixth century, as did pinched heads, particularly with applied features. With at least 13 heads with turban, cap, and/or sidelocks, or 36% of pinched heads at the site, this percentage is higher than all of Shiloh’s areas combined (12/53 or 23%). If the site’s extension into the Late Iron and Babylonian periods is considered, this variation may support the hypothesis that the designs became more popular in the seventh and sixth centuries.

At the same time, the fact that only 4 fragments come from structures constructed in Stratum II may show that figurines fell out of use during the transition from the Iron IIC into and through the Babylonian and Persian periods. Following the Iron IIC, almost all sites in Judah lack figurines. Because many of the structures in Jerusalem were destroyed or abandoned at the end of the Iron IIC, the absence of figurines in Jerusalem during the Persian period could have resulted from the mere time lapse between occupation phases. In other words, a collapse of the potting industry supporting figurine production or the simple lack of permanent habitation could create the archaeological void.

---

Alternatively, the figurine lacuna has sometimes been attributed to an intentional iconoclasm among the post-exilic community.\textsuperscript{199} If Zorn is correct to suggest Nasbeh survives into Stratum II, dated to the Babylonian/Persian periods, and the figurine deposition shows a marked decrease into this period, then settlement decimation was not the sole reason for the decreased popularity of figurines. Nor does the figurine fragments from the site support an interpretation attributing iconoclasm to the returning exiles rather than people remaining in the land. Instead, the Nasbeh figurines perhaps became less palatable as ritual objects after the destruction of Jerusalem, given the extreme changes in social structure.

7.5.6 Summary of figurines in Jerusalem and the central hill country

Jerusalem has often been considered the center of the surrounding farms that constitute its “agricultural hinterland.”\textsuperscript{200} The discoveries of the wineries at Gibeon and Ramot and the grain storage facilities at Moza and possibly Nasbeh suggest that Jerusalem was interconnected with its surrounding rural landscape in various complex ways.


ways. These four agricultural sites, as well as Ramat Rachel, all yielded figurines following the same general patterns of deposition, assemblage, and typology as those in Jerusalem.

The nature of these sites’ publications does not support a reconstruction of the complex relationship between Jerusalem figurine ritual and that of its hinterland; but the general similarities do suggest a regional character of figurine production and use. While the density of figurines within Jerusalem proper is certainly greater than its surrounding areas, the patterns emerging from the southeastern hill and throughout Jerusalem are not contradicted by the figurine patterns at any of the associated major hinterland settlements.

Finally, the fact that figurines are found at these five settlements cannot be attributed solely to some special relationship the sites have with the Jerusalem administration. Kletter shows that figurines were uncovered at almost all known sites in the Jerusalem hills. These five were selected for further discussion due to their particular relationship with the city, not because anthropomorphomorphic figurines were absent at other hill country sites. Furthermore, settlements closest to Jerusalem do not necessarily preserve higher numbers of figurines. Sites like Gibeon and Nasbe produce higher figurine counts. Although these numbers could reflect better preservation or

\[\text{See Greenhut and De-Groot, “Tel Moza in Context,” 221; Zorn, “Tell en Nasbeh: A Reevaluation,” 251-54, 256.}\]

202 Kletter, *Judean Pillar-Figurines*, 95. The other sites include Abu Gosh (1 fragment), Bethel (4), Bethlehem (1), Jericho (4), Kh. ‘Anim (1), Khirbet e-Ras (1), Khirbet Geresh (3), Khirbet Rabud (1), Tel el-Ful (4), and Vered Jericho (3). In addition, according to Emmanuel Eisen (personal communication), at least 1 body fragment of a female figurine came from an unpublished four-room house excavated in Hebron.
broader excavation at Gibeon and Nasbeh, they also show that figurines were not merely the result of trade with or proximity to Jerusalem. Rather, figurine counts correspond to the size and intensity of domestic settlement at each site, regardless of the distance to the capital.

In sum, in all cases anthropomorophic figurines are lacking from or are only minimal in spaces identified as cultic by other criteria. They are commonly found throughout all areas within domestic spaces and are recovered together with typical household debris. When they are recovered in public contexts or industrial spaces, their presence may be explained by the presence of other objects from household midden or by ceramic storage. Another possibility is that figurine fragments are present in these spaces because of ritual actions taking place nearby but unrelated to permanent temple or household cultic space. Figurines are almost never recovered from tombs, even when the graves are relatively undisturbed. Further, anthropomorphic figurines occur frequently with zoomorphic fragments and are often outnumbered by them.

In regards to style, at all sites where chronological specificity is possible, both molded and pinched head figurines are used by the end of the eighth century, with the strong possibility that molded heads with female pillar bodies predate handmade heads with pillar bodies. Sites that have well-represented seventh and sixth century strata seem

203 The role of excavation cannot be discounted. For example, Gibeon would have appeared to have had no figurines if the great pool had never have been excavated. Therefore, a small number of figurines from a site cannot be used, alone, to hypothesize site population or density. At the same time, the large numbers of fragments from Gibeon and Nasbeh suggest that sites may contain large numbers of fragments regardless of their distance to Jerusalem. The numbers must be the result of unique conditions at each site and not the result of Jerusalem exports.
to indicate that the pinched heads with applied features increased in popularity in this period. Based on the published data, pinched heads remain more popular than molded heads at these sites, although both molded and pinched heads were used to the end of the Iron IIC. All sites show a dearth of anthropomorphic figurines in the years following the destruction of Jerusalem.

7.6 Jerusalem figurines in Judean context

Kletter’s study of pillar figurines in Judah provides a broad backdrop for the preceding Jerusalem data. At the present time, Jerusalem has produced ca. 132 pinched heads, 80 molded heads, and 303 bodies, or 515 separate figurines (see Tables 77 and 78 in Appendix A). The number will certainly grow with each excavation, particularly that of Shlomit Weksler-Bdolah, whose figurines will not be analyzed and published for some time. At least for the moment, 62% of Jerusalem figurine heads are hand-pinched and 38% are molded. From the hill country outside of Jerusalem come 63 (55%) pinched heads and 52 (45%) molded heads, and from the hill country including Jerusalem, of 327 total heads, 195 (60%) are pinched and 132 (40%) are molded.

As per the discussion in Chapter 4, Kletter omitted all molded and pinched head types that did not conform to a proscribed “Judean” pillar figurine style. Thus, the totals included in Kletter’s study of Judah may be missing a number of fragments, particularly molded heads that vary in wig length or other minor details. Assuming Kletter’s statistics for the Negev can be trusted, the region produced 19 (38%) pinched heads and 31 (62%)
molded heads. Moreover, for the Shephelah, Kletter lists 18 (19%) pinched heads and 78 (81%) molded heads (see Figure 47).\(^{204}\)

![Diagram showing the distribution of pinched and molded heads by region in Judah](image)

**Figure 47: Pinched and molded heads by region in Judah**

Two interesting patterns emerge. First, the balance between the two head types in Jerusalem and the hill country are strikingly similar, perhaps suggesting a regional pattern in figurine design and use. Second, while both the Shephelah and Negev contain more molded heads than pinched heads, the distribution in the Negev between head types is more balanced than that in the Shephelah.

These regional distinctions could result from a number of factors. Many of the sites in the Shephelah were published earlier in archaeological investigation. Thus the quality of publications is often poor, and the likelihood that pinched heads might have

---

\(^{204}\) Kletter, *Judean Pillar-Figurines*, 95. In his section on the Shephelah, Kletter includes Khirbet Hoga and Tel es-Safi, sites otherwise considered as part of Philistia. Hoga and Safi each yielded 1 pinched head. According to Michael Press’s dissertation on Philistine figurines, Hoga also produced 2 molded heads, though with a slightly different style than the JPF heads. Press, “Philistine Figurines,” 308, Table 6.
been overlooked is greater. That having been said, the differences in relative percentages are fairly pronounced. Assuming the data bear some resemblance to the actual differences between molded and pinched heads, the larger number of pinched heads in the Negev bears mention.

The Shephelah was largely decimated by Sennacherib’s campaign in the region in 701 B.C.E. and never truly regained autonomy, nor was it redeveloped. In contrast, the Negev saw a period of settlement in the seventh century after the Assyrian invasion. Thus, it is possible that the pinched head count in the Negev reflects a closer interaction with Jerusalem during the seventh and sixth centuries. This is not to suggest that pinched and molded heads were not coterminous in the eighth century but that molded heads decreased in popularity and pinched heads increased during the seventh and sixth centuries.

It is argued in Chapter 6 that figurine production was largely a local phenomenon, with little evidence for figurine trade between cities or regions within Judah. Thus, the differing iconographic styles cannot simply result from a halt in figurine exports from the Shephelah to other regions after the 701 campaign. Furthermore, while the Negev has produced a larger number of pinched heads than the Shephelah, making it more similar to the Jerusalem pattern, the ratio between pinched and molded heads in the Negev is still exactly opposite that in Jerusalem. Thus, Jerusalem and its surrounding settlements

---

maintained a unique figurine ritual profile throughout the Iron IIB-C, particularly in the preference for pinched heads.

Finally, the earliest versions of the JPFs are known from tenth or ninth century loci at Beth Shemesh, Lachish, Beer Sheba, Tel Erani, Tel Qasileh, and perhaps Arad. Thus, in the Shephelah and the Negev, molded heads were found in very early loci, as were pillar bodies, confirming the fact that molded heads associated with pillar bodies appear to be the oldest form of the pillar figurines. When this larger number is compared with the only two Jerusalem pillar figurines that predate the eighth century, it may be possible to suggest that the pillar figurine tradition originated outside of Jerusalem proper, or gained in popularity earlier in the Shephelah and Negev.

---


207 Ibid., 98.B.4 (molded head) and 99.B.2.B (molded head). Kletter notes that the locus for 98.B.4, dated originally to the Late Bronze Age, is highly problematic.

208 Ibid., 276.C.3 (base); ibid., Addenda to Appendix 2, 598.C.2 (body); ibid., 600.C.2 (body).


210 Ibid., 280.C.2 (body).


212 For arguments supporting the centrality of the Shephelah in Judah’s eighth century economy see Lipschits, Sergi, and Koch, “Royal Judahite Jar Handles,” 18-21. This is not to imply a functional link between pillar figurines and lmlk seals but to suggest the centrality of Shephelah sites provide a plausible setting for the rise of new ritual forms and their spread to other areas of Judah.
7.7 A Regional study of Jerusalem figurines: summary and conclusions

The archaeological material from Jerusalem’s southeastern hill tells a unique story of ritual activity in the Iron IIB-C. As summarized throughout this chapter, when figurines are examined in their architectural context in object assemblages, they defy most traditional interpretations, including those outlined in Chapter 2. Furthermore, when the southeastern hill is placed in the context of Jerusalem and the Judean hill country an overall regional figurine pattern emerges. Figurines in this region are not strongly associated with domestic shrines or tombs, as they may be elsewhere. Nor are they normally associated with so-called cultic paraphernalia, such as standing stones, incense burners, chalices, shrine boxes, or cult stands. They are primarily household objects; however, there are some key exceptions, such as the market debris and storage contexts from the Kenyon excavations, the storage context from Ramat Rachel, and the pool from Gibeon, as well as a small number of Jerusalem tombs.

Particularities of figurine style are also unique to this region. Although the iconographic tradition included both molded and pinched heads, the pinched heads were much more popular throughout the region and became more so from the eighth through the sixth centuries. These hand-pinched heads also became more elaborate in the seventh and sixth centuries, with larger numbers of figurines having applied features (for more on this point, see Chapter 9).

Finally, from a regional perspective, it is clear that the centrality of Jerusalem at the end of the eighth century and into the seventh through sixth centuries had some impact on the figurine traditions of its hinterland (see Chapter 10 for more), though
probably not as a result of figurine trade, per se. In both archaeological deposition and iconographic morphology, Jerusalem shares a similar ritual profile with the hill country region; and its affect might also be felt in the figurine styles of later Negev sites.

Therefore, figurine rituals are best studied by region or location within Judah. In the past, interpretations of figurines, regardless of their particular archaeological or regional context, have often relied upon the interpretation of a few figurine remains, such as Tel Halif in the Shephelah\(^{213}\) or Arad\(^{214}\) in the Negev. Based upon these few contexts,

---

\(^{213}\) Hardin, *Lahav 2*, 134-43. Hardin argues that some of the objects in Area B or Room 2 in the F7 dwelling were the remains of cultic activity and that they may have been used together in this space, including standing stones, a pillar figurine head, and a ceramic cult stand. It should be noted that the interpretation of this space is not without some challenges, including poor preservation in this area of the tell, proximity to the modern ground surface (ibid., 133), fragments of the same artifacts scattered throughout ca. 50 cm of deposition from topsoil to floor surface, destruction debris, and ceiling collapse (ibid., 133-34). Cultic artifacts were found disposed with regular domestic artifacts (ibid, 134, 136). It is also unclear whether the artifacts were stored in this area (ibid., 136, 139) or used in this area (ibid., 138-39). In the end, Hardin relies heavily on Zevit (*Religions of Ancient Israel*, 123-25; 252-53) to interpret the remains. His decision to interpret Area B of Room 2 as a cultic corner or cult place relies primarily on the fact that more artifacts were uncovered in this area of Room 2 than in the adjacent Area C (so distinguished, not because of different architecture, but because Area B had more artifacts than Area C [ibid., 134, ]). Area B also contained more artifacts than other areas in the structure. Following Zevit, Hardin argues that the clutter itself indicates this was a shrine area, despite the fact that Hardin notes the actual deposition did not indicate any focal point for worship in the space (ibid., 139).

\(^{214}\) Uehlinger, at the suggestion of Bloch-Smith, suggests the presence of figurines at Arad and near the shrine indicates that Judean cultic practice was not so aniconic as has been claimed. See Christoph Uehlinger, “Arad, Qīṭmīt—Judahite Aniconism vs. Edomite Iconic Cult?: Questioning the Evidence,” in *Text, Artifact, and Image: Revealing Ancient Israelite Religion* (Brown Judaic Studies 346; ed. Gary M. Beckman and Theodore J. Lewis; Providence, R.I.: Brown Judaic Studies, 2006), 102-3, n. 53, n. 54. The incomplete state of publication for Arad problematizes conclusions drawn from this material. Furthermore, of Kletter’s 22 JPFs from Arad, 1 lacks context information (Kletter, *Judean Pillar-Figurines*, Appendix 2, 443.B.3-4), 3 are from Hellenistic layers (ibid., Appendix 2, 444.B, 452.C.2, 456.C.2), 1 comes from collapse on the slope outside the fortress (ibid., Appendix 2, 449.A.1.Ap), 1 is either a surface find or from a mixed locus (ibid., Appendix 2, 450.A.1.Ap), 6 are associated with fort or domestic architecture (ibid., Appendix 2, 445.B.2-3?,A?, 447.A.1.A, 451.A.1.A, 455.C.2, 457.C.2, 458.C.3), and 1 is from an industrial area whose exact function is unknown (ibid. Appendix 2, 454.C.2). Remaining are 2 fragments generally associated with the temple area but with little further specificity (ibid., Appendix 2, 442.B.2.A, 448.A.1.Ap); and 2 were found in a small room west of the altar in the temple (ibid., Appendix 2, 446.A.1.A, 453.C.2) along with a zoomorphic fragment. Thus, 4 were found in some general association with the shrine, but none presently have secure archaeological context needed to decide whether the remains were the result of use or secondary disposal. Furthermore, Uehlinger’s statement that 4 or 5 come
all figurines are considered paraphernalia from shrines, often representing a “household” religion in which women figured prominently. The contextual analysis of Jerusalem figurines presented here, in noting contrasts with overall patterns in other regions of Judah, suggests that figurine rituals are highly local. Thus, adding the data from all sites together and producing an average figurine context homogenizes any possible regional or local distinctions in figurine ritual. Moreover, using a small number of contexts to interpret the entire corpus also assumes that all people in Judah’s different regions used figurines in exactly the same ways throughout the course of two centuries.

In actuality, figurine rituals preserved in the Neo-Assyrian corpus and archaeological data indicate that figurine rituals were far more complex than has been supposed. Furthermore, most texts suggest that figurines themselves are the only elements from figurine rituals preserved in the archaeological record, challenging archaeologists’ ability to interpret figurine function. Thus archaeology, in and of itself, is not the only type of data in need of consideration. That having been said, only after careful examination of specific archaeological contexts and assemblages can the conclusions based upon this information, whatever its limitations, be compared with ancient Near Eastern texts, including the Hebrew Bible.

____________________

from an area “close to the sacrificial altar” is misleading (Uehlinger, “Arad,” 102) since Kletter actually lists them as divided from the altar in a separate room.
CHAPTER 8: CLAY AND IDOLS IN THE HEBREW BIBLE

Despite the number of biblical texts referring to idolatry, the Hebrew Bible does not mention clay images. Although this omission has been noted in cursory fashion,¹ the textual silence has been interpreted as intentional deletion on the part of the biblical authors and has been used as evidence for the authors’ implied disapproval.² Clearly, a more thorough investigation of biblical clay imagery is warranted.

Biblical texts refer to clay and potters in two ways. First, several texts describe clay used for practical and ritual purposes. Unlike passages referring to idols, no text mentioning clay objects supports the supposition that clay items were prohibited. Second, certain texts refer to Jerusalem markets and the sale of pottery items close to the City of David. After some brief methodological comments (8.1), this chapter investigates the biblical vocabulary related to clay and pottery production (8.2), vocabulary associated with idols and idol production (8.3), and passages describing Jerusalem market activity (8.4). It will provide evidence that clay objects are not targeted in biblical polemics against idol construction, that clay was believed to have properties that are uniquely significant for rituals, and that the Bible refers to the sale of pottery items in and on the outskirts of Jerusalem (8.5).

¹ E.g., Lewis, “Syro-Palestinian Iconography and Divine Images,” 87; Dever, Did God Have a Wife, 194.
² Ibid.
8.1 Methodological considerations

Given the complexity of biblical texts (in Hebrew as well as in translation), no simple one-to-one correspondence between text and artifact should be expected. Still, the results of the analysis of biblical texts can sometimes be used together with archaeological interpretation to form a more complete picture of Israelite religion. That having been said, studies that combine archaeology and text face significant challenges, especially the sheer volume of the interpretive tradition. In an attempt to examine each text in its own right and also consult the scholarly literature this chapter is selective by necessity. Textual and redactional issues that have a direct bearing on the argument are noted, and the opinions of several major interpreters are included to indicate the nature of the scholarly discussion. The secondary sources referred to in this chapter are by no means exhaustive; undoubtedly an entire dissertation could be written on any one of the passages described below. Yet, only by considering all the biblical passages together, given their respective genres and dates, do important insights emerge about clay objects and their functions.

8.2 Vocabulary describing clay objects and potters

8.2.1 Creation of humans

Clay is used to create a number of different types of objects, perhaps none so famous as humanity itself. However, this concept is not unique to the Bible. Barrelet notes a number of Mesopotamian myths in which deities construct items out of clay,
including the first humans. Following Ritner, Waraksa also notes that humankind, created by the gods, was associated with clay in Egyptian mythology.

Sharing the same root as the word for potter, Gen 2:7 says the deity formed (וַיִּיצֶר) the human out of “dust from the ground” (מִן־הָא ַדָמָה עָפָר). The previous verse informs the reader that a water source existed—the mist (אֵד) watering the land. Perhaps this information was given precisely because the audience would expect both earth and water for the formation of vessels or statues. Also of note, the deity is attributed with creating animals from the ground or dust (Gen 2:19; Ps 104:29).

[^3]: Barrelet, *Figurines et reliefs en terre cuite de la Mesopotamie antique 1*, 7-11.


[^6]: For one of the meanings of the root as “dry dust” see L. Wächter, ““עפר,” TDOT 11: 259. The use of ר珅 in Gen 2 may equally be motivated by the death and afterlife imagery associated with the substantive (Wächter, *TDOT* 11:264-65), which helps account for the word in Gen 2:7, as it does in Gen 3:19. This is counter the opinion of Ephraim A. Speiser (*Genesis: Introduction, Translation, and Notes* [AB 1; Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1981], 16) who claims ר珅 must mean “clods” of earth, likening the passage to Gen 26:15 where Abraham’s wells are filled up with ר珅 by the Philistines. However, the definition “dry dust” is totally appropriate in both contexts so the Gen 26 passage cannot be used to rethink the definition implied in Gen 2. Gerhard von Rad (*Genesis: A Commentary* [rev. ed.; OTL; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1972], 77) suggests the possibility that ר珅 was added to Gen 2:7, introduced from Gen 3:19b, for consistency, though he gives no reason to suppose that the Gen 3:19 passage is older. Nahum M. Sarna (*Genesis: The Traditional Hebrew Text with the New JPS Translation* [JPS Torah Commentary; Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1989], 17, 355 n.9) claims that “dust” and “clay” are synonymous, but his argument is also problematic. Every comparable passage he cites comes from Job (4:19; 10:9; 27:16; 30:19; 13:12). In many cases the intent of the passage is to evoke a connection between humans and death (4:19; 10:9; 30:19), hardening back to the Gen 2 and 3 passages. Further, he says nothing of the possible time difference between the composition of Gen 2 and Job and thus the difficulty using the word’s frame of reference in Job to understand Genesis. Nor does he address the fact that ר珅 appears to be specific to the creation of humans and is not found in other contexts where pottery items are mentioned.
8.2.2 The root יָצָר

Although יָצָר is uncommon in other passages involving clay items, יָצָר is the dominant root associated with clay terminology in the Hebrew Bible. In fact, tracing the root is the most direct way of investigating biblical passages related to clay objects and potters. The word has cognates in many languages, most specifically Ugaritic ʼyṣr where the term for potters, ʼyṣrm, is distinct from the word for sculptors, pslm. In Biblical Hebrew יָצָר has a broad range of meanings, from production using clay or earth to a more general sense of creation. It may refer to creation from a number of different materials. It can even be so broad as to connote, “frame, pre-ordain, or plan.”

7 Unlike other types of craftspeople who are designated by the title hrš followed by their specific trade, potters are referred to only by their trade as ʼyṣrm. See Heltzer, “Labour in Ugarit,” 243 and Michael Heltzer, “Royal Economy in Ancient Ugarit,” 493.

8 Dorman (Faces in Clay, 102-8) shows the same semantic variety for qd in Egyptian. For general uses of יָצָר see Isa 27:11; 43:1, 10, 21; 43:7; 45:7, 18; 49:5; Jer 1:5; Pss 33:15; 74:17; 94:9; 95:5;104:26; Amos 4:13; 7:1; Zech 12:1.

9 B. Otzen, “יָצָר,” TDOT 6:259. The number of materials used in combination with this root should not be overstated. Otzen’s examples come primarily from Isa 44:9-20 (to be discussed below) and his additional material rests on the meaning, not of יָצָר, but of the related roots צִּר and צִּיר. Otzen also admits that the “craft most often referred to by words based on the root…is pottery.”

10 Isa 22:11; 37:26; 46:11; Jer 18:11; 33:2; Ps 139:16. See also many uses of the noun צָר, including Gen 6:5; 8:21; Deut 31:21; Isa 26:3; 1 Chr 29:18; 28:9. This variety is also reflected in Ugaritic, where the verb can mean to create, shape, or cultivate, however, as suggested above, the nominative refers to “potter.” In Akkadian as well, ʼeṣērum can mean to form, shape, inscribe, draw, or sketch, as well as establish or determine. See A. H. Konkel, “יָצָר,” NIDOTTE 2:503-6. In agreement with both these etymological comments see Otzen, TDOT 6:256. Otzen continues, suggesting that the Akkadian does not usually refer to divine works of creation, where banû is a more common term. A related term, ʼēṣiru, can mean “potter” but more commonly paḥaru.
Several texts describe potters or clay objects, though none occur in accounts of craftspeople employed for tabernacle or temple construction. The word does occur twice in the historical books. In 1 Chr 4:23 potters (יוֹצְרִים) are listed after genealogical comments about craftsmen (רחשים) (1 Chr 4:14),\(^{11}\) and the families of “the house of linen workers,” (בית עבדת חיטים) (1 Chr 4:21). Unfortunately, although this is the only passage in the Bible that describes potters and their relationship to the throne, the verse in which יהוֹצְרִים occurs is ambiguous. “These were the potters and the inhabitants of Netaim and Gederah; with the king in his service they dwelt there.” First, the identity of the potters is in question. If the pronoun הם refers to the preceding clause in verse 22, the potters were males who ruled over Moab for a time (or took Moabite wives)\(^{12}\) and who may have subsequently returned to Bethlehem.\(^{13}\) Complicating matters, verse 22 ends with a summary phrase, “and the accounts are ancient,” (והדברים עתיקים), which seemingly divides it from verse 23. Thus, when verse 23 begins, “These were the potters” it remains unclear whether the pronoun refers to the immediately preceding verse (Jokim, the men

\(^{11}\) It is interesting that the son of Joab was named חַרָשִׁים or, “the valley of the craftspeople.” See also Neh 11:35 where “the valley of craftspeople” is listed near Lod and Ono, outside of Jerusalem. It is unclear from the text whether the inhabitants of this town were associated with the Levites or the temple.

\(^{12}\) 1 Chr 4:22 mention Jokim, the men of Cozeba, Joash, Saraph, who ruled in Moab, and Jashub-lehem. Jacob M. Myers (1 Chronicles: Introduction, Translation, and Notes [AB 12; Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1965], 24) translates the verb באַל to mean “marry” rather than “rule over,” contra Sarah Japhet, I and II Chronicles: A Commentary (OTL; Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox, 1993), 117. Ralph W. Klein (1 Chronicles [Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2006], 125, 126, 141) also translates the verb “married.”

\(^{13}\) Myers (1 Chronicles, 24, 26) changes the pointing of יהוֹצְרִים to read “and they returned to Bethlehem.” For this emendation see also Japhet, I and II Chronicles, 104 and Klein, 1 Chronicles, 125, 126. BHS suggests the same on the basis of the Targum and the Vulgate.
of Cozeba, etc.) or other parts of the genealogy. This is exacerbated by the fact that verse 23 actually concludes the overall genealogy of Judah, begun in chapter 2.

Second, the location of the potters is problematic. The conjunction between “potters” and “inhabitants” is ambiguous, begging the question of whether the potters were associated with these two locations. A possible emendation omits the waw-conjunctive reading, “these were the potters who were dwelling in Netaim and Gederah.” Further, the antecedent for יָשָם at the end of verse 23 is unclear. Does it refer to the still unidentified Netaim and Gederah or an undisclosed location? Klein solves the problem by interpreting “they dwelt there” as referring to Bethlehem (dependent on the textual emendation), rather than Netaim and Gederah, and for that reason believes the statement about the potters refers only to verse 22.

Although there has been some question about the passages’ date, more recently scholars claim the text dates from preexilic times with some later additions; and verses

---


15 Klein (*1 Chronicles*, 127) identifies verses 21 through 23 as an inclusio for Judah’s genealogy.

16 Myers,*1 Chronicles, 24* and Japhet,*I and II Chronicles*, 104. *BHS* cites the Septuagint, Targum, and Vulgate, which all omit the vav conjunctive. Alternatively, Klein (*1 Chronicles*, 125, 126) maintains the conjunctive in translation but notes that the vav could also be translated “namely.”

17 Ibid., 142.

18 Wilhelm Rudolph (*Chronikbücher* [HAT 21; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, Paul Siebeck, 1955], 14) dates this passage to the postexilic period.

19 Myers,*1 Chronicles, 27*. See also Simon J. de Vries,*1 and 2 Chronicles* (FOTL 11; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1989), 48. He claims these verses comprise an “attached fragment” and are thus separate from the original source for the rest of the genealogy but still date to the premonarchic or early monarchic periods. Japhet (*I and II Chronicles*, 105-6) enumerates the many difficulties dating chapter 4 (including
21-23 describe the founding of guilds and their traditional production locations.\textsuperscript{20}

Unfortunately, the fairly unattached manner in which the Chronicler has incorporated the earlier document provides little information about the potters, other than that some descendents from the house of Judah, who enjoyed an unclear relationship with Moab, were believed to have been filling pottery orders for the king while living somewhere in the western section of the territory.\textsuperscript{21} The passage suggests that potters may have been working for the royal house;\textsuperscript{22} but, given the total absence of potters among the temple craftsmen described in Chronicles and elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible, potters were not associated with temple service.

\begin{quote}
the use of some late biblical Hebrew in verses 21 and 22) but decides a preexilic date is the most probable. Steven S. Tuell (\textit{First and Second Chronicles} [Int; Louisville, Ky.: John Knox, 2001], 27) agrees with an early date as does Klein (\textit{1 Chronicles}, 128), though he suggests only that the text is preexilic rather than dating it to the early divided monarchy. In all these scholars the final dating decision rests on the fact that the cities mentioned in chapter 4 do not reflect the postexilic boundaries of Yehud. Nadav Na’aman (“The Kingdom of Judah Under Josiah,” \textit{TA} 18 [1991]: 27) dates the text to the eighth century expansion of Judah.

\textsuperscript{20} Myers, \textit{1 Chronicles}, 30. On the independence of verses 21-23 see also De Vries, \textit{1 and 2 Chronicles}, 46.

\textsuperscript{21} Klein (\textit{1 Chronicles}, 142) notes Netaim and Gederah have yet to be located. This is contra Isaac Mendelsohn (“Guilds in Ancient Palestine,” \textit{BASOR} 80 [1940]: 17), who, following Albright, identifies the sites with Hirbet en-Nuweiti and Tell ej-Judeidah.

\textsuperscript{22} The nature of the potters’ relationship to the king is unclear. As Ephraim Stern (“Craft and Industry,” in \textit{The Age of the Monarchies: Culture and Society: Volume Four-2} [ed. Abraham Malamat; World History of the Jewish People; Jerusalem: Masada, 1979], 251) points out, the verse may either suggest the existence of a potter’s guild employed only by the king or that regular potters could produce either royal or ordinary vessels. Given the discussion in Chapter 6 of ancient Near Eastern textual descriptions of potters and the lack of evidence for potters in exclusive employment of royal houses, it is more likely that these potters were either craftsmen who filled orders for both the royal house and regular inhabitants or that they may have devoted themselves for a short time to royal production as a type of corvée labor.
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In 2 Sam 17:28 David and his loyal subjects cross into Mahanaim in Transjordan and are brought “vessels of a potter” (꽁יל יוצר) along with other objects, such as couches, bowls, and a variety of foodstuffs. Some evidence suggests that these bowls were metal and possibly used in ritual contexts, in contrast to the pottery vessels. Thus, in both texts from the historical narratives pottery refers to common vessels rather than cultic items; and the root יוצר is used in its narrow semantic sense to connote clay objects.


24 McCarter (II Samuel, 395) notes, the objects are brought to David by three unlikely characters, Shobi, the son of Nahash, from the Ammonites, Machir from Lo-debar who was a supporter of Saul’s house, and Barzillai of Gilead, a location traditionally associated with pro-Sauline sentiments. Inexplicably, Antony F. Campbell (2 Samuel [FOTL 8; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2005], 155) interprets this list of items as materials brought by Barzillai alone rather than by all three men. The hiphil perfect third common plural (SingleOrDefault) in verse 29 seems to imply a plural subject.

25 Ludwig Kohler and Walter Baumgartner (The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament [ed. and transl. M. E. J. Richardson; 2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1995], 762-63) note the Akkadian cognate s/sappu meaning “metal vessel,” as well as 1 Kgs 7:50, 2 Kgs 12:14, and Jer 52:19, where the term refers to metal basins in the temple. See also Hab 2:15 which may refer to a cup for drinking (when emended), as well as Zech 12:2. In Exod 12:22 the term refers to the basin (material unspecified) that holds the blood for the Passover. It is unclear in the present context whether the two terms are meant to imply vessels of different material, i.e. metal and clay, or vessels for different purposes, i.e., drinking and eating. Given the phrase in verse 29, “the people are hungry, tired, and thirsty in the desert,” perhaps both meanings are simultaneously correct. Further, given the other occurrences of ספסות, a ritual use for the metal vessel cannot be ruled out. Nor would the use of a metal bowl for drinking exclude a ritual function. On this point see Jonathan, S. Greer (“A Marzeach and a Mizraq: A Prophet’s Mêlée with Religious Diversity in Amos 6.4-7,” JSOT 32 [2007]: 251-61), who discusses the widespread iconographic evidence for drinking bowls (including metal bowls) in feasting and ritual in the ancient Near East, including neo-Assyrian contexts.
8.2.2.2 יוצר in poetic texts: Lamentations and Psalms

The root יוצר occurs most frequently in poetic and prophetic texts. Lamentations 4:2 mentions potting activity, likening the sons of Zion to “earthen jars” (נִב לֵי־חֶרֶש), “work of the hands of a potter” (יוֹצֵר), contrasted with the value of fine gold. Berlin argues that the poet of Lamentations intentionally included various segments of Jerusalem society, including the potter. This suggests that biblical tradition, dated within sixty years of Jerusalem’s destruction, was indeed aware of potters associated with the city. Furthermore, Berlin contrasts the pottery imagery in verse 2b with the reference to gold and holy gems, interpreted as temple artifacts, in verses 1-2a. Assuming Berlin is correct, these verses show a fundamental division between elite objects considered appropriate for formal worship and expendable objects constructed from clay.

Psalm 2:9 promises David that “like a vessel of a potter (כִּכ לִֵּיוֹצֵר) you will dash them to pieces (ת נַפּ צֵם),” referring to the nations of the earth. In comparison with other

27 Delbert R. Hillers (Lamentations: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary [2d rev. ed.; AB 7A; New York: Doubleday, 1992], 9-10) argues that the book was written soon after the fall of Jerusalem in 587 B.C.E., though there is no consensus on the order in which chapters were written. See also F. W. Dobbs-Allsopp, Lamentations (Int.: Louisville, Ky.: John Knox, 2002), 4 and ibid., “Linguistic Evidence for the Date of Lamentations,” JA NES 26 (1998): 1-36 where he argues the book’s linguistic characteristics place it in the sixth century between 587 and 520 B.C.E. See also Berlin, Lamentations, 33-35. Berlin argues for a date in the sixth century but not necessarily immediately following the destruction of Jerusalem.
28 Ibid., 104-5.
29 BHS suggests amending to the plural “vessels” based on the Septuagint and the Syriac.
texts (see below), this passage is unique in likening the enemies of David (and thus Israel) to broken pottery, an image usually used to describe disobedient Israel herself. Unlike Chronicles and Samuel, in both Lamentations and Psalms other vocabulary, particularly references to the vessels produced by potters, accompanies יוצר and clarifies its connotation as “potter.” Further, in both cases, the dominant poetic image is that pottery is cheaply made and easily broken.

8.2.2.3 יוצר in Prophetic books

8.2.2.3.1 Zechariah

One verse in Zech 11:13 appears to suggest some connection between potters and the Temple. As the text stands, the deity commands the prophet to throw thirty shekels of silver to the potter (יוצר) who is in the house of Yahweh. In all likelihood, this text should be emended to אוֹצָר, meaning “treasury” or “storehouse.” Even where interpreters have maintained the Masoretic Text, they have redefined the word to mean “smelter”

30 Given the uniqueness of this image, nowhere else attested in the rest of psalmic literature, it is possible that the writer had the more common motif in mind (Yahweh dashing Israel to pieces), which he has subsequently reversed (David dashing his enemies to pieces). This would not necessarily date the text to a late period, given the fact that this poetic imagery emerges as early as First Isaiah (see below). Conversely, Erhard S. Gerstenberger (Psalms Part I with an Introduction to Cultic Poetry [FOTL 14; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1988], 29, 45) argues the addition of Psalms 1 and 2 to the first collection of Psalms (chapters 3-41) occurred in the postexilic period. He notes, however, that the majority of commentators consider it preexilic (ibid., 38). Gerstenberger bases his dating on the lack of superscriptions in chapters 1 and 2 and the triumphal character of 2:7-9, which he considers troubling and ultimately out of place during the monarchic period. He suggests it belongs to “early Jewish theological universalism,” akin to that in Second and Third Isaiah and Zechariah. Note that the poetic image of broken pottery is also attested in Second and Third Isaiah as well. For an alternate opinion on the dating see Amos Ḥahkam, The Bible: Psalms with the Jerusalem Commentary. Volume 1: Psalms 1-57 (Jerusalem: Mosad Harav Kook, 2003), 10-11. He notes that although Jewish commentary often interprets this psalm to refer to the end of days, it may refer to historical periods, including that of the Davidic monarchy. Ḥahkam explains verse 8 as an aspiration rather than a description of realized history.
rather than potter.\textsuperscript{31} Given the problematic nature of the text and the Second Temple context,\textsuperscript{32} this verse cannot support any connection between potters and the temple in the Iron IIB-C.

\subsection{Isaiah}

References to \textit{יצר} occur in Isaiah and Jeremiah. Isaiah 41:25 mentions people who form clay, though probably not clay pots. The text likens the figure who will come from the north (Cyrus) to one who will go into \textit{ו יָבֹא} rulers\textsuperscript{33} like mortar (חֹמֶר) and like a potter (יֹצֵר) who treads (יִרְמָס) upon clay (טִיט). Given the parallelism between \textit{חֹמֶר} and \textit{טִיט}, the image is probably not that of a potter constructing a vessel but of clay being prepared

\textsuperscript{31} Otzen, \textit{TDOT} 6:259 says the text should not be emended; he argues that the Jerusalem temple contained a metalworker’s shop, understanding \textit{יצר} not as a potter but as a craftsman who melts down silver offered in the temple. Alternatively, David L. Petersen (Zechariah 9-14 and Malachi: A Commentary [OTL; Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox, 1995], 86, 87) emends the text to “treasury” with the Syriac and Targum. See also Carol L. Meyers and Eric M. Meyers (Zechariah 9-14: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary [AB 25C. New York: Doubleday, 1993], 237-38, 277-78), who address the perspectives mentioned in Otzen (himself reliant upon Charles. C. Torrey, “The Foundry of the Second Temple at Jerusalem.” \textit{JBL} 55 [1936]: 247-60) but conclude that redefining the word \textit{יצר} as “metal-worker” is itself unnecessarily complicated when a more convincing textual case for emendation is already present.

\textsuperscript{32} Petersen (Zechariah 9-14, 4-5) argues that chapters 9-14 date to the Persian period. He also offers a useful review of other positions, particularly those that suggest these chapters were not all composed at the same time. Meyers and Meyers (Zechariah 9-14, 26-27) date chapters 9-14 to the period between 515 and 445 B.C.E. based on the socio-historical situation at that time.

\textsuperscript{33} \textit{BHS} proposes emending this verb to בָּשֵנָה in comparison with the Targum. See also Joseph Blenkinsopp, Isaiah 40-55: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary (AB 19A; New York: Doubleday, 2000), 204 and Claus Westermann, \textit{Isaiah} 40-66 (OTL; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1969), 82, though they provide no argument for the change, and Childs (Brevard S Childs, \textit{Isaiah} [OTL; Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox, 2001], 314-15) who merely states that the verb is often emended in this way. John N. Oswalt (\textit{The Book of Isaiah: Chapters 40-66} [NICOT; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1998], 98) provides more information, suggesting that both the Septuagint and Qumran retain \textit{حا}, though they appear to struggle to make sense of the verb.

\textsuperscript{34} The term \textit{סָגָן} refers to an Assyrian or Babylonian governor of a conquered city or province.
for bricks. The word טִּיט is usually defined as “mire or mud” rather than clay; and the only other text to use the noun in reference to levigated earth (in parallel with חֹמֶר) is Nah 3:14, which also uses the root בָּא when it commands “go into the clay” (בֹּא), “tread on the mortar,” (וֹרִּים יִּבְהַר), and “seize the brickmold” (וְקָצַּיָּאָל בֵּן). Given these passages, it is tempting to hypothesize that potters were responsible for both pottery vessels and brick construction when need arose.

35 For the classic use of חֹמֶר in relation to bricks see Gen 11:3. Further supporting this imagery is Blenkinsopp’s (Isaiah 40-55, 205-) observation that verse 25 refers to Cyrus. The poetic imagery of a Persian treading upon Babylonian governors as one who prepares bricks for construction is particularly potent, given the longstanding Babylonian royal traditions associating the king with building activity (Barbara Neving Porter, Images, Power, and Politics: Figurative Aspects of Esarhaddon’s Babylonian Policy [Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1993], 65, 82-91). The fact that the author of Isa 40-55 may have been located in Babylonia (Blenkinsopp, Isaiah 40-55, 104; Westermann, Isaiah 40-66, 8 (but contra this stance see Klaus Baltzer, Deutero-Isaiah [ed. Peter Machinist; trans. Margaret Kohl; Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001], 24)) implies that such a tradition may have been known and intentionally incorporated into the biblical text.

36 Here again, BHS suggests emending the imperative from בֹּאִּי to בּוּסִי, though no textual data is cited in support. Note that Christensen (Duane L. Christensen, Nahum: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary [Anchor Yale Bible 24F; New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009], 375, 378, 380) does not emend; however, his evidence is Isa 41:25 and he seems unaware of the scholarly trend to emend the Isaianic passage. Jimmy J. M. Roberts (Nahum, Habakkuk, and Zephaniah: A Commentary [OTL; Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox, 1991], 69) also maintains the Masoretic Text. The likely possibility that Nahum predates Isa 41 argues against emending either text. Christensen (Nahum, 52-56) provides a useful summary of opinions on the dating of Nahum, with a clear consensus in the seventh century, up until the sack of Nineveh. See also Roberts (Nahum, Habakkuk, and Zephaniah, 38-39) who prefers 640-630 B.C.E. but not outside the seventh century. Alternatively, Jeremias argues for a late exilic or postexilic date, based upon some similarities with Second Isaiah (Jörg Jeremias, Kultprophetie und Gerichtsverkündigung in der späten Königszeit Israels [WMANT 35; Neukirchen-Vluyn, Germany: Neukirchener Verlag, 1970], 14). His argument focuses almost exclusively on a comparison between Isa 52:1, 7 and Nah 2:1; and his proof that Nahum depends on Second Isaiah, rather than the reverse, is based on the difficulty of each reading and Jeremias’ perceived character of Second Isaiah, whose date he takes as fixed. Christensen (Nahum, 52-56) argues that the present setting of the text is clearly Babylonian, given its structural integration into the Book of the Twelve, but he does not dispute the possibility of earlier authorship. If it can be assumed that Nahum is prior to Isa 41:25, and the Nahum text lacks a strong argument for emending the verbs as they stand in the Masoretic Text, it is probably best to maintain the masoretic reading in both texts. Further, the possibility that Second Isaiah is bringing to mind the sack of Assyria outlined in Nah 3 (where brick production is in preparation for the siege of Nineveh) is intriguing.

37 Dorman (Faces in Clay, 96-97) discusses the semanatic range of qd in Egyptian, which can refer to both potters and builders. Dorman concludes that the overlap is due, in part, to the similarity between the work
As part of a series of woe sayings from First Isaiah 28-33, Isa 29:16 asks if the potter (הַיֹּצֵר) will be esteemed (יֵחָשֵׁב) like clay (כ חֹמֶר). This phrase is then developed by the next two verses, which are themselves parallel, likening “that which is made” (מַע ַשֶה) to “that which is formed” (יֵצֶר) and a “maker” (יִֹּעֶשׁ) to a “former” (יוֹצֶר). 38 Within the same large section of text, 39 Isa 30:14 suggests Yahweh will break Israel, “like the breaking (כ שֵבֶר) of a jar or pitcher (נֵבֶל) of potters (יוֹצְרִים). Crushed (כָתָות) he will not spare (לֹא־יִֵּחָשֵׁב). It will not be left (וֹלָֹא שִׁמֵּא) in its crushed earthenware fragments (בִּמ כִּתָת חֶרֶש) to snatch up fire (לַח תוֹתִֵּאֵש) from that which is kindled (מִיָּקָדֶשׁ) or to draw water (וֶלַח שֹׁם) from a cistern (מִגֶּבֶא).” Thus, First Isaiah’s poetic imagery, which is known to focus on Jerusalem, 40 preserves the common practice of reusing broken pottery, though in this case the destruction will be so complete that only totally useless sherds remain. It

of potters with damp earth and that of brick makers. He further notes that this semantic overlap continues into Coptic (ibid., 98).


39 Childs (Isaiah, 224) notes that verses 30:12-14 may have originated as independent oracles, but they were subsequently redacted into the verses 1-17.

also specifies the meaning of יצר by using a myriad of other terms related to clay objects.\(^41\)

Pottery imagery also occurs in Second Isaiah. In addition to Isa 41:25, which may refer to brick construction (see above), Isa 45:9 mentions potters, repeating the theme found in 29:16, “woe [to the] one striving with one forming him (ַיֹּצ ר),\(^42\) an earthen vessel\(^43\) with\(^44\) vessels of earth (חֶרֶשִֵּּאֶת־חַר שֵיִֵּּא ַדָמָה).” The text then asks if clay (חֹמֶר) will say to one forming it (וֹל יֹצ ר) “what are you making (תַע ַשֶה),” or criticize his work\(^45\) for having no skill (יָדַיִּם).\(^46\) Once again, the particular connotation of יצר is clarified by the use of other terminology specifically related to clay. The text then broadens the metaphor

\(^{41}\) It should also be noted that verse 13, preceding this text, compares Judah’s guilt to a quickly collapsing wall. Although Blenkinsopp (ibid., 417) seems to think the double metaphor (the wall and the pottery) “overworked,” the two images may not be randomly juxtaposed. If one takes seriously the overlap between the creation of vessels and bricks, then the images maintain some connection. Further, if the allusion in the verse 13 “high wall” is to a defensive city wall (ca. Isa 26:5), then some familiarity with extramural pottery market activities may also come to mind.

\(^{42}\) In comparison with verse 9b, BHS suggests בִּר ל ר ו ה might be emended to בְּרוֹר, or “will he strive.” See also Blenkinsopp (Isaiah 40-55, 251), who claims that the woe form is foreign to Isa 40-66.

\(^{43}\) BHS suggests this is transposed and should read instead חֹר שוִּחֶרֶש, or “with one engraving him, a postsherd/vessel of earth.” Blenkinsopp (ibid., 251) notes that 1QIsa’ contains the plural participle, or “the potters of the earth,” although see below for the problem reading כָּרָה as “potter” as opposed to craftsman. Baltzer (Deutero-Isaiah, 234 n.165) argues that the text does not require emendation.

\(^{44}\) Blenkinsopp (Isaiah 40-55, 251) argues that הַיָּרִיב must be taken to mean “among,” based on the context. See also Oswalt, Book of Isaiah, 206; Westermann, Isaiah 40-66, 164; and Baltzer, Deutero-Isaiah, 232. For “together with” see HALOT 1: 101, though not quoting this text in particular.

\(^{45}\) Blenkinsopp (Isaiah 40-55, 251) first emends יָרָה of the Masoretic Text to “his work” on the basis of the Septuagint. See also Baltzer, Deutero-Isaiah, 232 for a full rendering of the Septuagint, “and [to] its fashioner: ‘Have you no hands?’” Baltzer (ibid., 234) suggests this final phrase is a direct address to Yahweh claiming that “your work” refers to humans and the lack of hands suggests humans cannot form themselves.

\(^{46}\) Although the NRSV has translated the word as “handles,” no evidence supports this reading.
to include fathers begetting and women producing in labor (45:10), concluding that Yahweh is “the holy one of Israel and one forming it (_decoder)" (45:11) and mentioning both the children and pottery metaphors (11b). Subsequent verses then describe Yahweh as a creator in general, using _creare_ in 45:12, _ bara_ in 45:12, 18, and _creare_ in 45:18. 47 Similar to 41:25, 45:9 is embedded in a large text about Cyrus, with verses 9-13 intended to counter any question as to Yahweh’s choice of Cyrus as anointed. 48 This does not imply that the characterization of clay in 45:9 was unique to Second Isaiah. Rather, Blenkinsopp has posited some literary dependence on Isa 29:16 (see above). 49 Of particular interest, both oracles are about rebuilding Jerusalem, once again preserving a connection between clay items and the southern capital.

Finally, as part of a longer psalm-like passage, Isa 64:7 compares Yahweh, as father, 50 to a “former” (_decoder) and Israel to the clay (_decoder) and a work (_decoder) of Yahweh’s

47 Blenkinsopp (Isaiah 40-55, 254) also notes the prevalence of creation imagery in these verses.

48 Ibid., 252.

49 Blenkinsopp (Isaiah 1-39, 408) notes that not only is the language of this verse similar to Isa 29:16, but Isa 45:9-10 is the only example of a woe saying in Second Isaiah. For these reasons, he hypothesizes that the author of Second Isaiah may have borrowed from the earlier material. Note, however, that Blenkinsopp (Isaiah 40-55, 251) later suggests emending the text to omit the woe formula. Still, he (ibid., 252-53) maintains a possible dependence on Isa 29:16 based on the similarity of content, rather than on the form of the woe saying. In contrast, Westermann (Isaiah 40-66, 165) claims that the woe is original but that, given its unusual presence in Second Isaiah, it must have been reworked by a later redactor. He also understands these various verses (especially comparing verses 9 and 11) as originally unrelated (ibid., 166-67).

50 Westermann (ibid., 397) and Joseph Blenkinsopp (Isaiah 56-66: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary [AB 19B; New York: Doubleday, 2003], 265) claim the combination of paternal and pottery imagery prevent suggesting Yahweh begat Israel directly, as was the case for gods and humans in other ancient Near Eastern texts.
hands, once again combining יַצִּיר with clay terminology.⁵¹ Although Blenkinsopp notes that Yahweh as potter-creator occurs in other texts,⁵² he does not mention the fact that the image is often negative, likening Israel to pottery as a way of commenting on her limitations at best and destruction at worst. Elsewhere, only in Job 10:8-9 does the author similarly turn the metaphor on its head, asking Yahweh whether he will destroy what he has made.

### 8.2.2.3.3 Jeremiah

Jeremiah 18 also connects יַצִּיר with pottery vessels in Jerusalem.⁵³ Jeremiah is commanded to “go down” (יָרַד תָּא) to the house of the potter (הַיוֹצֵר), which may imply that

---

⁵¹ Blenkinsopp (ibid., 258-59) presents a helpful overview of the various dates attributed to 63:7-61:11[12], which range from the early post-destruction period (586-539 B.C.E) to post 539. Blenkinsopp appears to agree with the earlier range of dating based on the similarities between this text and Lamentations (ibid., 265-66). Westermann (Isaiah 40-66, 301) also dates this psalm-like composition to a time soon after the fall of Jerusalem, though it may have been expanded and altered before inclusion in Third Isaiah.


⁵³ John Bright (Jeremiah: Introduction, Translation, and Notes [AB 21; Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1965], lxxv) claims that chapters 18-20 were completed over time, consisting of short oracles, biographical material, and prose discourse. Specifically, he considers the verses in question, 18:1-12 and 19:1-13, to belong to the realm of prose discourse that was later edited into these chapters. In the case of 18:1-12 Bright believes the passage warns about an incident that took place in the first years of Jehoiakim’s reign (ibid., 126). Furthermore, these prose materials are sometimes attributed to a separate Deuteronomistic redactor or the influence of Deuteronomy on the author; and they range in date from the end of the monarchy to the Babylonian exile. For a helpful summary see Robert P Carroll, Jeremiah (OTL; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1986), 40-46. In regards to chapter 18, Carroll believes that verses 1-6 were expanded by verses 7-10 which use some Deuteronomistic terminology, only to be added to later by verse 11; after the exile verse 12 was compiled into the whole (ibid., 371-74). In contrast, William L Holladay (Jeremiah 1: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Jeremiah Chapters 1-15 [ed. Paul D. Hanson; Hermeneia; Philadelphia; Fortress, 1986], 513) sees no reason that verses 7-11 should be considered separately; though he does admit verse 12 is problematic, suggesting it was added by Jeremiah at a later time (ibid., 514).
the house was outside the city, on the slopes below Jerusalem. Whether or not the pottery was usually sold in this location, the potter is shown forming his clay (חֹמֶר), vessels on “two stones” (הָאָב נָיִּם), probably a wheel.

According to the text of chapter 19:1-2, Jeremiah is commanded to purchase a vessel (ו קָנִּיתִֵָּבַק) of one who forms (יוֹצֵר) earthen vessels (חָרֶש). Yahweh then commands Jeremiah, in the company of the elders and priests, to go out to the Hinnom Valley, which is at the opening of the Potsherd Gate (שַעַרִֵּהַחַר סִּות). Further, if

54 Holladay (ibid., 513) notes that some interpreters assume Jeremiah was on the temple mount when he received the instructions, but he interprets the verb to mean the potter’s workshop was at a lower part of the city.

55 Note that this term occurs most of the time in passages dealing with potting activity (Jer 18:4, 6; Isa 45:9; 64:7; Job 10:9) but also as clay for seals, as the material of human bodies (Job 4:19), materials for bulwarks (Job 13:12), as mire (Isa 10:6, Job 30:19), and as mortar for building (Gen 11:3, Exod 1:14). In the case of pottery activity and building activity (and by extension the passage that compares human bodies to “houses of clay”) it can be assumed that a semi-levigated clay is implied. In the case of the seal impressions and the mire, the author is still referring to a moistened clay (or wet earth) rather than regular earth or dust.

56 Bright, Jeremiah, 124; Carroll, Jeremiah, 370; Holladay, Jeremiah, 515.

57 If read with the Codex Leningradensis, the participle stands and must refer to the craftsman. Note the apparatus of BHS does suggest a possible emendation to a passive.

58 The word must be a collective here. The obvious sense is not that the potter made only one earthen vessel and that for Jeremiah, but he was the sort of craftsman that made earthen vessels. This may have been a necessary qualifier of the participle because the verb can sometimes mean to carve wood.

59 Carroll (Jeremiah, 384) notes the possible alterations to these verses in the various versions, particularly how other versions solve the problem of the missing verb in verse 2.

60 Bright (Jeremiah, 131) considers Valley of ben Hinnom an expansion; the text originally commanded the prophet to go out of the Potsherd Gate. He also believes all the material mentioning Topheth is an expansion (verses 3-13) and suggests a date in the early years of Jehoiakim’s reign (ibid., 133). Carroll (Jeremiah, 386) also considers the original account to include verses 1-2a, 10-11, and 14-15 with all other material belonging to a separate sermon. Note that Holladay (Jeremiah, 536-37) believes the entirety to be original and possibly associated with Baruch.

61 This term for potsherd occurs only here in Biblical Hebrew but is obviously related to the alternative spelling with a sin in the previous verse. BDB: 360 suggests this is a place where potsherds were thrown;
Jeremiah 18 and 19 are read in tandem, the prophet actually follows the process of pot construction, from the formation of the vessel at the potter’s house, possibly outside of the city, to the sale of pottery vessels near the Potsherd Gate, not far from the Hinnom Valley (and the Kidron Valley). Eventually the prophet smashes the pottery as an act of judgment against the Judahites and Jerusalemites (19:10-11), completing the life of the pottery vessel. Thus, the texts of Jeremiah also use a combination of clay terminology to indicate the meaning of יצר and preserve an association between Jerusalem and the clay production industry.

but, contra BDB, it is equally likely that the term refers to foot traffic or market debris (see below) from the nearby potter’s residence. Most likely the term should be read with the masoretic Qere.

62 The geographic location of the Potsherd Gate near the Valley of ben Hinnom can only be taken seriously if the text is read as it stands. If Bright and Carroll are correct (see above) that the location of the gate is a secondary redaction, then the nature of the information is less secure. Regardless, Carroll (Jeremiah, 388) believes the original intention of the text was directed toward Jerusalem. Holladay (Jeremiah, 539) also notes the location of the gate is unknown, though he does not consider the Valley of ben Hinnom to be secondary.

63 Given this is the same word יבוק used in 19:1, there is some consistency throughout the prose section, though in verse 11 it is referred to as יבוקי. The choice of this particular vessel name may have been motivated by a play on words with יבוקי of verse 7 (Bright, Jeremiah, 131).

64 Regardless of the possible redactional history, there is reason to read these chapters as a continuous literary piece, even if they reached their final form secondarily. The prophetic message parallels the form of the vessel. When Jeremiah is witnessing the forming and reforming of the vessel, Yahweh is soft enough to reconsider the fate of Judah and Jerusalem just as the potter reconsiders and reforms the soft clay. Once the people reject this message in chapter 18 and Jeremiah cries to Yahweh, the new prophecy is given. In chapter 19 the hard and set message of Yahweh for the people is demonstrated with a fired vessel; then subsequently the destruction of the people is likened to the smashing of that vessel. In later chapters, the dispersal of the people and the destruction of Judah and Jerusalem is compared to abandoned potsherds (Jer 22:28; 25:34). For a similar opinion see Carroll, Jeremiah, 385-86.
8.2.2.4 יָצָר in passages describing idol production

8.2.2.4.1 Isaiah

In addition to its connection with clay objects, in two instances the term יָצָר refers to forming idols, although in neither case are other terms for clay included. Isaiah 44 uses the root a number of times. The chapter begins by describing Yahweh as “the one who made you” (ךָּעֹשֶ) and “the one who formed you from the belly” (ו יֹצֶרְךָ) (44:2). After describing Yahweh’s commitment to water the earth and bless Jacob and Israel’s offspring (44:3-5), the text begins a new section, also introduced by the formula “Thus says Yahweh,” (44:6). Verses 6-8 ask the general question of whether there is any god other than Yahweh. Verse 9 continues with this theme by discussing idol makers, introduced by the general phrase, “formers of an idol, all of them are void (יָצָרְיָיָרְכֶם תֹהו).” Verse 10 restates verse 9 asking “who will form a god and an idol who will cast

---

65 Blenkinsopp (Isaiah 40-55, 230) suggests that verse 6 begins a new subsection, separated from verses 1-5, on the basis of 1QIsa and the common themes shared between verses 1-5 and 43:22-28. See also Westermann, Isaiah 40-66, 138. Baltzer (Deutero-Isaiah, 184) also separates verses 1-5 from the rest of chapter 44; he suggests their content is distinct from 43:22-28 but, as the text stands, is linked with those verses.

66 Blenkinsopp (Isaiah 40-55, 235) and Westermann (Isaiah 40-66, 138-39) see verses 9-20 as an interpolation interrupting 44:6-8, 21-23. Note, however, that Oswalt (Book of Isaiah, 170 n. 27) argues that verses 21-22 do not necessarily fit well with verses 6-8 and their presence may be explained as an addition based on verses 9-20. Baltzer (Deutero-Isaiah, 188) also takes verses 6-8 on their own as a “link passage” though he notes these verses “correspond” to verses 21-23, including the use of the catchword יָצָר.

67 Although 9-11 are often read together (see below), it also seems possible that 9 is a link or introduction to verses 10-11. The number of repeated terms between the verses is particularly striking (יָצָר, יָעָל, פָּסִל, יָצָר, and בּוֹש).
and verse 11 condemns to shame all who make idols. Thus verses 9-11 comprise a general condemnation of idol makers.

Verse 12 begins a sub-section on those who make idols out of metal (חָרַשׁ בֶּן זֶל) and verse 13 a sub-section on those who make idols of wood (חָרַשׁ עֵצִים). Interestingly, with the exception of the introductory formula in verses 9-11, יָצָר is virtually absent in the rest of the address (44:12-20). Alternatively, the text uses versions of сделал (44:13, 15, 17, 19) to discuss the production of an idol or a god. The root יָצָר only returns with the next section of the chapter (44:21) where Yahweh reasserts, “I formed you” (ךָי צַר תִּי), reasserted again in verse 24, “Thus says Yahweh, the one who redeems you and the one who has formed you from the belly” (ו יֹצֶר ךִָּמִּבָטֶן), repeated from verse 2.

68 Verse 11 contains two problematic words. As the text stands it reads, “Behold all his companions (חַבֵּרָיו) will be shamed and engravers (ו חָרָשִּים), they are from human[s]. A minor change of vowels would produce the alternative, “All his spells (חֶבֶר) will be shamed and those skilled in magical arts (חֶרֶש) are human.” For the first of these emendations see Isa 47: 9, 11 as referring to Babylonian magic. For the second, see Isa 3:3. Complicating this second point see V. Hamp (““חֶרֶשׁ, 3.b.” TDOT 5: 222-23), who argues that חֶרֶשׁ, meaning “to practice magic,” must be from a different root than that used for “craftsman.” He points out that only in Isa 3:3 does the root clearly mean “charms” and that even in Ugaritic literature it is used to refer to magic only twice. Blenkinsopp (Isaiah 40-55, 239) points out that Duham had also suggested both emendations, but Blenkinsopp does not believe the changes produce “a good fit” with the context. Westermann (Isaiah 40-66, 148) also notes Duhm’s emendation but claims that it is impossible because in this passage the manufacture of idols is totally unconnected with religion. In neither case does Blenkinsopp or Westermann provide a convincing argument against emendation. On a further problem with the text, Baltzer (Deutero-Isaiah, 194) points out the ambiguity of the third masculine singular suffix חַבֵּר, questioning whether it refers to the idol’s companions (i.e., worshippers) or the craftsmen’s companions.

69 Verse 12 does say, “with a hammer he forms it” (חָרַשׁ בַּמַקְבוֹת). But BHS suggests amending to חָרַשֵׁה based on the Arabic ṣawāda. Blenkinsopp (Isaiah 40-55, 240) claims the core of 9-20 is verses 12-17 in prose, “sandwiched” between 9-11 and 18-20. This may explain why יָצָר is mostly absent in verses 12-17. Note, however, Westermann (Isaiah 40-66, 148) and Oswalt (The Book of Isaiah, 173 n. 34) consider the entire set of verses poetry though freer than most poetic structure in Second Isaiah. For the same opinion see Baltzer (Deutero-Isaiah, 192-93), who includes a useful review of scholarship on this point. He argues verses 9-20 are continuous.

70 Blenkinsopp (Isaiah 40-55, 245-46) separates verse 24 as the introduction of the next oracle but also shows how this beginning is intended to integrate the oracle into the general style of chapters 44-48.
Thus the majority of occurrences of בָּנוּ in this chapter are found in framing or linking texts introducing or ending oracles. Even where the verb exists within the oracle, it refers only generally to all people who form idols or gods not to the specific acts of formation. It seems safe to conclude that when the word is used with its specific connotation it usually evokes construction from clay or wet earth; but it can also evoke the broader definition “to form,” whether the object is creation, humanity, or occasionally other gods.

The question remains whether Isa 44 uses the term in its narrow or broad sense. The absence of other clay terminology should be indicative. Further, the theology of Second Isaiah suggests a broader meaning for the root. Blenkinsopp distinguishes between creation terms (including pottery imagery) in First and Second Isaiah, suggesting only Second Isaiah is characterized by “sustained reflection on creation and Yahweh as creator.” Blenkinsopp also argues that the polemic in 44:9-20 is characteristic of

including the use of the root בָּנוּ. For the same division see Westermann, Isaiah 40-66, 152 and Baltzer, Deutero-Isaiah, 205. In contrast, Oswalt (Book of Isaiah, 189, 190-91) includes verse 23 as the beginning of the following section (following Mowinckel), but still states that the transitions are so artfully composed one has difficulty identifying whether they close the preceding section or open the following.

Konkel, NIDOTTE 2:504-5 concurs with the breadth of range as well as the predominance of pottery imagery. See also Otzen, TDOT 6:257-65.

Blenkinsopp, Isaiah 1-39, 408. Otzen, (TDOT 6:262-63) also claims that in this chapter the term often refers to salvation oracles, thus the verb’s more general sense. Alternatively, some scholars feel Blenkinsopp overstates the distinctions between First and Second Isaiah. On the division of First and Second Isaiah and the dating of Second Isaiah during the sixth century see also Paul D. Hanson, Isaiah 40-66 (Int; Louisville, Ky.: John Knox, 1995), 1 and Westermann, Isaiah 40-66, 3; and for a brief review of the problems with this traditional dating see Childs, Isaiah, 1-4, where Childs notes the thematic continuity
chapters 40-48, unparalleled in the rest of Isaiah and possibly from a larger source.\textsuperscript{73}

Further suggesting a contrast between the way בַּּצָּה is handled in other Isaianic passages and its occurrence in chapter 44, Blenkinsopp notes the similarities between the prohibition against idols in Second Isaiah (found in chapters 40-48) and that found in Deuteronomic theology,\textsuperscript{74} an argument undergirded by the use of the typically late term הָינַח in 44:13, found also in Deut 4 (see below).\textsuperscript{75} Finally, Baltzer points out the contrast between Yahweh as successful “former” of creation and human craftsmen as failed “formers” of idols.\textsuperscript{76} Thus, most of the Isaianic pottery imagery comes from First Isaiah, while Second Isaiah mentions brick-making, quotes First Isaiah, or includes the root בַּּצָּה as an element of its unique creation theology. Moreover, if the Gen 2 creation from dust and ground serves as the backdrop for Second Isaiah’s depiction of Yahweh as a “former” of creation, Yahweh’s chosen medium would stand in contrast with wood and metal, the materials of idol makers.

throughout the book but without positing a single author. For a more extreme skepticism of the dominant scholarly dating see Oswalt, \textit{Book of Isaiah}, 5-6.

\textsuperscript{73} Blenkinsopp, \textit{Isaiah 40-55}, 240. The source would also be responsible for 40:19-20; 41:6-7; 42:17; 45:16-17, 20; 46:1-7; 48:5 in addition to this passage. Westermann (\textit{Isaiah 40-66}, 146-47) argues that perhaps only 40:19ff; 41:6ff, 44:9-20, and 45:16ff are from the same source.

\textsuperscript{74} Blenkinsopp, \textit{Isaiah 40-55}, 241-42. He is referring to Exod 20:4-6=Deut 5:8-10; Exod 34:17; Deut 4:15-18; 27:15; Lev 19:4; 26:1, several of which will be discussed below.

\textsuperscript{75} See also Moshe Weinfeld, (\textit{Deuteronomy 1-11: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary} [AB 5; New York: Doubleday, 1991], 209) who notes that in the Pentateuch, only in Deuteronomy (27:15; 28:36; 29:16; 31:29) are idols treated sarcastically, a common practice in prophetic literature, especially Second Isaiah (40:19ff; 41:7; 44:9-29; 46:6ff).

\textsuperscript{76} Baltzer, \textit{Deutero-Isaiah}, 194-95.
8.2.2.4.2 Habakkuk

Habakkuk 2:18-19 also uses יצר in its broad sense. These verses are tied to the rest of chapter 2 by the woe pronouncement in 19, which echoes verses 6b, 9, 12, and 15, but the verses share little else with the rest of the chapter. For example, all other woe statements are followed by judgments, totally lacking in verses 18-19. Further, the other indictments discuss social inequity rather than religious purity.

These verses literally ask “what profit is an idol (פסל) when his idol, he forms it (כי עזר).” Similar to Isa 44, the text next refers to “a cast image” (מסכה) parallel with “idol.” It then claims a former (יוצר) trusts his formed [object] (ויצר), and describes idols...

---

77 See Francis I. Andersen, *Habakkuk: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 25; New York: Doubleday, 2001), 15. Andersen points out the common trend of reading 2:6b-20 as a separate prophetic composition that has been added to the book secondarily; though he also notes some arguments may suggest these verses be seen as integral to the book.

78 Andersen (ibid., 18) also points out formal problems with the text. The refrain of 17b marks a transition between the fourth and fifth woe oracles, but the woe pronouncement that might be expected in verse 18 is delayed until verse 19. This is not a great difficulty for Andersen; but Roberts (*Nahum, Habakkuk, and Zephaniah*, 126) suggests that verse 18 is highly problematic in its present location and must either result from a transposition (originally following verse 19) or a later gloss. At the same time, Roberts (ibid., 127) notes that many scholars consider the entire oracle to be out of place in chapter 2, particularly because idolatry is not a major theme in Habakkuk. He himself argues that the idolatry theme is introduced in 1:11, 16, although, contra Robert, these minor mentions hardly constitute a major concern in the book. He is on firmer ground when he suggests that the oracle prohibits idol production at this point because of the Babylonian opponent addressed in the overall passage.

79 According to *BHS*, Qumran manuscripts are missing the third masculine singular possessive suffix on פסלים. Andersen (*Habakkuk*, 252) interprets a break between פסלים and כך, suggesting instead, “How does an image benefit? For its craftsman has carved it.” In contrast, Roberts (*Nahum, Habakkuk, and Zephaniah*, 113) reads without a break, “what has the carved image availed that its fashioner has carved it?”

80 *BHS* suggests that יצרן כה is a dittography and should be read simply יצר, or “a former trusts it,” with the יائر marking the object. Andersen (*Habakkuk*, 254) maintains the Masoretic Text but argues that יצר should refer to a clay object. This contradicts his own interpretation of 18a, where he claims the root יצר is used in a general sense to mean any manufacturer. He is not aware of the possible emendation to 18b with *BHS*.
as mute gods (אֱלִילִים אֱלִילִים). After this general allusion to idol formation, verse 19 speaks directly about construction from wood and stone, plated with gold and silver. Further, in contrast with the other prophetic passages examined (though similar to Isa 44), no specific clay terminology is used in combination with the root. Thus, once again יצר is used in its general sense. The text makes clear that the idols in question are constructed of wood, stone, and precious metal—not clay or earth. Finally, the possible later date of the text, at least in its redacted form, may suggest a closer relationship to Second Isaiah than to the other passages describing clay objects.81

8.2.2.5 Summary of יצר and clay terminology

To review, יצר can be used alone to connote potters but is most frequently accompanied by other clay terminology. Of these, חוֹמֶר refers to cement or mortar but usually clay.82 This term is used more often than טיט, the Akkadian loan word used in

Further contradicting himself, he even suggests that יֵצַר מַסֵכָה יְצַר רוֹ from 18a may be a hendiadys, which would seem to indicate metal materials are foremost in the author’s mind, not to mention the stone, wood, and metal of verse 19.

81 Andersen (ibid., 24–27) provides a helpful summary on the proposed dates for the book, ranging from the eighth century to the Hellenistic period. He settles on a date between 605 and 575 B.C.E. on the basis of the Chaldeans mentioned in Hab 1:6. Roberts (Nahum, Habakkuk, and Zephaniah, 83) also summarizes the various positions but concludes that individual oracles were given over a span of time slightly broader than 605-597 B.C.E and that the book was not completed until after 596. In particular, Roberts believes some of the woe oracles from 2:6-20 may have been composed against a Judean oppressor, like Jehoiakim, but have been re-worked to refer to Babylon.

82 As mortar or cement for bricks: Gen 11:3; Exod 1:14; Nah 3:14; as material for vessels Jer 18:4, 6; Isa 29:16; as material for the fashioning of humans on analogy with clay vessels: Isa 45:9; 64:7; Job 10:9; as material for bodies: Job 4:19 33:6; as material for bulwarks: Job 13:12. The related verb means “to be red.”
many Assyrian figurine rituals. In HebrewTekhalim refers to mire or mud, and twice it is associated with ḥomir in order to describe brick making (Isa 41:25; Nah 3:14). Also interesting, ḥapar is never used in pottery imagery, other than the possible allusion in Gen 2, though it is used to describe humans as well as mortar/dried mud for plastering houses (Lev 14:41). It is possible that ḥapar generally refers to earth or dust in its raw form, versus ḥomir which implies levigated clay. Similarly, ḥadamah is used only once to refer to vessels of earth (Isa 45:9). Likening pottery vessels to humans, the passage stands within the creation theology of Second Isaiah, perhaps harkening back to the material from which humans and animals are made (Gen 2:7, 19).84

The objects formed of clay include vessels (כלי), jugs (נבל), bricks (לבן), potsherds/vessels (חרש), and particular pottery forms (בקבק). In a more general sense a “work” (מעשה) can be formed of clay. In its most general sense, the verb can take as its object a personal pronoun referring to nations, humans, an idol, or a god.

Chronologically, the earliest materials in the historical books use the root יצר to indicate potters without the presence of other clay terminology. The later materials and poetic materials combine other clay terms with the root to specify its meaning, probably because the root has a broader connotative field in later texts, particularly in Second Isaiah. In no text (assuming the emendation in Zechariah) are potters employed in formal temple or tabernacle practice; and pottery terminology occurs most commonly in texts

83 Job 41:22; Mic 7:10; Pss 18:43; 40:30; 69:15; Zech 9:3; 10:5; Jer 38:6; Isa 57:20.

84 L. Wächter (TDOT 11: 259) claims that the meanings of the roots עפר and אדמה intersect; but Wächter’s suggestion provides little help since אדמה is no more common among pottery terminology than is עפר.
that liken the destruction or debasement of people to pottery items. Many of the texts associate pottery imagery with Jerusalem, in particular. Most important, the text remains stubbornly silent about the formation of figurines from clay. Nor do the Isaiah and Habakkuk passages refer to clay images.

8.2.3 חֶרֶש in Leviticus and Numbers

Despite the textual silence, one term does shed light on the uses of clay in ritual contexts. In the previous texts, the noun חֶרֶש occurs in a number of verses with יצְר. The term evokes a broad range of images. At the same time that it can be defined as potsherd and used to symbolize the transitory nature of breakable pottery, it is also used in Jer 32:14 to preserve the deeds for the land: “put them in a vessel of clay (בִּכ לִּי—חֶרֶש) so that they will stand many days,” attesting to the resilience of fired pottery.

Furthermore, the term is used a number of times without יצְר in Leviticus. Leviticus 6:21 describes what happens to a vessel of clay in which the “sin” offering has been boiled. If the sin offering is boiled in a vessel of clay (וכ לִי—חֶרֶש), it is to be broken; but if it is prepared in a bronze vessel (בִּכ לִּיִנ חֹשֶת), the vessel need only be rinsed and cleaned with water. Breaking the vessel was necessitated by the holiness/impurity


86 On the alternate translation “purification offering” see Milgrom, Leviticus 1-16, 253-54. See also Baruch A. Levine (Leviticus: The Traditional Hebrew Text with the New JPS Translation [JPS Torah Commentary; Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1989], 19), who maintains the term “sin offering,” understood to imply both impurity and guilt. Roy E. Gane (“Privative Preposition in Purification Offering Pericopes and the Changing Face of ‘Dorian Gray,’” JBL 127 [2008]: 209-22) argues that purification cannot be separated from sin in the Levitical passages.
adhering in the sin offering, which must be eaten in a holy place because anything that touches it or its blood becomes holy (Lev 6:19-20).  

Leviticus 11:33 relates a similar rule in regards to unclean animals and earthen vessels. The text says that the contents of “any earthen vessel” (ו כָל־כ לִּי־חֶרֶש) into which a part of an unclean animal falls becomes unclean (איןני). Verse 34 seems to reiterate that any food or water associated with such vessels become unclean. This is the reason verse 33 commands the vessel must be broken. Note also verse 35 requires even an oven (תנור) or stove (оборот) that touches the unclean animal to be smashed. The clay objects

---

87 Milgrom (Leviticus 1-16, 405-6) suggests the requirement to break the vessel results from an older “pagans” belief that objects used to exorcise impurity became charged with the same power. Subsequent development in the notion of purity resulted in a contradictory notion that objects and processes related to purging impurity could be considered at once impure and holy. Elsewhere, however, Milgrom (“The Preposition מ in the קָרָאת Pericopes,” JBL 126 [2007]: 162) says that the garment spattered with blood in the immediately preceding verses (6:20) was holy rather than impure. Roy E. Gane (Cult and Character: Purification Offerings, Day of Atonement, and Theodicy [Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2005], 172-74) agrees with Milgrom’s initial stance, arguing that the sin offering, while holy, still carries some vestige of human impurity. Erhard S. Gerstenberger (Leviticus: A Commentary [OTL; Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox, 1996], 92) interprets the problem as one of residual holiness rather than impurity. In contrast to Milgrom’s original position, Levine (Leviticus, 40) claims that the vessel must be broken, not because of impurity adhering in the vessel, but because the porous nature of earthen vessels may absorb food particles from the sacrificial flesh that may then inadvertently mix with other foodstuffs in subsequent meals, thus contaminating any further use of the vessel. Levine does not offer a sufficient explanation. If the real problem is the remainder of the sacrificial meat rather than the clay, this would not explain the several other texts (not involving the sacrifice) wherein earthen vessels must be destroyed (see below).

88 Gerstenberger (Leviticus, 128-29) suggests chapters 1-7 and chapters 11-15 were possibly self-enclosed units prior to their incorporation in the present context. If Gerstenberger is correct, the unique character of chapters 11-15 may limit the degree to which this material is comparable to that in chapter 6.

89 Gerstenberger (ibid., 143) seems to treat verses 33 and 34 as different traditions, with verse 34 describing an alternate ritual wherein only the contents of the pot are defiled (rather than the pot itself). Gerstenberger’s reading seems implausible; nor does he provide any argument for why verses 33 and 34 should be read separately. More likely, verse 34 is a justification for why the pot needs to be broken in verse 33.

90 The term describes a portable and breakable oven, probably equivalent to a tabun. These are always made from clay in the archaeological record.
are contrasted with other elements that come into contact with unclean animals, like people (11:24-28, 31, 39, 40), items of wood, clothing, skin, sacks, or “any item that is made” (כָּל־כְּלֵי אֲשֶׁר־יָשָׁה; ); these are only unclean until the evening and do not need to be broken or smashed (11:32). Again, in Lev 15:12 any earthen vessel (כַּל־כִּי־חֶרֶש) that comes into contact with a man who has a discharge must be broken. In contrast, vessels of wood are only to be rinsed in water. The difference appears to depend on the materials from which items are constructed. If an item is made from clay, whether it is an earthen vessel or a tabun, it must be destroyed.

Leviticus 14:5 records another ritual using an earthen vessel, this time to purify someone with a skin disease. The priest slaughters one of two birds over “water of life” (מַיִםִֵּחַיִּים) in the earthen vessel (כַּל־כִּי־חֶרֶש). A living bird along with hyssop, cedarwood, and a crimson thread should be dipped into the blood of the bird slaughtered over the earthen vessel (14:6). Afterwards, the priest sprinkles the person who had skin disease and releases the living bird. Likewise, in the ritual for the cleansing of a house (14:34-

91 The term appears only here; however, a related term, כִּיּוֹר, also indicates a pot or basin used sometimes for cooking (1 Sam 2:14).

92 See below where Milgrom argues that the rite, in its present form, no longer functions to purify the individual. Rather he argues that it was included to placate the laity and was largely anesthetized by occurring only after the person is already well and at the beginning of several days of purification rites.

93 Milgrom (Leviticus 1-16, 837-38), Gerstenberger (Leviticus, 176), and Levine (Leviticus, 84) suggest spring water.

94 Gerstenberger (Leviticus, 176) claims that the text is ambiguous about whether the water is in the pot or whether the ceremony takes places near a spring or brook.
57), after the house is pronounced clean the priest performs the same ritual as that for the person with skin disease (14:49-53).\footnote{Baruch A. Levine, \textit{(In the Presence of the Lord: A Study of Cult and Some Cultic Terms in Ancient Israel} [SJLA 5; Leiden: Brill, 1974], 83-84) argues that these rites are prophylactic, intended to prevent the return of the symptoms. In this way, he explains why the ritual takes place after the person or structure is healed.

In a similar vein,\footnote{Baruch A. Levine, \textit{Numbers 1-20: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary} (AB 4; New York: Doubleday, 1993), 181. Though he claims that Num 5 is composed of a number of sections, Levine also shows the close relationship between chapter 5 and Lev 13-15. Jacob Milgrom (\textit{Numbers: The Traditional Hebrew Text with the New JPS Translation} [JPS Torah Commentary; Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1990], xiv, 33) claims that chapters 5 and 6 may have come from an independent scroll, subsequently added after Num 3-4. Martin Noth (\textit{Numbers: A Commentary} [OTL; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1968], 44-45) also believes that chapters 5 and 6 were added to the Priestly narrative, though these chapters contained highly varied materials, which are late in composition but may preserve earlier practice, juxtaposed together. Milgrom (\textit{Numbers}, 350-54) argues for the composition unity of 5:11-31 with the exception of verse 21 (added at an early time in redactional history to associate an otherwise “pagan” rite with the power of the deity) and verse 31. In his argument for compositional unity he follows Michael Fishbane, “Accusations of Adultery: A Study of Law and Scribal Practice in Numbers 5:11-31,” \textit{HUCA} 45 (1974): 25-45 and Herbert C. Brichto, “The Case of the Sota and a Reconsideration of Biblical ‘Law,’” \textit{HUCA} 46 (1975): 55-70.} Num 5 uses an earthen vessel in the ritual performed when a man suspects his wife has been unfaithful. After bringing the woman to the tabernacle, Num 5:17 says the priest mixes dust (הֶעָפָר) from the tabernacle with holy water in an earthen vessel (בִּכ לִּי־חֶרֶש), thereafter called “the water of bitterness” (מֵיִּיםָרִים) (5:18).\footnote{\textit{BHS} says the Samaritan Pentateuch reads הַמ אִּרִּים or the hiphil participle of אָרָא meaning “the water that shines or makes light.” \textit{BHS} suggests amending to הָאורִּים or הַםוֹרִּים meaning “the water of the Urim,” or “water of myrrh.” Levine (\textit{Numbers I-20}, 196) maintains the Masoretic Text as does Milgrom (\textit{Numbers}, 40, 303 n.58), though Milgrom notes that the use of the heh and the construct state, rather than the attributive adjective, is problematic and that the matter of its translation is not finally resolved. See also Noth, \textit{Numbers}, 50-51.}

In contrast Milgrom (\textit{Leviticus} 1-16, 838-39, 888-89) argues that the original purpose of the skin disease rite was exorcistic but has been co-opted by the larger Priestly framework making it appear extraneous as reported in its present form. He concedes that the purification of the house was originally apotropaic but that this function too has been expunged from Leviticus (ibid., 864-65, 889). Gerstenberger (\textit{Leviticus}, 175-76) claims the text has undergone a number of additions but that the root consisted of two separate rituals, one aspersion ceremony where the bird bears the impurity away and one blood aspersion ceremony.
priest writes these curses down and washes them into the water (5:23), which the woman subsequently drinks (5:24-28). The water in the earthen vessel appears to act as a conduit for the curse, transferred to the woman’s body when she drinks.  

Thus, Leviticus and Numbers preserve two related uses for clay objects. In the first set of texts, the clay objects must be destroyed because they are a permanent conduit across the sacred/profane divide, whether the issue is contact with a sin offering, an unclean animal, or an unclean human. In the second set of texts, the clay vessels are required because they act as a conduit between these realms, purifying a formerly diseased human or house or transferring curses to a woman’s body.

Although the result is different, i.e. whether or not the vessel is destroyed, in both types of rituals, clay clearly absorbs and conducts ritual purity and impurity. Moreover,

---

98 Levine (Numbers 1-20, 195) comments on the fact that the vessel is clay and on the ritual’s connection with Lev 14:5, 50 but does not reflect on the purpose of the clay other than “simplicity dominates the ordeal of the errant wife.” He also notes the contrast with vessels used in the sanctuary cult, which were silver and gold. Alternatively, David P. Wright (The Disposal of Impurity: Elimination Rites in the Bible and in Hittite and Mesopotamian Literature [SBLDS 101; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987], 96-98) mentions these texts, but adds to them Num 31:19-24 and Num 19:15. Neither of these other passages explicitly mentions clay. In Num 31 clay vessels are not listed as one of the materials that must remain outside the camp for purification, which Wright interprets as evidence that they are not capable of being purified. In chapter 19, Wright interprets כ לִּי as referring to clay vessels in particular although no clay terms are included in the verse to support his argument.

99 Wright (ibid., 98, n.14) argues that, though not stated, the clay vessels in Lev 15 and in Num 5 would have been broken. His assumption rests on his interpretation that the bird ritual uses the clay vessel to remove the impurity of the sick person, which would make the pot unclean. He does not address Milgrom’s argument (above) that the person is already healed at the time of the ritual. In the case of Num 5, he assumes that the clay vessel was contaminated by the impurity from the curses washed into the water. Thus, in Wright’s view, clay vessels were always chosen so that they might be disposed of after the ritual.

100 Note that the term כליִֵּחרס in M. Kelim gives a different rationale for the problems with clay. In M. Kelim 4:4 the text argues that “earthen vessels” become unclean at the moment they are fired. Thus, this text suggests the real issue is not necessarily the clay composition but the manufacturing process. Yitzhak Magen (The Stone Vessel Industry in the Second Temple Period: Excavations at Hizma and the Jerusalem Temple Mount. Judea and Samaria Publications 1 [ed., Levana Tsfania. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration
in many cases clay alone has this property, in contrast with bronze, wood, skin, clothing, or sackcloth.\textsuperscript{101}

On the date of the relevant texts, Milgrom argues that these Leviticus passages all stem from P (rather than H), which he dates no later than the eighth century and probably concurrent with the temple at Shiloh.\textsuperscript{102} Furthermore, he hypothesizes many of the texts explaining treatment of metal are those related to the Temple (Lev 6:21) and war spoils (Num 31:22). Even if the disparate treatment of metals is related to their relative scarcity as daily objects, clay is still treated differently than a number of other common items. Although Milgrom suggests an economic reason for this distinction (earthen vessels are more easily replaced)\textsuperscript{(as does Gerstenberger, \textit{Leviticus}, 92)}, he does note that clay is permeable to impurity and holiness. Wright (\textit{The Disposal of Impurity}, 111-13), however, argues that the only reason he can deduce for the differential treatment between types of porous material, such as clay, wood, leather, etc., is cheapness and availability of clay vessels in contrast to the other porous items.

\textsuperscript{101} Milgrom (ibid., 921) suggests that metalware was largely absent in the Israelite home and thus the only texts explaining treatment of metal are those related to the Temple (Lev 6:21) and war spoils (Num 31:22). Even if the disparate treatment of metals is related to their relative scarcity as daily objects, clay is still treated differently than a number of other common items. Although Milgrom suggests an economic reason for this distinction (earthen vessels are more easily replaced)\textsuperscript{(as does Gerstenberger, \textit{Leviticus}, 92)}, he does note that clay is permeable to impurity and holiness. Wright (\textit{The Disposal of Impurity}, 111-13), however, argues that the only reason he can deduce for the differential treatment between types of porous material, such as clay, wood, leather, etc., is cheapness and availability of clay vessels in contrast to the other porous items.

\textsuperscript{102} Milgrom (\textit{Leviticus 1-16}, 26-35). Even more specifically, Milgrom dates these texts to the original P\textsubscript{1} material (ibid., 63) although he suggests the structure of 14:34-57 indicates the verses were reworked by H (ibid., 881). For another opinion that argues H is later than P (throughout the Pentateuch) and responsible for the redaction of P see Israel Knohl, “The Priestly Torah Versus the Holiness School: Sabbath and the Festivals,” \textit{HUCA} 58 (1987): 65-117, although Milgrom dates the final stratum of H to the Babylonian Exile while Knohl argues for the beginning of the Persian period (ibid., \textit{The Sanctuary of Silence: The Priestly Torah and the Holiness School} [Minneapolis: Fortress, 1994], 226).
in question (11:24-38 and chapters 12-15) came from the same original source.\textsuperscript{103} Although Levine places the overall book in the postexilic period,\textsuperscript{104} Gerstenberger argues that the complex process of transmission, particularly for chapters 1-15, impede the establishment of an exact chronological order;\textsuperscript{105} he claims that materials from these chapters would be at home in the postexilic period though may be based on “pre-priestly” roots.\textsuperscript{106} Finally, Blenkinsopp argues against the school that dates P to the preexilic period\textsuperscript{107} but also notes that the dating argument has rested, almost exclusively, on the narrative sections of P rather than the legal material and that “the origin of the individual stipulations, enactments and smaller units is…a quite distinct issue.”\textsuperscript{108}

In the case of Numbers, Levine argues for a postexilic date for the P material in chapters 1-20,\textsuperscript{109} while Milgrom contends that the material is preexilic.\textsuperscript{110} In the case of

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{103} Milgrom, \textit{Leviticus} 1-16, 693, 695. Still attributed to P in the case of 11:24-38.
\item \textsuperscript{104} Levine, \textit{Leviticus}, xxxiii.
\item \textsuperscript{105} Gerstenberger, \textit{Leviticus}, 17-18.
\item \textsuperscript{106} Ibid., 88, 92, 182, 208-9.
\item \textsuperscript{107} Joseph Blenkinsopp, “An Assessment of the Alleged Pre-Exilic Date of the Priestly Material in the Pentateuch,” \textit{ZAW} 108 (1996): 495-518. He includes a brief overview of the history of the debate as well as responses to a number of scholars dating P to the preexilic period.
\item \textsuperscript{108} Ibid., 517. In contrast to Milgrom, Blenkinsopp emphasizes that the date of any possible ancient Near Eastern comparanda for the law and/or ritual in P should not serve as conclusive evidence for the date of the biblical text. Alternatively, Knohl (“Priestly Torah Versus the Holiness School,” 99) argues that the original dating of P by Wellhausen suffered from a lack of knowledge of ancient Near Eastern ritual, which Near Eastern Archaeology has corrected.
\item \textsuperscript{109} Levine, \textit{Numbers} 1-20, 104, 107.
\item \textsuperscript{110} Milgrom, \textit{Numbers}, xxxii-xxxv.
\end{itemize}
chapter 5 in particular, Milgrom considers the rite to be quite old (and “pagan” in origin), and reworked into its present context.\footnote{Ibid., xxxv.} Noth believes that Numbers contains a very large amount of late material from the postexilic cultic community but also that earlier practices were preserved in this written tradition,\footnote{Noth, \textit{Numbers}, 10-11.} including the rite in chapter 5.\footnote{Ibid., 49.}

Thus these ritual texts in Leviticus and Numbers, even if reworked, may refer to earlier rituals, possibly coterminous with practices in the eighth through sixth centuries. At the very least, these texts should not be dismissed summarily as late intrusions; they appear to preserve traditions about clay that may have enjoyed a long history in Israel. Within the priestly compilation clay is an important component in ritual action but is not used to create the significant artifacts of the official cult. Clay vessels are not referred to as specialized cultic equipment; and in most cases, the rituals take place outside of official cultic space. The continued importance of clay in these rituals depends upon its unique ability to absorb and conduct purity and impurity.

**8.3 Vocabulary describing idols and idol production**

It has been claimed that the Hebrew Bible is silent concerning clay representations. The terminology investigated above, with two exceptions, does not occur in passages describing idol production or prohibitions. Even in the two exceptional
passages (Isa 44 and Hab 2), the root (יצר) is used in its general sense, rather than in combination with specific clay terminology. Furthermore, clay is used in a number of rituals accepted into the priestly corpus. This comes as no surprise if clay images were used for apotropaic and medical purposes. Levine points out that none of the legal prohibitions against illicit cultic practice include either apotropaic or prophylactic rites. Nor do these laws prohibit therapeutic “magic.” Support for the differences between clay objects, which were acceptable, and idols, which were not, is also provided by a brief examination of terms associated with idols. This examination reveals almost no overlap between these sets of terms and terms associated with clay.

8.3.1 צְלֶם

To begin with, צֶלֶם never occurs in the same contexts as pottery terms. Even when the word is used to describe Yahweh’s act of creation, the verb used is עשה (Gen 1:26; 9:6) or בָּרָא (Gen 1:27) in contrast to the Gen 2 account. Where the word refers to


115 Ibid., 90. Admittedly, this is an argument from silence and the lacuna may be interpreted other ways. Perhaps the authors of these legal materials excluded therapeutic and prophylactic rites for other reasons. However, it is conspicuous that condemnation of these activities is not only missing from the legal materials cited by Levine but from the entire Hebrew Bible (with the possible exception of 2 Chr 16:12). For more on therapeutic practices and biblical prohibitions see Chapter 10.

116 Otzen (*TDOT* 6:261) notes a number of contrasts between Gen 1 and 2, including the absence of רוח. He suggests the preference for בָּרָא and הָעַנּוּשׁ avoid anthropomorphism.
images, they are made of gold or metals,\footnote{Num 33:52; 1 Sam 6:5, 11; Ezek 7:20; 16:17.} in one case painted men (Ezek 23:14), or the material remains unspecified (Amos 5:26\footnote{The images refer to “Sikkut your king” (סיקְקָתְךֶּם) and “Kiyyun” (כִיון). According to BHS, one should perhaps read the first word as סָכָת based on the Septuagint or, “booth of your king,” but ultimately proposes סָכָתון or סָכָת, either “Sakkut,” a Mesopotamian deity, or “images,” often of metal (Exod 32:4, 8; 34:17; Lev 19:4; Num 33:52; Deut 9:16; Neh 9:16; Ps 106:19). In the first reconstruction, if the text describes a proper deity, it probably refers to a proper cult image of wood/metal. In the second, it may refer to metal more directly. As for the second term, BHS suggests it may be an addition or proposes it be read כִּיון or כִיון.}^118; 2 Kgs 11:18=2 Chr 23:17).

8.3.2 מסכה

The word מַסֵכָה likewise refers to molten images,\footnote{Exod 32:4, 8; 34:17; Lev 19:4; Num 33:52; Deut 9:12,16; Judg 17:3, 4; 18:14, 17, 18; 1 Kgs 14:9; 2 Kgs 17:16; Neh 9:16; Isa 30:22; Hos 13:2; Ps 106:19.} and one meaning of its related verbal root נַסֵךְ is to cast metal idols (Isa 40:19; 44:10).\footnote{Note that C. Dohmen (“מַסֵכָה,” TDOT 8:431) problematizes the connection between the noun and the verbal root נַסֵךְ, claiming that the verb refers to pouring libations rather than pouring metal.} Otherwise, the material is unspecified.\footnote{Deut 27:15; Isa 42:17; Nah 1:14; Hab 2:18; 2 Chr 28:2; 34:3, 4.} Given the far greater number of instances where the term is related to metal, it may be most accurate to understand the image as a metal one wherever the word occurs. A related word, מַשכִּית may describe stone (Lev 26:1), paint (Ezek 8:12), or metal (Prov 15:11) but never clay.
8.3.3

Another common term related to idols is "עָצָב". Occurring only in the plural, the word may be used alone without any accompanying indication of the materials from which the idols are made, or the images are made with metals. Frequently it refers to foreign gods. Jeremiah 44:19 uses the related verb in the *hiphil*, though the reference is problematic and missing from the Septuagint and the Peshitta. As the text stands it

122 1 Sam 31:9=1 Chr 10:9; 2 Sam 5:21; 1 Chr 14:12; 2 Chr 24:18; Jer 50:2; Hos 4:17; 14:9; Mic 1:7; Zech 13:2; Ps 106:36, 38.

123 Isa 10:11; 46:1 (note, metal is mentioned in verse 6, which describes hiring a goldsmith to create a "god"); Hos 8:4; 13:2; Pss 115:4; 135:15.

124 Judith M. Hadley, "עָצָב", *NIDOTTE* 3:483-84. Hadley sites Isa 46:1 and Jer 50:2 suggesting the authors are referring to images used in worship by foreigners. In contrast, she notes the word’s use in Hosea seems to refer to images in the worship of Yahweh. See also A. Graupner, "עָצָב", *TDOT* 11:281-82, 283. Graupner adds Isa 10:11; 46:1; 48:5; Pss 115:4; 135:15 to the list of passages referring to alien gods and notes the use in Hosea appears to be prior to the later polemics against foreign idols (*TDOT* 11:282, 284). In actuality, Hosea consistently associates Israel’s idols with “foreigners”—i.e. those outside the covenant between Israel and Yahweh. The dominant image “Israel as prostitute” (e.g., Hos 4:17; 5:7; 8:9-10) implies all idols are outsiders. Furthermore, the same passages that refer to idols explicitly say the people have abandoned Yahweh (Hos 4:10; 13:4-6) and are led astray (Hos 4:12). Further, the people return to Yahweh when they stop trusting in Assyria and in idols (Hos 14:3). Although the Israelites may have believed the idols represented Yahweh, the author interprets the idols as though they represent other entities; or, perhaps more intriguing, he characterizes the construction of images (particularly metal ones) as a “foreign” practice even when they represent Yahweh. Thus, Hosea’s prohibition may not reflect a belief that images are latently problematic or that Israel was worshipping other gods but that metal images were foreign and therefore inappropriate in Yahwism.

125 ל הַע ַצִּבָה appears to be the *hiphil* infinitive construct with an unaccounted for ending. *BDB*: 781 suggests reading the end as ל הַע ַצִּבב or, “to fashion her,” which still does little to clarify the meaning of the sentence. Because this added detail is missing from Jer 7:18, which mentions only baking cakes (כַוָנִּים) for the Queen of Heaven, and because the phrase is totally missing in other manuscript traditions, little can be said about this singular instance. For an alternate opinion see Graupner (*TDOT* 11:281), who claims that the omission in the Septuagint and Syriac occurred because the translators no longer understood the meaning of the word.
reads, “making cakes to shape” and is often understood to mean that the cakes made for the Queen of Heaven bear some resemblance to her.¹²⁶

8.3.4 הרש

Idol production is often attributed to the הרש, engraver or craftsman. The term can appear in connection with any product in metal,¹²⁷ wood,¹²⁸ or stone,¹²⁹ or without a clear material correlate.¹³⁰ Frequently, however, the term refers to idols constructed from metal¹³¹ or wood.¹³² The word may also refer generally to idol-makers, without stipulating the material, though this is less common.¹³³ Ringgren emphasizes the common use of the term in passages describing both the temple/tent of meeting and idol

¹²⁶ Graupner, *(TDOT* 11:281) understands the text in this way but makes no comment explaining the missing המַפָּאִית in the heh. See also Susan Ackerman, *Under Every Green Tree: Popular Religion in Sixth-Century Judah* (HSM 46; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992) 10. Ackerman seems to conclude that the passage refers to offering cakes dedicated to the “Queen of Heaven” (ibid., 33), but she only briefly deals with the problematic Hebrew vocabulary or syntax (ibid., 7 n.7; citing GKC 56g and 91e) and nowhere comments on the omission in the parallel verses of Jer 7.

¹²⁷ 1 Sam 13:9; 1 Chr 22:15; 29:5; 2 Chr 24:12; Isa 41:7; 54:16.

¹²⁸ 2 Sam 5:11; 2 Kgs 12:12; 22:6=2 Chr 34:11; 1 Chr 14:1; 22:15; 2 Chr 24:12; Ezra 3:7.

¹²⁹ Exod 28:11 (gems); 2 Sam 5:11 (though note BHS suggests this phrase is missing in key translations).

¹³⁰ Exod 35:35; 38:23; 2 Kgs 24:14, 16; 1 Chr 4:14; Jer 24:1; 29:2; Neh 11:35.

¹³¹ Deut 27:15; Isa 40:19; 44:12 (though as per BHS, problematic); Jer 10:9; Hos 8:6 (though BHS thinks the phrase may be a gloss); 13:2.

¹³² Isa 40:20; 44:13; Jer 10:3.

¹³³ Isa 45:16, although the text is not exactly clear. It refers to the הרשיא, engraver. *HALOT*: 1024 defines this second word as idol, based on the IV meaning of ונש, to fashion or delineate. This is the only attestation of the noun; and the verb does not refer to the construction of idols, making the identification difficult. See also Isa 44:11 (note BHS suggests a minor emendation, not changing the sense of the word), although the following verses (12-13) stipulate particular construction of stone and wood.
production, arguing that, in both cases, the materials in question are human produced objects rather than gods.\textsuperscript{134} Still, it is significant that the same materials show up in both contexts, suggesting metal and wood were more appropriate for articles used in religious devotion to high deities.

8.3.5 מַעַשֶּה

One of the most common terms associated with idols is מַעַשֶּה. Generally referring to any type of deed, work, or thing made, one of its specific connotations relates to idols. In Deut 4:28, the Israelites are warned that they will serve gods, work of the hands of humans (אֱלֹהִים מַעַשֶּהֶן), and specifically mentions wood and stone.\textsuperscript{135} The term is also found, as in Deut 27:15, in relation to craftsmen, (מַעַשֶּה דֵי חַרָשִׁים), here specifically referring to molten images (פֶּסֶל and מַסֵכָה).\textsuperscript{136} The word can also stand on its own to connote idols, though usually in parallel with another term, like נִּס כֵיהֶם (Isa 41:29).

Finally, in one case the term refers to the construction of altars (הַםִז ב חוֹת), asherim (הָא ַשֵרִים), and incense stands (הָחַםָנִים) (Isa 17:8).\textsuperscript{137}

\textsuperscript{134} Helmer Ringgren, “חָרַש. 3.a,” \textit{TDOT} 5:222.

\textsuperscript{135} For this exact phrase, “the work of the hands of humans, wood and stone” see also 2 Kgs 19:18=Isa 37:19=2 Chr 32:19 (2 Chronicles lacks “wood and stone”). For the same phrase without “wood and stone” see Pss 115:4; 135:15, for “the work of his hands” see Isa 2:8, for “the work of our hands” see Hos 14:4, for “the work of your hands” see Mic 5:12, for “the work of their hands” see Jer 1:16.

\textsuperscript{136} See also Jer 10:3, 9 where the writer refers to images of wood overlaid with precious metals and Hos 13:2 referring to silver. Similarly Jer 10:9 uses the word in relation to skilled workers (כִּנֹּקְceans). Finally both Jer 10:15 and 51:18 refer to these works, again, molten images, as works of mockery (כִּנֹּקְceans).

\textsuperscript{137} \textit{BHS} suggests that all of these terms should be deleted as later additions. This would read, “He will not lift up the work of his hands and what his fingers have made he will not look to.”
Perhaps the most common term for idol is פֶּסֶל. Its related verb means to hew or hew into shape and can refer to stone tables (Exod 34:1, 4; Deut 10:1, 3) or building stones (1 Kgs 5:22). The noun and a related plural form, פָּסִּיל, refer to idols in general, and specifically idols of wood, stone, or metal. Dohmen points out that the plural almost exclusively refers to foreign idols.

In some cases other terms are joined with פֶּסֶל. For example, Deut 27:15 curses anyone who “makes an idol (יַעֲשֶׂה פֶּסֶל) and a molten image (ומַסֵּכָה), an abomination of Yahweh (תְּוֻבַּת יְהוָֹה), work of hands of an artisan (מַעֲשֶׂה דֵיִֵּי).” The text is slightly ambiguous about whether the conjunction of “idol” and “molten image” is meant to cover a large spectrum or whether it should be read as a hendiadys. The fact that, in addition to

138 Exod 20:4=Deut 5:8 (as in Deut 4, this prohibition does not prohibit the image of “gods” per se, but anything from the created world); Deut 4:16, 23, 25; Isa 10:10 mentions “idols” in conjunction with gods (וְלֶא אָלָלִים) and idols (וְלַעֲצַבֶיהָ) in verse 11; Jer 51:47 refers to the “images” of Babylon; Hos 11:2 lists “idols” in parallel with baals.

139 The predominance of stone may be questioned. The idols of Judg 3:19, which describes Ehud and Eglon at Gilgal, have been interpreted as stones, though nothing in the text states so explicitly. Their cultic nature may be undergirded by the fact that Ehud chooses this place to reveal that he has a secret message for Eglon, which is later attributed to אֵלֹהִים (verse 20). See also Isa 21:9 that describes the images of the gods of Babylon. Nothing explicitly suggests the idols are made from stone other than the fact that they are described as shattered (שְׁרָק) (here in the piel, but BHS suggests amending to pual). Further, Mic 1:7 and 2 Chr 34:7 may refer to idols crushed (תַּכֵּת), which may imply either stone or metal images. Close examination of the verb suggests it can refer to a much wider range of materials including (in the qal) clay (Isa 30:14), the golden calf (Deut 9:21), a sacrificial victim (Lev 22:24), enemies (Ps 89:24), swords (Joel 4:10), or in the piel to images (2 Kgs 18:4; 2 Chr 34:7) or to swords (Isa 2:4=Mic 4:3); in the pual it refers to nations (2 Chr 15:6). The wide range of materials makes it difficult to pinpoint the exact material used to make the idols.

140 C. Dohmen, “פֶּסֶל,” TDOT 12: 32.
the שרש is also mentioned may further indicate the author is describing images of metal. Also, Isa 48:5 uses “my idol and my molten image” (טְסֵלִּים קַנֶּסֶךַה) in conjunction, both in parallel with מַסֵּכָה, the more general term for idol;¹⁴¹ and Nah 1:14 (טְסֵלִּים קַנֶּסֶךַה) uses the two words in conjunction as the direct objects of the verb “to cut off.” Perhaps most clear is the oath of Micah’s mother (Judg 17:3, 4) who dedicates silver to make, literally, “an idol and a molten image” (טְסֵלִּים קַנֶּסֶךַה). In this case the conjunction clearly represents the object followed by its material.¹⁴² A related construction may exist in Isa 42:17, where “the ones trusting in the idol” (הַבֹּטְחֵנִים טְסֵל) is parallel with “the ones saying to a molten image, ‘you are our gods’” (הַאֹמְרִים מַסֵּכַת מַסֵּכָה).¹⁴³ Hab 2:18 also places the words in parallel structure.¹⁴⁴

In a number of places the term clearly refers to metal images. Isaiah 30:22 says the inhabitants of Jerusalem will defile “your plating of idols of silver (חָצֵי צִפּוֹר יִפְסָל קַנֶּסֶךַה) and your ephod of a molten image of gold” (ו אֶת־א ַפִּדֲתַתָּם מַסֵּכַת מַסֵּכָה;),¹⁴⁵ and Isa 40:19 refers explicitly to an idol that has been cast (נָסַ), as well as a number of other metal terms like

¹⁴¹ BHS suggests amending the pointing to עָצ בִּי.

¹⁴² Judith M. Hadley (“משכה,” NIDOTTE 2:1000) agrees, claiming the word frequently occurs along with a second term in order to provide a more specific definition of the other term.

¹⁴³ According to BHS, both Septuagint and Syriac texts have מַסֵּכַת in the plural.

¹⁴⁴ Dohmen (TDOT 12:32) argues that the use in parallel structure was created from the hendiadys for stylistic purposes.

¹⁴⁵ See C. Dohmen, “משכה,” TDOT 8:436 for different readings of Isa 30:22, depending on whether the parallelism is read as synonymous or synthetic. Either way, the terms clearly refer to metal working.
gold overlay and silver chains.\textsuperscript{146} Not that the metal terminology is incommensurate with construction from wood. Isaiah 40 continues to discuss the choice of mulberry wood (הַמָּסַכָּן), which is then established as an idol by a skilled craftsman (חָרָשִֵּחָכָם). Thus, the core of an idol was made from choice wood that was then overlaid with metals by a separate crafts person, as was common in Mesopotamian practice.\textsuperscript{147}

In other cases the material is difficult to stipulate, and this is particularly applicable to texts that list idols among other types of cultic objects. For example, 2 Kgs 21:7 describes Manasseh setting up the idol of the asherah in the temple (ְֵּוַיָשֶםִֵּאֶת־פֶּסֶלַּשַרָה). Nothing in the text indicates whether this image is made of metal, stone, or wood.\textsuperscript{148} Given the idiosyncrasy of the passage and its date,\textsuperscript{149} no further suggestion may be offered.

\textsuperscript{146} See also Jer 10:19, which refers to a molten image (וֹנִּס כ), and a goldsmith (צוֹרֵף), though earlier sections of the text also mention trees and axes (verse 3) without actually using the term פֶּסֶל but clearly describing idol production. A very close reproduction of this text is Jer 51:17, which also mentions goldsmiths along with פֶּסֶל.

\textsuperscript{147} Hurowitz, “What Goes in Is What Comes Out,” 3-4. Although Hurowitz claims that clay may be used for the production of Mesopotamian deities, his two examples include one minister of the gods buried as part of the foundation ritual of a temple and the passage from śep lem already discussed in Chapter 3. Neither of these texts discusses major divinities and both describe protective statues (ibid., 14-15).

\textsuperscript{148} Note the 2 Chr 33:7 version lacks the asherah and substitutes הַסֶּמֶל. In fact, Marvin A. Sweeney (I & II Kings: A Commentary [OTL; Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox, 2007], 430) takes the Chronicles account as more historically accurate than that in Kings. Alternatively, the two words may have been combined here for rhetorical reasons. Nelson (First and Second Kings [Int; Louisville, Ky.: John Knox, 1987], 249) notes that the double language “the image of the asherah” serves as an overwhelming confirmation of Manasseh’s failure, occurring in the center of the section on Manasseh’s sin. In contrast 2 Kgs 23:6 lacks the word פֶּסֶל, saying only Josiah brought forth the asherah. It goes on to describe him burning it and beating it to dust (עָפַר), which could refer to any ash from a burned object. The act of “beating” or “pulverizing” (וַיָדֶק) elsewhere refers to the golden calf (Exod 32:20; Deut 9:21) in the qal, as well as the bamah (2 Kgs 23:15) in the hiphil. In the 2 Chronicles version of Josiah’s reform, 34:4 describes Josiah breaking down the asherim, the idols (הַפּסְלִים), and the molten images (הַמַּסְכוֹת) and pulverizing them. Thus, it appears many different materials may be “beaten” to dust. Furthermore see John William McKay, Religion in Judah Under the Assyrians (SBT 2/26. London: SCM Press, 1973), 22-23 on
Several terms appear together in Mic 5 as well. Together verses 11 and 12 proclaim that Yahweh will cut off sorceries (כ שָפִּים) and soothsayers (ומ עוֹנֶיְים), idols (ךָפִּיסִליַי) and standing stones (ךָמַצְבוֹי), so that Israel will no longer bow down to the works of their hands (לִמְעֶשֶׁה). Verse 13 continues that Yahweh will uproot asherim (ךָאשֵירֵי) and destroy cities (ךָעֶרֶי). While the commonality between all these words is their cultic function, technically “idols” are parallel with “standing stones” suggesting, if anything, objects made from stone. Because these verses follow verses 9-10, which describe Yahweh purging horses, chariots, cities, and fortresses, Dillers suggests that the unusual nature of לִמְעֶשֶׁה in the Kings account as well as possible motivations for its emendation in Chronicles.

149 See Mordechai Cogan and Hayim Tadmor, *II Kings: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 11; New York: Doubleday, 1988), 270-71. They include an overview of scholarly positions on the date of 21:7-9. While Cogan and Tadmor concede that some scholars date this passage to the postexilic Deuteronomist, they argue for a preexilic Deuteronomistic critique of Manasseh.

150 The use of the verbal root נתש here does not particularly help settle the question of the materials from which asherim are made. Elsewhere it refers to nations (Deut 29:27; 1 Kgs 14:15; 2 Chr 7:20; Jer 12:14) and cities (Ps 9:7). Only once does it refer to asherim, and the purpose for the verb in this clause may be governed by the use of רֵע in the second half of the verse. James Luther Mays (*Micah: A Commentary* [OTL; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1976], 124, 127) notes that the verb used here is different from that which structures verses 10-12 (חָרְב), suggesting this verse was added to the original in an early stage of the text’s history. He also argues the addition of asherim may have been prompted by the standing stones of verse 12.


152 See also Lev 26:1, where an idol and standing stone appear in conjunction as the objects of לא־תָקִי in addition to the following clause that lists “figured stones” or אֶבֶןִֵּמַש כִּית.
cultic terms in verses 11-13 refer to foreign influence on Israelite practice. Similar to the 2 Kgs passage, the date of the text is in doubt, with an exilic layer a distinct possibility.

Deuteronomy 7:5 also lists several cult objects belonging to the peoples in the land and the manner of their destruction, including pulling down their altars (מִזְבֵּחָתָם), smashing their standing stones (זְבִיבֵיהֶם), hewing down their asherim (אשֶרֶים), and burning their idols with fire (סִילֵיהֶם). Later in verse 25 the text specifies that these idols are covered with silver or gold. Complicating matters further, in Isa 44 the word is used to refer to different materials even within the same passage. As has been argued, Isa 44:9 refers to idol in its general sense. Verse 10 then mentions casting an image (פסלִֵּנָס) and verses 15 and 17 refer to a wooden image.

153 Hillers, Micah, 73. This is further undergirded by the explicit reference to Assyria in 5:4-5.

154 Andersen and Freedman (Micah, 24, 494) prefer an early exilic date for chapters 4-5, though based upon a preexilic kernel in 4:1-3 or 4:1-5. For an early exilic date see also Mays, Micah, 124. Alternatively, John T. Willis (“The Authenticity and Meaning of Micah 5:9-14,” ZAW 81 [1969]: 353-68) argues for a preexilic date, during the reforms of Hezekiah. For a counter argument see Ehud Ben Zvi, (Micah [FOTL 21B; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2000], 139-40), who argues for a probable postmonarchic date though emphasizes that the text is intentionally ambiguous about its sitz im leben. Although he notes similarities with Deuteronomistic language, including Deut 4, he also notes the unique linguistic features that separate these verses from normal Deuteronomistic language.

155 While the root גֵּדַע can refer to wood (in the qal Zech 11:10, 14; Isa 10:33 and in the pual Isa 9:9) it can also refer to an arm (1 Sam 2:31), horns (Lam 2:3); and in the niphal it can refer to altar horns (Amos 3:14), to severing a tribe from the nation (Judg 21:6), a king (Isa 14:12) and in many cases is found parallel with שָׁבַר in the piel. In the piel, as it is in this verse, it refers to the asherim (2 Chr 14:2; 31:1), idols (Deut 12:3) and incense altars (2 Chr 34:4, 7), as well as bars of iron (Isa 45:2).

156 Deuteronomy’s account should not be taken too literally. In Deut 12:3 the verbs associated with these nouns are slightly reversed. Altars are still to be broken down (גֵּדַע) and standing stones are to be smashed (שָׁבַר) but this time the asherim are to be burned with fire (שִׂרַּף) and the idols of their gods are to be hewed down (גֵּדַע). On the evidence of the Septuagint and Deut 7:5, BHS actually suggests the material about the asherim and the idols should be deleted.
8.3.7	and סמל

A much less common word, סֶמֶל, occurs primarily in late texts. The semantic range can include any type of pattern, including patterns for objects related to the tabernacle (Exod 25:9, 40), a foreign altar (2 Kgs 16:10), and the temple and temple objects (1 Chr 28:11-19). In regards to idols, the term is prominent in Deut 4:16-18, referring to the patterns for the creation of idols (פסל) of males, females, beasts, birds, creeping things, or fish. Elsewhere it refers to the creation of wood images (Isa 44:13) or images carved on a wall (Ezek 8:10). In Ps 106:20 it alludes to the molten calf.

Another term from Deut 4, המונָה, often refers to the form or semblance of Yahweh. In Deut 4 itself (verses 16, 23, 25) the term refers to the construction of idols (פסל) in any number of forms. It also occurs in the more general form of prohibition in Deut 5:8 and Exod 20:4.

A third term occurring in the Deut 4 passage is סֶמֶל (verse 16). It can also refer to a graven or carved image (used with פֶּסֶל 2 Chr 33:7) or an image of jealousy (Ezek

157 Note, BHS suggests the word is an addition in Ezek 8:10, and it is missing in the Septuagint.

158 Num 12:8; Deut 4:12, 15; Ps 17:15.

159 Note that BHS contrasts the phrase:auto:hel in verse 7 with 2 Kgs 21:7 that contains אֱלֹהֵי הָאָרֶץ instead. After Manasseh’s repentance, the text describes him removing only פֶּסֶל from the House of Yahweh, in addition to the foreign gods from the temple and the altars from the surrounding countryside.
8:3, 5) described as seated in the north gate of the inner courtyard.\textsuperscript{160} Note that the Ezek 8:10 also describes the תַב נִּית of creeping things and beasts, similar to Deut 4.\textsuperscript{161}

The Deut 4 passage is unique enough that it deserves note. In this verse, most of the terms are used together, “[lest] you make for yourselves a graven image of a likeness of any image, a form male or female” (ַשִּיתֶםִֵּלָכֶםִֵּפֶּסֶלִֵּת מונַתִֵּכָל־סָמֶלִֵּתַבנִּיתִֵֵֹּּנ קֵבָהִֵּ).\textsuperscript{162}

The text justifies its prohibition of any type of idolatrous likeness by claiming first that Yahweh did not reveal his form to the Israelites (Deut 4:15). Thus, the Israelites are to avoid creating idolatrous images. Interestingly, verses 15-23 do not prohibit the construction of other “gods,” as is common in the prophetic writings, but rather lists the complete types of creatures whose likeness (תַב נִּית) may not be created (verses 16-18), including male, female, animal, bird, creeping thing, or fish. Other than the term פֶּסֶל, which may indicate a molten image much of the time (see above), this text provides little information about the materials from which the forms are constructed.\textsuperscript{163} Only in verse 28

\begin{itemize}
\item[160] Both verses 3 and 5 are complicated. As for the phrase in verse 3, מָלַשׁ פֶּסֶלִֵּמֶלִֵּהַקִּנ אָהִֵּהַםַק נֶה, \textit{BHS} suggests the Septuagint and the Syriac contain only סֶמֶל. In verse 5 BHS notes that פֶּסֶל was omitted in the textus Graecus originalis.
\item[162] Jeffrey H. Tigay (\textit{Deuteronomy: The Traditional Hebrew Text with the New JPS Translation} [JPS Torah Commentary; Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1996], 47, 352, n.55) alters the Masoretic Text to place a break between ב and פֶּסֶל, reading, “make for yourselves an idol of the visage of anything, a statue which is the likeness of a man or a woman.”
\item[163] E. –J. Waschke (““תַב נִּית,” \textit{TDOT} 15:688) argues that here and in Deut 5:8 the word does not refer to a particular form of an image but any visible image at all. Perhaps it even broadens the meaning of פֶּסֶל, which it typically follows, to refer to any type of image rather than a graven image exclusively.
\end{itemize}
does the text refer to the “gods” as “works of the hands of humans,” specifically from wood or stone.\textsuperscript{164} Perhaps the intensity of the vocabulary in Deut 4 reflects the sermon’s central concern that Israel avoid the idols of the nations, thus preserving her uniqueness.\textsuperscript{165}

8.3.8 אֱלִילִים

Idols are also referred to by a number of derogatory terms. The first is אֱלִיל. Whether related to the word’s definition as “worthlessness” or to a diminutive of אֵל or אֱלֹהִים, the term is always used negatively.\textsuperscript{166} As Preuss notes, this word occurs in several early sections of Isaiah, thus predating Second Isaiah’s more expansive concern with idols.\textsuperscript{167} Addressed to the “House of Jacob,” or the north, chapter 2:6-8 refers to these

\textsuperscript{164} Although Gerhard von Rad (\textit{Deuteronomy: A Commentary} [OTL; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1966], 50) does not consider the whole of chapter 4 homogenous, he does suggest that verses 25-28 might be a continuation of the chapter’s earlier material prohibiting idols. On the reasons for dividing the chapter into subsections and for considering the whole artfully redacted together see Richard D. Nelson, \textit{Deuteronomy: A Commentary} (OTL; Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox, 2002), 62-63.

\textsuperscript{165} Weinfeld, \textit{Deuteronomy 1-11}, 221. Elsewhere (ibid., 46) he argues that this concern with iconoclasm originated in the north, as evidenced by passages in Hosea, and was subsequently influential on the thought of the authors of Deuteronomy. Weinfeld interprets the passages in Hosea and subsequently in Deuteronomy and 1 Kings as an iconoclastic reaction to elements of Canaanite religion. Tigay (\textit{Deuteronomy}, xxiii) also argues that Hosea and the north were central to the crystallization of Deuteronomistic theology but he claims that this arose as a response to Assyrian pressures of assimilation and the northern monarchy.

\textsuperscript{166} \textit{HALOT}: 55-56 takes the position that the word comes from the nominative “worthlessness” or “weakness,” but see also Horst Deitrich Preuss ("אֱלִיל", \textit{TDOT} 1:285) for a number of etymological options.

\textsuperscript{167} Preuss, \textit{TDOT} 1:286.
gods/idols as the product of eastern influence;\(^{168}\) and the following allusion to horses, chariots, gold, and silver seem to suggest the author has the Assyrians in mind, although choice words are reserved for the Phoenicians as well (2:12-17). Verse 8 does not stipulate the materials from which the idols are made, but verse 20 describes the idols as made of silver and gold.\(^{169}\)

Chapter 10:9-11 also discusses the idols of Judah’s neighbors in the context of Assyrian domination, specifically referring to Calno, Carchemish, Hamath, Arpad, and Damascus as “kingdoms of idols.” It is of note that the polemic is specifically against foreign idols, undergirded by the use of עָצָב in verse 11 to refer to Jerusalem’s idols (see above for the ways this term refers to foreign practices).

Another significant text, Isa 19, describes Egypt’s idols as trembling before Yahweh in verse 1. In verse 3, the text mentions Egypt consulting idols, “mutterers” of charms (הָאִטִּים), mediums (הָאֹבוֹת), and spiritists (הַיִּדּעֵנִים). Here too the text proclaims that Egypt will be turned over “into the hand of a hard master,” (verse 4), and later refers to Assyria explicitly (verses 23-25).

Finally, Isa 31:7 describes the idols of silver and gold that the inhabitants of Israel will throw away, at which time the Assyrians will be destroyed by Yahweh (verses 8-

\(^{168}\) Note that the phrase, “כִּיִֵּמָל אוִֵּמִּקֶדֶם,” of verse 6 is problematic. In its present state it reads, “for they are filled from [the] east,” however BHS suggests reading כִּיִֵּמָל מִּקֶּם or “divination.” It also posits מַדַּבֵּק or קְנָאָכִים in comparison with the Targum.

\(^{169}\) Preuss (TDOT 1:286) considers 2:20 a later addition but based upon Isaiah’s use of the term.

\(^{170}\) In comparison with Isa 8:19; 29:4.
Thus, the term אֶלְלִים is often accompanied by descriptions of precious metals, though not always. It does seem to refer, predominantly, to idols of foreign influence.

Three additional negative terms deserves some consideration. The word גִּלְוָל is used most frequently in a general sense, without any allusion to the materials from which the idols are constructed. It may also be used to refer to a number of different idolatry practices and substances (1 Kgs 21:11; 2 Kgs 23:24) or idols made from different materials (Deut 29:16). Once it refers to images on a wall (Ezek 8:10). Furthermore, Zimmerli argues that the word refers to “heathen” or foreign cult objects, in particular.

---

171 Preuss (TDOT 1:286) does not consider this original to Isaiah of Jerusalem.

172 See above for Hab 2:18-19 which mentions the אֶלְלִים in parallel with פֶּסֶל and מַסֵכָה, including descriptions of items from wood or stone overlaid with precious metals. See also Lev 19:4 where the word is parallel with פֶּסֶל.

173 For example Lev 26:1 simply lists the אֶלְלִים as one item in a list of things the Israelites are forbidden to make, also including making an idol (פֶּסֶל), erecting a standing stone (מסכ), or setting up a figured stone (אֶבֶן). It is unclear with the term is meant to represent something different from פֶּסֶל or whether they are synonymous. See also Ezek 30:13, though BHS suggests the possibility of אֵילִים instead; the passage is concerned with Egyptian idols. See also Pss 96:5; 97:7 (here also parallel with פֶּסֶל).

174 Lev 26:30; 1 Kgs 15:12; 2 Kgs 17:12; 21:21, 26; Jer 50:2; Ezek 6:4, 5, 6, 9, 13; 14:3, 4, 5, 6, 7; 16:36; 18:6, 12, 15; 20:7, 8, 16, 18, 24, 31, 39; 22:3, 4; 23:7, 30, 37, 39, 49; 30:13; 33:25; 36:18, 25; 37:23; 44:10, 12.

175 Walther Zimmerli (Ezekiel 1: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Ezekiel Chapters 1-14 [transl. Ronald E. Clements; Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979], 186-87) argues the etymology of this term is גֵל, or dungballs. He also notes that the term is used 39 times in Ezekiel, suggesting the term came into predominance within the Jerusalem priesthood.

The noun תֹּעֵבָה is used to describe a wide range of acts abhorrent to certain Israelite writers. The word is often used to describe idolatrous practice in general.\(^{177}\) More specifically, the term refers to idols but often without stipulating the materials from which the idols are constructed.\(^{178}\) It may also refer to images of wood (Isa 44:19) or metal (Deut 27:15).

A similar term, שִּקְּץ, likewise refers to a variety of acts, including idolatry. Again, the list of materials associated with the root can be all-inclusive, as in Deut 29:16, which warns of wood and stone, silver and gold (עֵץ, אֶבֶן, קֶסֶף;\(^{179}\)) or the word may not refer to any material in particular.

### 8.3.10 Summary of idols and idol production in the Hebrew Bible

The words associated with idolatry may follow a general trend. While a number of terms, such as צֶלֶם, מַסֵכָה, עָצָב, חָרָש, פֶּסֶל and even מַעֲשֶה and אֶלִיל are used in specific ways to indicate the materials from which the images are produced, later terms such as תַבְנִית, תִּמְנָה, סֶמֶל, גִּלּוּל, תֹּעֵבָה, and שִּקְּץ are more commonly used without clarification. This is not to say that the first group of words could not be used in a broad sense but that the second group is used in an overwhelmingly general sense. In the case of Deut 4 in particular, although Wagner argues that the text does not condemn the act of making an

---

\(^{177}\) Deut 13:15; 17:4; Isa 41:24; Ezek 16:50; 18:12; Mal 2:11.

\(^{178}\) Deut 32:16; Jer 16:18; Ezek 7:20; 14:6; 16:36.

image of living things, only making one with the intent that it would be used as an idol,\(^{180}\) several of these later terms appear to have been appended to פֶּסֶל perhaps with the intent of broadening the meaning to include any type of image or likeness, regardless of the material from which the object is made.\(^{181}\) Thus, it is possible that by the exilic and postexilic periods, the biblical authors (particularly the Deuteronomist\(^ {182}\) and Ezekiel\(^ {183}\)) prohibited images much more broadly than did earlier biblical commentators, a position consistent with Mettinger’s theory that Israel moved toward iconoclasm in the postexilic period.\(^ {184}\) Many of the earlier texts that prohibit images do not comment on the particular


\(^{181}\) Note that the list of creatures whose likeness was prohibited probably implies that copying any creature from the created world is forbidden. Weinfeld (\textit{Deuteronomy 1-11}, 205) claims the list of synonyms was added to “strengthen the prohibition,” contrasted with Exod 20:4. He claims this is consistent with “the rigoristic approach of the Deuteronomic school toward idolatrous practices of any sort.” Another explanation of the repetitive vocabulary in the passage might be intentional repetition for rhetorical purposes. On this point see Brent A. Strawn, “Keep/Observe/Do—Carefully—Today!: The Rhetoric of Repetition in Deuteronomy,” in \textit{A God So Near: Essays on Old Testament Theology in Honor of Patrick D. Miller} (ed. Brent A. Strawn and Nancy R. Bowen; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2003), 215-40. Although Strawn criticizes authors who interpret repetition as a sign of editorial seams (ibid., 216), understanding the text as the end result of an editorial process is not incommensurate with reading its final form as a rhetoric of repetition. Nelson (\textit{Deuteronomy}, 66-67) argues that while the initial prohibition is explained by the fact that Yahweh did not reveal his form, the list in verses 16-18 moves increasingly away from images that would represent Yahweh (birds, fish, etc.), while Tigay (\textit{Deuteronomy}, 49) claims, though to little effect, that the animals might be thought of as Yahweh’s chariot or mount.

\(^{182}\) See Weinfeld, \textit{Deuteronomy 1-11}, 10, 14, 49, 229-30 on the date of Deut 4. See also Von Rad (\textit{Deuteronomy}, 12), who also dates 4:16-18 to the postexilic period and Nelson, \textit{Deuteronomy}, 61. For a helpful summary of the Noth-Cross argument over Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomist as it applies to chapter 4 see Tigay, \textit{Deuteronomy}, xxv-xxvi.

\(^{183}\) Zimmerli (\textit{Ezekiel 1}, 187) contrasts this term in Ezekiel with the regular way idols are referred to in Isaiah and Jeremiah, suggesting a unique perspective on idolatry in Ezekiel that reflects a polemic rising from the Jerusalem priesthood.

\(^{184}\) Trygve N. D. Mettinger, “A Conversation with my Critics: Cultic Image or Aniconism in the First Temple?” in \textit{Essays on Ancient Israel in its Near Eastern Context: A Tribute to Nadav Na’aman} (ed. Yairah Amit, Ehud Ben Zvi, Israel Finkelstein, and Oded Lipschits; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2006), 73-96. See also Dohmen (\textit{TDOT} 12:36), who argues that these texts expand the prohibition of cultic images to
The iconography of the image but the materials from which the images were made. Only late in Israel’s history did the prohibition extend to include any type of image and to consider its iconography.

Coincidentally, Stern has noted that Persian period terracottas are largely absent from Yehud (see Chapter 7 above). This does not imply that Persian-period Judaism was aniconic in any simplistic way. In fact, many of the texts condemning images constructed of metal and wood come from Second Isaiah, which must be dated to the exilic or postexilic periods. The very prohibitions suggest that some sections of society must have continued producing religious images. But, it may be plausible that key figures in Judean include “any portrayal within the cultic sphere.” As evidence for this expansion Dohmen cites Lev 19:4; 26:1; Deut 4:16, 17, 18; 27:15; Hos 8:6; 11:2; 13:2; 14:3.

185 Even the iconic story of the golden calf stresses the gold from which the calf was constructed. In the Deuteronomy account the reader first learns that the Israelites made a מַסֵכָה, or metal image, without any mention of its form (Deut 9:12). Only in verse 16 does the Masoretic Text refer to the עֵגֶל מַסֵכָה, though the term “calf” is actually missing in certain Septuagint versions. An even stronger emphasis is placed on the metal materials in the Exodus account. This is indicated by the repeated phrase עֵגֶל מַסֵכָה (Exod 32:4, 8), the repeated explanation of how the calf was made—from the golden earrings (Exod 32:2-4, 22-24), the account of its destruction (Exod 32:20), and the reiteration of the א ֶלֹהֵיִֵּזָהָב in Moses' final supplication to Yahweh (Exod 32: 31). In contrast, the text does little more than mention the iconography. Even in 1 Kgs 12:28 the text merely states Jeroboam made two עֶג לֵיִֵּזָהָב without any reason why a calf was chosen. Apparently, the only detail that merited comment was the material used to make the calf.

186 Iconography is specifically alluded to in Deut 4 (animals and humans from creation). Here the materials from which idols were constructed are largely missing. See also Isa 44:13, which describes an idol constructed in the pattern of humans (כ תַב נִּיתִֵּאִּיש), although this text also stresses the materials from which the idol is made; similarities between Second Isaiah and Deuteronomy have already been noted (see above). For more on the theological similarities between the two texts and their bearing on the development of monotheism see Adrian Schenker, “Das Paradox des israelitischen Monotheismus in Dtn 4,15-20: Israels Gott stiftet Religion und Kulbilder der Völker,” in Bilder als Quellen/Images as Sources: Studies on Ancient Near Eastern Artefacts and the Bible Inspired by the Work of Othmar Keel (OBO special volume; ed. Susanne Bickel, Silvia Schroer, René Schurte, and Christoph Uehlinger; Fribourg and Göttingen: Academic Press, Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 2007), 511-28.
society, and perhaps the general populace, reacted negatively to clay images in ways that did not characterize the eighth through sixth centuries. Perhaps the extended time in Babylon during the exile highlighted already latent concerns with image production, encouraging authors to expand prohibitions.\textsuperscript{187} Even more, this shift occurred, not as mere result of the returning exiles but already at sites with continual occupation throughout the period, like Tell en Nasbeh (on this point, see Chapter 7). As such, the breakdown of social and economic structures in the aftermath of Judah’s political dissolution may also have contributed to changing attitudes toward clay figural representations.

Another general observation concerns the repeated “foreign” motif. More often than not the text is concerned with preventing Israel from adopting the practices attributed to the surrounding peoples. Thus, the “foreign-ness” of these practices (whether real or imagined by the authors) must be considered a major factor in idol prohibitions.\textsuperscript{188} This suggests that the texts did not necessarily prohibit images due to their inherent and latent danger. If this interpretation is correct, it is no surprise that the Hebrew Bible lacks any prohibition, or even mention, of small clay figurines, whose

\textsuperscript{187} Although these texts are normally interpreted as a reaction to the cult of images in Mesopotamia, Ornan has argued that Mesopotamian religion was more aniconic that is normally recognized. She claims that the prohibition against images in late Biblical texts (specifically Deuteronomy and Second Isaiah) was a result of both Northwestern Semitic (as per Mettinger) and Mesopotamian \textit{de facto} aniconism. See Tallay Ornan, \textit{The Triumph of the Symbol: Pictorial Representations of Deities in Mesopotamia and the Biblical Image Ban} (OBO 213; Fribourg: Academic Press; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2005), 178-82.

\textsuperscript{188} Smith (\textit{Memoirs of God}, 151) hypothesizes that deities and practices originally part of Yahwistic religion were eventually recategorized as foreign by collective memory in a process called “differentiation.” Since the current topic is the biblical text, not necessarily what actually happened in ancient Israel, the difference between perceived and actual foreign influence is less important.
iconography was not associated with foreign deities. Perhaps only in the later strata of biblical texts would the production of these clay images have been considered problematic.

8.4 Markets and potters in the Hebrew Bible

Finally, a number of biblical texts preserve a memory of market activity on the outskirts of Jerusalem, including the sale of pottery. In his examination of Israelite prophets and their relationship to Israelite market economy, Silver notes the specialized meaning of חוץָה as market place. Silver claims that markets are mentioned in 1 Kgs 20:34 (חוץָה), 2 Kgs 7:1 at the gate of Samaria, and in Neh 13:15-16, where merchants bring goods into Jerusalem for sale on the Sabbath. In Jer 37:21 the texts mentions a “bakers’ street” (nięcia אופים), and there is a possibility that the reference to the streets of Tyre being trampled and her riches spoiled in Ezek 26:11-12 also refers to a market. Silver further comments that the term is sometimes translated as “market” (מחוזין) in the

He also notes that Sargonic texts (2334-2154) mention goods sold “on the street” in reference to a marketplace.

In his treatment of Israelite markets, Elat claims that the 1 Kgs 20:34 passage has the most in common with the Neo-Assyrian kāru, market contexts established in vassal kingdoms that privileged Assyrian merchants. From the similarity, Elat concludes that חוצוֹת in 1 Kgs 20 were, “stations set up in key centres of international trade in the kingdom of Damascus in which Israelite officials and traders acted on the basis of the privilege granted to their king.” Thus, local and international wares being sold in public open areas inside or outside the walls of the city are certainly attested in ancient documents.


192 Elat, “Monarchy and the Development of Trade,” 543-45. His argument rests on the interpretation of פָּשִים as indicating the activity of a stronger party in relation to a weaker party rather than a relationship between equal partners. He cites Gen 45: 9; 47:26; Exod 2:14; 15:25; Deut 4:44; Judg 18:31; 1 Sam 8:11; 2 Sam 8:14; 1 Kgs 12:29; 2 Kgs 18:14; 21:7; 2 Chr 33:7; Esth 10:1; Jer 49:38. Note Maria Eugenia Aubet, The Phoenicians and the West: Politics, Colonies, and Trade (trans. Mary Turton; 2d ed.; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 111. She argues that the majority of textual support for this practice comes from the second millennium and can only be related tentatively to first millennium practices. In contrast, Moshe Elat, (“Phoenician Overland Trade within the Mesopotamian Empires,” in Ah, Assyria...: Studies in Assyrian History and Ancient Near Eastern Historiography Presented to Hayim Tadmor [ed. Mordechai Cogan and Israel Eph’al; Scripta Hierosolymitana 33; Jerusalem: Magnes and the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1991], 25-26) provides information about the kāru and בִּית קָרִי of Gaza, Tyre, and Arvad including those during the time of Tiglath-Pileser III and Sargon.

193 Aubet (The Phoenicians and the West, 108-9) describes one such market at Kanesh in detail, stressing its complexity, including the development of suburbs. Obviously, no evidence would connect this
Silver also notes the large number of place names in Jerusalem related to commodities, including the “Fish Gate” (Zeph 1:10; 2 Chr. 33:14; Neh 3:3), the “Sheep Gate,” (Neh 3:1, 32; 12:39), and the “Pottery Gate” (Jer 19:2);\(^{194}\) and Elat emphasizes that trade in Israel occurred near the gates of the city.\(^ {195}\) If the Hebrew Bible preserves a memory of actual practice, it appears to allude to markets Jerusalem as well as specific locations associated with particular types of goods.

In the Jeremiah text in particular, the prophet is commanded to buy an earthen jug and go out at the “Potsherd Gate” to the Hinnom Valley.\(^ {196}\) Thus, the text provides reasonable circumstantial witness to pottery being sold in the vicinity of the Hinnom Valley. In the same vein, one must also wonder whether the burning to which the writer later alludes (19:4) was due only to the possible sacrifices to foreign gods, or whether the Hinnom Valley had also become a location for industrial activity, like kiln firing. Thus, the biblical record may attest to the location of potters selling, if not working (Jer 18:2), close to the main source of clay for most of the City of David figurines—the Kidron Valley. In the very least, it appears that Jeremiah preserves some cultural memory of institution to a small pottery market on the outskirts of Jerusalem; however, it is still significant that even the Assyrian markets are located on the outskirts of cities, outside the walls.


\(^ {195}\) Elat (ibid., 175, 313 n. 15) compares these biblical passages with the Assyrian “market gate” where camels were traded.

\(^ {196}\) See above for a discussion of “The Valley of ben Hinnom” in this and subsequent verses.
pottery markets associated with main passageways in and out of the city, perhaps not
dissimilar to that near the Kenyon Street Deposit.

As for production areas, ethnographic analogy and historical documents suggest
industrial activity often takes place outside the boundaries of cities (Chapter 6). The
Kidron Valley is known from biblical texts as a border for the city of Jerusalem. In 2 Sam
15:23 King David’s crossing of the Kidron Valley is treated as an official exit from the
city. Once he and his entourage cross the wadi, they are described as moving toward the
wilderness. Furthermore, in 1 Kgs 2:36-37 Solomon warns Shimei that he is on house
arrest in Jerusalem. As long as he stays in Jerusalem he is protected, but the day he goes
out and crosses the Kidron Valley he will die. Finally, Jer 31:38-40 list the boundaries of
Jerusalem, which includes the Kidron Valley on the east, near to the southern border, or
the “valley of dead bodies and ashes,” which may be an allusion to the Hinnom Valley.
As a border region, the Kidron Valley would have provided a possible space for various
industrial activities.

Second, although the Hinnom Valley is more famous as the location for burning
and fire, some passages record burning images and objects in the Kidron Valley as well.
The horrid thing belonging to Asherah (מִפּלֶצֶתֵלָא שֶׁרָה) was cut down by King Asa and
burned in the Kidron Valley (1 Kgs 15:13; 2 Chr 15:16). Also, as part of the supposed
Josianic reforms, the vessels for Baal, Asherah, and the host of heaven were removed
from the temple and burned “outside Jerusalem in the field of Kidron.” Furthermore, the
asherah (for more on this text see above) was also brought “outside Jerusalem, to the
Kidron Valley” where it was burned, beat to dust, and thrown on the graves “of the sons

of the people” (2 Kgs 23: 4-6). Several altars were also pulled down from the temple, reduced to rubble, and thrown into the Kidron Valley (2 Kgs 23:12). While the memory of these activities could relate to the Kidron Valley’s position as a liminal border region or its association with graves, it is also possible that industrial activity in the area provided a convenient trope for the burning described in the text.

8.5 Conclusions

This overview of biblical passages has produced a number of significant observations, many of which contradict traditional figurine interpretations—i.e. that figurines are (1) major deities associated with (2) popular religion and are made and used by persons of (3) low socio-economic status or by (4) females. First, clay is not used to produce images of high deities or official cultic implements in major sanctuaries. In actuality, none of the texts using clay terminology intersect with those describing idol production. Rather, texts mentioning idols refer to images of wood, metal, or stone. Perhaps only later in Israel’s history were prohibitions broad enough to include clay images. Furthermore, idols are considered foreign intrusions. The fact that clay objects are ignored in the Hebrew Bible may suggest that these items were not representations of foreign deities nor created through foreign production techniques.

197 Although קֶבֶר is in the singular, BHS suggests amending to the construct plural based on the Lucianic recension of the Septuagint, the Syriac, the Targum, and the Vulgate.

198 The 2 Chronicles account lacks any mention of burning. It simply states the Levites brought all unclean things from the temple to the Kidron Valley (2 Chr 29:16) as they did with the altars (2 Chr 30:14).
Second, while potters do not appear to have been associated with the Temple, several ritual texts describe clay vessels used in ritual contexts, particularly because of clay’s ability to transmit impurity/holiness. In most of these texts the rituals occur outside the official sacred precincts but are performed by official religious agents. Therefore, the ritual use of clay resists any easy dichotomy between official and popular religion since it is omitted as a material for idols and official cultic implements but is used in certain rituals with priests as officiants.

Third, rituals involving clay objects give no clue as to the economic status of the participants. While some scholars have hypothesized that clay vessels were used because they could be replaced inexpensively, not every ritual requires that the clay items be broken. Regardless of whether an economic consideration lies at the origin of clay vessels in ritual contexts, this is not the rationale reflected in the text. Nowhere does Leviticus suggest that clay vessels represent economic alternatives to more expensive materials, as it does for certain offerings and sacrifices. Rather, the best explanation of the treatment of clay vessels is their ability to transmit purity/impurity.

At the same time, most poetic texts portray clay as cheap and/or breakable. Whether this would apply to figurines (as opposed to pottery vessels) must remain in question; but it cannot be denied that biblical texts from many periods focus on this aspect of clay items, particularly when they are likened to humans.

Fourth, many of the rituals incorporating clay objects occur outside of communal cultic space, particularly in the household. This does not imply that such practices were administered solely by household members or officiates of so-called heterodox religion.
Nor is there any suggestion that clay was linked to the specific concerns of particular household members. Clay objects are mentioned in rituals involving both genders, from male sexual emissions to female pregnancy. Furthermore, clay was used in a variety of rituals, such as purifying people and places from disease and transferring purity/impurity in rituals of divination.

Finally, figurines may have been manufactured from clay due to clay’s particular attributes. The special function attributed to clay in Leviticus and Numbers may explain why the JPF iconic design does not occur in other forms or media, as do animal and plant motifs that occur on free standing figurines, ostraca, and seal impressions and appear in clay, ivory, and metal. If the figurines were used for rituals transferring purity/impurity, clay would be fundamental for the figurines’ function.

Furthermore, the Gen 2 creation story may attest to a tradition shared by biblical texts and figurine producers, one that deemed clay the appropriate material for anthropomorphic images. The associations found in Gen 2 and 3 between the ground, humanity, and death may also betray longstanding traditions connecting clay with the power of primordial creation as well as the realm of the dead, which is often considered responsible for illness and misfortune in the ancient Near East. Given the large number of tombs in the Kidron Valley, the predominance of Kidron Valley clay among Jerusalem figurines (in contrast with Jerusalem pottery; see Chapter 6) might even reflect a traditional preference for clay collected from liminal areas associated with death and the grave.
Additionally, several biblical passages refer to markets in or on the outskirts of Jerusalem. The Hebrew Bible also associates specific locations with particular goods, such as pottery outside the city gates. Moreover, the Kidron Valley is remembered as an external border and is associated with burning, as is the Hinnom Valley, further suggesting that industrial activity may have occurred in these valleys, including the creation and sale of pottery items.

Overall, the Hebrew Bible presents a picture of clay objects, including those used in rituals, that is similar to the picture derived from ancient Near Eastern texts and archaeological data. It is also apparent that the texts do not support many interpretations that claim to be based upon the Bible, such as those that use biblical reform movements and Yahwistic monotheism to interpret the figurines as foreign or heterodox objects. Furthermore, this picture can be confirmed through an investigation of actual Iron II female iconography.
CHAPTER 9: STYLE AND ICONOGRAPHY

Although the identity of the JPFs has been the object of much speculation, scholars have yet to reach a consensus. Despite the fact that the number of major interpretive options is limited (e.g., goddess or human), every scholar has a nuanced view about what or who the figurines represent. Thus, there are as many theories about the identity of these figurines as there are scholars who have written about them.

For these reasons an alternative approach is in order. Instead of interpreting the various components of the figurines as one holistic image, the individual elements that constitute figurine design can be analyzed separately. This method is particularly appropriate because the JPFs represent a new combination of iconographic and stylistic elements, some previously known from clay and others from different media. Only in this way can both the distinctive innovations of the Iron II figurines and their similarities with previous traditions be appreciated.

JPFs consist of various parts of the human form constructed from clay, whitewash, and paint. In what follows, these elements are evaluated based on two design principles—permanence and detail. Comparable iconography within the terracotta figurine tradition and across minor and major arts is also investigated, taking into consideration the continuity of iconographic elements as well as their local adaptations. Thus, this chapter considers methodological issues (9.1), then investigates the style and comparanda for the major components of figurine design, focusing on the pillar base (9.2), the breasts and gesture (9.3), the molded heads (9.4), and the pinched heads (9.5) to
identify chronological developments, motivations for stylistic adaptations, and the significance for figurine function (9.6).

9.1 Methodological issues

In the study of ancient Near Eastern art, the “Iconographic School,” has focused on the meaning behind visual symbols, highlighting the content of images rather than the manner of their creation. While content is significant, elements may be included in a representation for a number of reasons; and the most stereotyped aspects of an image are often the most difficult to interpret. Furthermore, this methodology inadvertently creates the impression of a continuous function and meaning that glosses over the particularities of a trope’s adaptation in various cultures and time periods.

---


2 Winter (“Le Palais Imaginaire,” 140-41) summarizes Mieke Bal’s critique of Panofsky in Reading ‘Rembrandt’: Beyond the Word-Image Opposition (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991). Winter claims that Panofsky’s style of analysis emphasizes continuity by focusing on the source of symbols rather than their “contemporary reception.” She further argues that many studies fail to recognize the importance of the form or medium through which a given symbol is manifested. In Winter’s opinion, the same symbol occurring in different forms (seals, figurines, monumental art, etc.) may take on different meanings. See
An alternative to this approach is to include elements of style in the discussion—the particular manner in which iconographic symbols are depicted. This would include the often overlooked category “technological style,” which considers materials and

also Angelika Berlejung, “Die Reduktion von Komplexität: das theologische Profil einer Gottheit und seine Umsetzung in der Ikonographie am Beispiel des Gottes Assur im Assyrien des 1.Jt. v. Chr,” in Die Welt der Götterbilder (ed. Brigitte Groneberg and Hermann Speickermann; BZAW 376; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2007), 37-38. Berlejung demonstrates the way particular features of a divinity (in this case Aššur) are selected and highlighted in different media. On the methodology of the Fribourg School, Weissenrieder (“Crown of Thorns,” 117) discusses the way these scholars track a single motif across multiple media to create a “motif history.” See also Izaak J. de Hulster, “Illuminating Images: A Historical Position and Method for Iconographic Exegesis,” in Iconography and Biblical Studies: Proceedings of the Iconography Sessions at the Joint EABS/SBL Conference, 22-26 July 2007, Vienna, Austria (ed. Izaak J. de Hulster and Rüdiger Schmitt; AOAT 361; Münster: Ugarit, 2009), 146. De Hulster summarizes Keel’s methodology, noting that Keel proposes a “continuity of sentiments” or “diachronic continuity where religions follow one another,” to justify the application of Canaanite motifs to texts of the Hebrew Bible. While Keel recognizes the fact that a change in the composition of an image affects the meaning of symbols, there is little awareness of the change in media or style and its impact on the meaning of a symbol (Othmar Keel, “Iconography and the Bible,” ABD 3: 360-61); Keel, Goddesses and Trees, New Moon and Yahweh; Keel and Uehlinger, Gods, Goddesses, and Images of God, 12-13; Othmar Keel, Das Recht der Bilder gesehen zu werden: Drei Fallstudien zur Methode der Interpretation altorientalischer Bilder (OBO 112; Fribourg: Universitätsverlag; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1992), 267-71.

production techniques. Although various aspects of technological style could be explained through a functionalist approach, i.e. economic necessity or resource availability, materials and production processes were chosen for ideological reasons as well. Further, technological styles have a more restricted area of distribution than do “iconological styles,” making them incredibly valuable in the identification of regional style and adaptation.


Miriam T. Stark, “Social Dimensions of Technical Choice in Kalinga Ceramic Traditions,” in Material Meanings: Critical Approaches to Interpreting Material Culture (ed. Elizabeth Chilton; Salt Lake City, Utah: University of Utah Press, 1999), 24-43. See also Irene J. Winter, “Establishing Group Boundaries: Toward Methodological Refinement in the Determination of Sets as a Prior Condition to the Analysis of Cultural Contact and/or Innovation in First Millennium B.C.E. Ivory Carving,” in On Art in the Ancient Near East: Volume 1: Of the First Millennium B.C.E. (Culture and History of the Ancient Near East 34.1; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 407-9; 414-17; repr. from Crafts and Images in Contact: Studies on Eastern Mediterranean Art of the First Millennium BCE (ed. Claudia E. Suter and Christoph Uehlinger; OBO 210; Fribourg: Academic Press; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2005). Because individual motifs can appear in multiple media and across many cultures, Winter argues that style, i.e. the way a particular motif is depicted, is a stronger indicator of “hand, school, or place.” Note, however, the difficulty identifying which variable elements indicate a regional style versus those that result from the preference of individual artisans. On this point see Georgina Herrmann, “Naming, Defining, Explaining: A View from Nimrud,” in Crafts and Images in Contact: Studies on Eastern Mediterranean Art of the First Millennium BCE (ed. Claudia E. Suter and Christoph Uehlinger; OBO 210; Fribourg: Academic Press; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2005), 11-20.
The ideological motivations for production strategies are also indicated by the scale and nature of the figurines as miniatures. A miniature is not the same as a replica. While a replica, or a model, attempts to reproduce even the smallest details of a larger image, a miniature is selective, reproducing only those elements that communicate the most important aspects of the image. Miniatures imply choice on the part of the artisan community, including which visual representations to include, the degree of detail invested in any given aspect of the image, and the resources dedicated to the durability of these various parts. Furthermore, miniatures depicting the human body are especially indicative of artistic choice, including which elements are depicted, how they are portrayed, and which elements remain ambiguous.

7 Winter (“Le Palais Imaginaire,” 142-43, 147) comments on the significance of scale in the interpretation of Neo-Assyrian cylinder seals, arguing that the same motif, i.e. the king and semi-divine creatures flanking a tree, may take on a different meaning when occurring on a seal than when they occur as monumental reliefs in a throne room. See also Douglass W. Bailey, Prehistoric Figurines: Representation and Corporeality in the Neolithic (London: Routledge, 2005), 32-33. Bailey argues that miniatures work through abstraction and compression, making the details depicted even more significant than on full scale images. See also James Roy King, Remaking the World: Modeling in Human Experience (Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1996), 3, 11; Mark Morris, Models: Architecture and the Miniature (Chichester UK: Wiley-Academy, 2006), 9; Susan Stewart, On Longing: Narratives of the Miniature, the Gigantic, the Souvenir, the Collection (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1993), 55; Joanna S. Smith, Art and Society in Cyprus From the Bronze Age into the Iron Age (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 18-21. In particular, Smith (ibid. 19) suggests that “miniaturization can infuse an image with new meaning, sometimes magical, as in the case of apotropaic images at the scale of an amulet.”

9.1.1 Technological style elements

In regard to technological style elements, figurines are composed of fired clay, white wash, and paint. Rated on a continuum of permanence or durability, clay is less durable than stone or metal, suggesting the figurines were not created for extensive long-term use.\(^9\) At the same time, artisans dedicated the time and resources to fire the images, indicating that they were intended for some durability. Firing the figurines also implies they may have been displayed or exposed to the air, since unfired clay would disintegrate quickly when handled.\(^10\) Furthermore, those elements depicted through the modeling of clay may also have been intended to endure and must have been important to the function and meaning of the image. This would include the heads, arms and breasts, and pillar bodies.\(^11\)

The significance of clay as a production material is indicated by a number of textual witnesses. In addition to references to clay or earth in creation accounts (see Chapter 8), clay was an important material in apotropaic rituals and rituals of transference. In Mesopotamian literature a number of ritual texts mention clay. Tablet 9 of the Utukkū Lemnūtu incantations prays, “may Nunurra, the great potter of Anu, drive

\(^9\) See Chapter 2 for an overview of anthropological approaches that focus on the materials out of which figurines are made and possible implications for their function.

\(^10\) Van Buren, *Clay Figurines of Babylonia and Assyria*, 191-92, 211.

(the demon) away from the house in a pot fired in a pure kiln from a pure place…”

From the same corpus, Tablet 12 describes “liquid extract of dark clay” used to cover the outside gate of the temple to protect against demonic attack. Further, raw clay is used in one sky omen NAM.BUR.BI. Additionally, Scurlock relates a ritual for healthy delivery in which a woman recites prayers inside a potter’s kiln. Dorman also notes a connection between potters and healing rituals in Egyptian spell literature. For an extensive examination of clay in the Hebrew Bible see Chapter 8.

The clay properties can be compared with whitewash and painted decoration. While there is overwhelming evidence that the figurines were whitewashed and painted, these particular elements are poorly preserved on most of the fragments from Jerusalem. Whitewash may have served two purposes. It hides imperfections resulting from poorly levigated clay or firing mishaps. Indeed, in Chapter 6 it was noted that even badly malformed fragments were covered and used. The whitewash also prepares the surface

---

13 Ibid., 240-41, Tablet 12:92-94.
15 Scurlock, “Translating Transfers in Ancient Mesopotamia,” 219. Scurlock is citing SpTU 5 no. 248:26-32. She likens the womb of the woman to the “womb” of the pottery oven.
16 Dorman, *Faces in Clay*, 96. Dorman is referring to a phrase in medical prescriptions, “bsn n qd” defined as a “natron of a potter,” the translation of which is supported by pHearst and pEbers. He also notes healing spells that require “uraei of pure clay,” and one that requires a serpent made from “earth and spittle” to heal a scorpion sting (ibid., 30).
17 Clay associated with certain types of rituals is not limited to the ancient Near East. For African exemplars see Hardin, “Technological Style and the Making of Culture,” 40. For South Asia see Huyler, “Tulasī: A Survey and Case Study of Ritual Terracotta Planters,” 325.
for painted decoration. Where paint survives, red is the most common color, followed by yellow.

However, because pillar bases were not usually painted, the whitewash must have a function other than preparation for painted decoration. Furthermore, other cultic items like zoomorphic figurines, cult stands, and shrine boxes were regularly whitewashed or whitewashed and painted, suggesting some common techniques for the preparation of cultic objects. Perhaps the best explanation is that whitewash was an appropriate solution for the aesthetic irregularities that accompany clay formation and also provided an appropriate surface for painting. Because, as was argued in Chapter 8, clay was necessary for the figurines’ function, whitewash was the easiest way to improve their appearance. The fact remains, however, that other production steps suggest the appearance of the figurines was not important enough to warrant specialized levigation methods or firing environments.


19 Of interest, cf. with Deut 27:1-6, which commands the Israelites to coat large, undressed stones with lime and write the words of the law upon them. The Israelites are then commanded to build an altar of undressed stone, which may refer to the lime-coated stones, though the text is ambiguous. Tigay (Deuteronomy, 248) claims that the painted stones were not used to construct the altar because he assumes these stones must have been worked to prepare the surface for writing. In contrast, nowhere does the text describe these stones as worked. Regardless, the whitewash here is clearly in preparation for the paint; but it is also applied to cultic items. Additionally, Tigay (ibid) notes that the white wash and paint were applied to the walls of the shrines at Kuntillet Ajrud and either the walls or a stela at Deir ‘Alla.
Furthermore, ethnographic analogy suggests that whitewash and paint quickly fade from figurines, particularly when exposed to the elements. Thus, while the whitewash and paint must have been important in the initial design and function, they were not the most durable components of the image. This may indicate that design elements depicted in paint were necessary for only part of the ritual. It may also suggest that the painted elements were less important than those elements molded or modeled from clay.

9.1.2 Iconographic style elements

It has been shown elsewhere that pillar figurines in Judah represent a geographically defined style group. This does not imply that only those figurines constructed in this dominant style were known or produced locally at Judean sites but that figurines with a particular combination of elements constitute the majority of the assemblage at these sites. As Judean-style figurines are relatively unknown in neighboring areas, the existence of a local style in Judah seems clear.


Components of the dominant local style in eighth through sixth century Jerusalem include hand-made, solid pillar bases, hands holding or supporting the breasts, and molded heads or pinched heads. These combined elements comprise the majority of Jerusalem figurines and are the focus of this chapter. That said, variation exists within the corpus. A small number of bases are wheel-made and/or hollow, particularly early specimens (see Chapter 7). A few figurines hold objects, usually a disc or a child. These fragments are largely excluded in this investigation since they are far outnumbered by the more common type.


Further, it is difficult to ascertain which variations are significant for regional style and which reflect the idiosyncrasies of particular artists and production events. For example, while Holland distinguishes between figurines with hands holding the breasts and those with arms supporting the breasts, both types occur frequently; and thus far it is not possible to identify different clays or distribution patterns that suggest these types function differently or were made by different workshops. Furthermore, the large number of torso fragments from which arms and breasts have been broken (making it difficult to assign the fragments to either category) would probably challenge the validity of such attempts.

There are also slight variations in the hand-pinched heads. A small number have an engraved/incised mouth. A few also have a pointed chin, often interpreted as a beard; though none of these have been found on bodies with breasts. Some have applied pellet eyes.24 These features do not normally occur on figurines with typical Judean-style bodies. While these variations are included in the overall figurine totals and provenience statistics for the Jerusalem figurine corpus, they may be male figurines, fragments from riders, or previously attached to ceramic vessels, stands, or shrines.

Perhaps the most difficult decision is which variations among molded heads are stylistically or iconographically significant. Heads typically have a short wig, descending no longer than the chin and covering the ears. Beyond that commonality, there may be anywhere between one and six rows of horizontally arranged curls surrounding the face; and the curls may be circular or square. Vertically arranged curls are uncommon. Furthermore, the eyes of the face are always almond shaped but the angles and widths may vary. The lips are always closed, usually in a slight smile. While the variations in faces may reflect different workshops or different molds, no correlation between these variations and clay make-up or archaeological distribution is currently apparent. Further, molded heads may be badly worn or the mold may have been improperly applied to the clay creating variation where none was intended. Thus, the common features rather than the idiosyncratic elements are dealt with below.

9.2 Pillar Bases

9.2.1 Stylistic considerations

Turning to the iconographic content of the pillar figurines, figurines are composed of pillar bases, breasts and arms, and two very different styles of heads. First, the pillar bases have presented complications for the study of pillar figurines, as explained in Chapter 2. Some interpreters have assumed that the pillar represents a tree trunk, which they connect with Asherah and sacred tree imagery. Others have argued that the plain

bases represent garments, anesthetizing their Canaanite forerunners—the naked female plaque figurines.

In actuality, pillar bases are found on a number of figurines all over the world as a means to support a standing image. Thus, a more functional rationale cannot be dismissed. Further, hand-made pillar bases are component parts of a number of figurines in the Middle Bronze Age in the ancient Near East, as are wheel-made and hand-made pillars in contemporaneous figurines from Philistia, Transjordan, northern Israel, Cyprus, and Phoenicia (see below).

Unlike plaque figurines, the JPF bodies generally lack molded decoration or any indication that the pillar was intended to represent a garment. In most examples only whitewash remains; and where paint is preserved it consists of broad stripes in red and yellow. In short, the remaining paint does not seem to depict a garment. Thus, the style of the pillar suggests that more permanent and detailed decoration on the base may have been unnecessary for the function of the image. In comparison, a number of free-standing bird figurines appended to pillars have been discovered, though few scholars would argue that the pillar is anything more than the base of the figurine.

Moreover, were the pillar meant to represent a clothed female body, this artistic convention would be considerably different from that in neighboring Egypt, where clothing on females is most frequently depicted adhering closely to the body, so much so

26 Gilbert-Peretz, “Ceramic Figurines,” G/2281/1 described as a pillar base with broad stripes of red and yellow.

27 E.g., Kletter, Judean Pillar-Figurines, Appendix 5, 5.II.2.1-34.
that the breasts, waist, thighs, buttocks, and even pubic triangle remain visible.\(^28\) Given the fact that Egyptian convention largely governs the art of the Levant from this period (see below), the schematic nature of the pillar base is even more striking.

Press claims that the style of manufacture of the various pillar figurines indicates whether the figurine is clothed or naked, contrasting cylindrical bodies from Phoenicia and Cyprus with hand-formed bodies from Philistia and Judah. He claims the former depict a dress while the latter depict nude females. He further supports this distinction by showing that the Phoenician and Cypriote figurines only rarely have breasts.\(^29\) Instead, Phoenician and Cypriote figurines typically hold objects against their chests. Press does not consider the possibility that the breasts may have been omitted due to the difficulty modeling both breasts and objects. In fact, three-dimensional figurines that hold objects rarely have modeled breasts. Still, Press is correct to note the regional character of various pillar/bell figurine styles;\(^30\) but the connection between pillar style and naked versus clothed bodies is not supportable. As is argued below, displaying the breasts probably communicated certain meanings and functions. Figurines holding objects communicated other (though probably related) functions where the gender of the image is less explicitly invoked.

---


\(^29\) Press, “Philistine Figurines,” 297.

\(^30\) Ibid., 299.
9.2.2 Comparanda

The explanation for the adoption of pillar-style figurines is shrouded in some mystery, owing to the problematic dating for pillar figurines from a number of locations, such as the cylindrical bodied figurines of Phoenicia and pillar figurines in Jordan. As far as the current information allows, Cypriote figurines with molded heads and hollow pillar bodies are dated no earlier than the seventh century. In Philistia the majority of hollow pillar-based figurines with molded heads are dated to the eighth and primarily seventh centuries. Mycenaean style pillar bodies with hand-made heads from Philistine sites are discussed below. Pillar bodies with hand-made heads have also been dated to the eighth and seventh centuries in northern Syria, with a few specimens even earlier.

---

31 Ibid., 228. Press points out the problematic nature of Phoenician figurines and cites a few examples from eighth century contexts, including a composite frame drum player in Tyre Stratum II (second half of the eighth century) and a similar figurine from Shiqmona that preliminary reports date to the early eighth century.

32 ‘Amr, “Study of the Clay Figurines and Zoomorphic Vessels of Trans-Jordan,” 22-35. ‘Amr reviews sites in Jordan where figurines have been found. In most cases only a general date of “ninth through sixth century” is possible and often on stylistic rather than archaeological grounds.


34 Press (“Philistine Figurines,” 282, 294-302) suggests the pillar body with molded head dates to the eighth and seventh centuries in Philistia, though he argues for an eighth century predecessor in the Phoenician bell-shaped figurines. Given the problematic dating for the Phoenician figurines (see above), this argument is inconclusive.

While, Iron Age plaque figurines are predominate in the Aramaean states, these pillar figurines are predominate in north Syrian areas under Neo-Hittite influence.

As suggested in Chapter 7, the earliest secure dating for the Judean pillar with molded head appears to come from ninth century contexts in the Shephelah and the Negev, with some possible mid-to-early eighth century examples in Jerusalem. Further, Press notes the presence of the Judean style figurines in Philistine sites close to the Judean border, particularly Miqne, which has one example dated to the early part of the eighth century.

Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols, 2010), 222, Tabelle 16. These have a variety of gestures, some with hands on their chests.

Ibid., number 289, Taf. 34, a woman holding child, dated to the eleventh-ninth centuries; ibid., 286, Taf. 34, with broken arms dated to the tenth through eighth centuries; ibid., 285, Taf. 34, woman with hands on her chest, dated to the tenth through eighth centuries.

Ibid., 155-56. This pattern does not correspond with “ethnicity” in a simplistic way. The more sophisticated point that Pruß is making is that the plaques are not influenced by Neo-Hittite artistic conventions, in contrast with the orthostats (monumental art) and elite goods (ivories) where Syrian and Hittite motifs are mixed and combined with Egyptian motifs. He argues that the use of the Hittite conventions may have been especially appropriate for the political and propagandistic art of the monarch but would have little meaning for objects used in private religion.

Ibid., 225, particularly concentrated in and around Carchemish and Çatal Hüyük. A notable exception is Tel Ahmar, which was an Aramaean center prior to the Assyrian conquest. The figurines may be explained by trade interactions between this site and Carchemish (see below).

Press, “Philistine Figurines,” 311. Note that Press dismisses the dating of the early exemplar because he believes that the JPF style does not arise until the second half of the eighth century (ibid., 282). This would ignore the possibility, proposed by Kletter, that the style may have some early eighth century and even ninth century exemplars. Further, according to personal communication with the excavator of Tel Miqne, Dr. Gittin, the fragment in question (reg. 6559) was found in a fill layer that served as a foundation for and was sealed by a surface dated to the early eighth century, itself overlaid by another surface dating to the late eighth century. If this is one of the oldest Judean style figurines found at a Philistine site, it may suggest that the Shephelah region exerted some influence over the Philistine figurines.
Aside from Judah, several of the pillar style figurines from northern Israel have an early date. Dateable examples of molded heads (which would have been attached to hand-made or wheel-made pillars) include Megiddo, Beth Shean, Dan, Hazor, and Samaria. Hollow pillar figurines with molded heads and depicting a woman playing a drum also come from Megiddo, and a hollow pillar figurine playing an instrument comes from Samaria. Solid pillar-body fragments also have been found at Beth Shean, Megiddo, and Samaria. These fragments represent a wide mixture of hairstyles and gestures. Many come from the Iron IIA or the early Iron IIB.

40 For Megiddo, see Kletter, *Judean Pillar-Figurines*, Appendix 5, 5.III.4.2-4; 5.III.7.9, 27, all of which date to Level III or 780-650 during which time the city fell under Assyrian rule (from 732 B.C.E.); ibid., Appendix 5, 5.III.7.8; 5.III.7.10, 14, 21-23, 26, which came from Level V, originally dated to 1050-1000 though this may be revised to 1000-950; ibid., Appendix 5, 5.III.7.13, from Level VI originally dated to 1150-1100; For Beth Shean, see ibid., Appendix 5, 5.III.7.2, dated to the Iron I; ibid., Appendix 5, 5.III.7.4, with possible Hathor-style sidelocks and dated to ca. tenth century; For Dan, see ibid., Appendix 5, 5.III.7.5, dated tentatively to the eighth century (Kletter, following Holland, notes this may be a Cypriote import, in which case it would probably date to the seventh century); for Hazor, see ibid., Appendix 5, 5.III.7.6-7, dated anywhere between the ninth and seventh centuries; for Samaria, see ibid., Appendix 5, 5.III.7.15-16, 28, 30-32, 35-37, all from E207 and dated to the eighth century but prior to the destruction of 722 B.C.E.

41 For Megiddo, see ibid., Appendix 5, 5.III.6.1-7. Most of these are surface finds, but they are typologically similar to the stratified fragments which also date to Level III (780-650); for Samaria, see ibid., Appendix 5, 5.IV.6.17, from E207.

42 For Beth Shean, see ibid., Appendix 5, 5.IV.7.1, 3, 5, dated to the Iron I through the ninth century; for Megiddo, see ibid., Appendix 5, 5.IV.7.14-16 from Levels VI-V, either dated to the Iron I and early IIA or IIA-IIB, depending on chronology; for Samaria, see ibid., Appendix 5, 5.IV.7.18, from E207 of the eighth century.
9.2.3 Meaning and function

Similar to the free-standing figurines, a number of figurines, including those with hands on their breasts, were attached to the cult stands in the Yavneh corpus and dated to the end of the ninth through the beginning of the eighth centuries. Ziffer interprets the base as a skirt, suggesting a partially dressed female. This is problematic for several reasons. Females holding their breasts are more frequently depicted with full lower bodies on these cult stands. These fully modeled females appear in the same areas of the cult-stands (in rectangular or rounded openings) and with the same gestures as the females with pillar bases, suggesting a similar function. Moreover the fully modeled females generally lack any indication of pubic triangle or attention to the pudenda in contrast with many of the Late Bronze plaque figurines. Thus, perhaps by the Iron II, the lower half of the female image had become less important. If that is the case, a further schematization, reducing the gender of the image to its breasts, was a logical outgrowth.

43 Kletter and Ziffer, “Catalogue 1,” CAT37, 224-25, Pls 11:1; 76-77; 78:1-2; CAT44, 227-28, Pls. 13:1; 84-85; CAT49, 230, Pls. 2:2, bottom; 14:2; 90:1, 3; 91:1 (claims ridges beneath represent legs but this is conjectural); CAT59, 236, Pls 33:1; 103:2-3.


45 Ziffer, “Iconography of the Cult Stands,” 77.

46 Kletter and Ziffer, “Catalogue 1,” CAT84, 245, Pl. 21:1; 43:1, bottom; 119;120:1; CAT85, 246, Pl. 41:1; 120:2-3; CAT86, 246, Pl.21:2; 121; CAT92, 248-49, Pl. 23:2; 125:2-3; 126:1-2; CAT113, 257-58, Pl. 26:1; 143:2; 144; CAT123, 261, Pl. 150:2; CAT28, 220-21, Pls 9:2; 69; 70:1; CAT29, 221, Pls 47:3; 70:2-3; CAT57, 234, Pls. 7:1; 17:2; 99-100; CAT90, 247-48, Pl. 1:2-3; 40:1-2; 41; 123:3-4.
Furthermore, females are not the only figures attached to the cult stands by means of a pillar. Zoomorphic fragments are also depicted by their heads or heads and necks/columns, attached vertically in the openings. Moreover, in many of the same openings, the space is filled by pillar columns. Other cult stands also use females or sphinxes with molded heads as a substitute for columns; the heads may be associated with capitols and volutes. Female images combined with actual columns are known from Hathor columns in Egypt and at Timnah, as well as the basalt female standing on

---

47 E.g., ibid., CAT22, 218, Pl. 65; CAT30, 221-22, Pl. 71; CAT41, 226, Pl. 81; CAT110, 256, Pl. 141:2. These bull heads are interpreted as sitting upon necks, which is certainly possible. However, the stands in question do not show the bull heads projecting forward from the stand, as is otherwise common, but sitting vertically in the holes. Even the more numerous examples with the animal heads projecting forward represent a schematization, since the head and neck, not the full animal, are depicted to represent the whole.

48 Ibid., CAT17, 217, Pl. 62:1; CAT52, 232, Pl. 5:1; 16:1; 93:4; 94; CAT53, 232, Pl 2:2, center; 16:2; 95; CAT54, 233, Pl. 96:1; CAT106, 255, Pl. 138:2.

49 Aren M. Maeir and Michal Dayagi-Mendels, “An Elaborately Decorated Clay Model Shrine from the Moussaeiff Collection,” in Bilden als Quellen/Images as Sources: Studies on Ancient Near Eastern Artefacts and the Bible Inspired by the Work of Othmar Keel (ed. Susanne Bickel, Silvia Schroer, Schurte Renee, and Christoph Uehlinger; OBO Special Volume; Fribourg: Academic Press; Götttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2007), 111-23. Here molded female bodies take the place of pillars and female protomes take the place of capitols (see below for more). See also Zevit, Religions of Ancient Israel, 325-26, Fig. 4.10. Zevit points out that Megiddo stands with sphinxes have volutes behind the sphinx heads. He concludes that the sphinxes do not depict actual architectural features and that the volute stands for the sacred tree associated with fertility. This unlikely conclusion is partly motivated by Zevit’s interpretation of these shrines as replicas of actual sacred space (ibid., 327). Whether or not female images or sphinxes were used this way in actual shrines, they are certainly used as columns and capitols in the miniaturized shrines.


51 Benno Rothenberg, Timnah: Valley of the Biblical Copper Mines (London: Thames & Hudson, 1972), 130, 151, Fig. 78. The stone column was not found in situ in the shrine and was probably defaced and reused in a later phase.
the back of a lion from the ninth century palace entrance at Tell Halaf.\textsuperscript{52} Caryatids, believed to have been influenced by Ionic temples in Anatolia, may be a later continuation of these Syrian and Anatolian traditions.\textsuperscript{53} Thus, most of the evidence suggests that the lower “body” of the figurine is actually a pillar and a schematization that has largely lost its significance for the function of this image. If the base maintains any significance, perhaps it recalls the pillar columns from protective figures on cult stands guarding shrine space (see below).\textsuperscript{54}

9.3 Breasts

9.3.1 Stylistic considerations

In contrast to the pillar bases lacking in anatomical detail, the clay breasts are always depicted on typical JPFs. The prominence of the breasts has been greatly over-exaggerated. A brief visual survey of figurine fragments from any number of sites shows a great deal of variety in the manner in which the breasts are modeled, ranging from separately attached pellets to a single, continuous ledge. The breasts may be more

\textsuperscript{52} Max Freiherr von Oppenheim, \textit{Der Tell Halaf: eine neue Kultur im ältesten Mesopotamien} (Leipzig, Germany: Brockhaus, 1931), 121.

\textsuperscript{53} Ione Mylonas Shear, “Maidens in Greek Architecture: The Origin of the ‘Caryatids,’” \textit{Bulletin de Correspondance Héllenique} 123 (1999): 65-85. Mylonas Shear argues for the origin of this form at Delphi in the sixth century but based upon the figures in relief in the monumental carved column drums from Ephesus and Didyma.

\textsuperscript{54} Schroer, “Frauenkörper als architektonische Elemente,” 438-39. Schroer is aware of the potential connection between JPFs and columns, but she interprets the base as the trunk of a tree. She assumes JPFs are associated with Asherah, who is related to tree iconography (for a critique of this position see Chapter 2). At the same time, she argues that naked female bodies on cult stands and shrine boxes often represent architectural elements, taking the place of columns as well as other architectural features (ibid., 430-38).
rounded or pointed depending on the particular fragment. The sizes vary as well, although it comes as no surprise that figurines with large breasts are often chosen as illustrations when the figurines are discussed.

That being said, the fact that the breasts are included in durable form indicates that they were significant aspects of the image. Furthermore, the fact that the arms are not merely at the sides or holding objects but rather support or hold the breasts indicates that the breasts were important. Unfortunately, while the breasts were covered in whitewash, and thus perhaps paint, only the most minimal traces remain, complicating the interpretation of the painted features. Where paint is preserved, it usually consists of striped patterns, most frequently above the breasts. Given the state of preservation on examples, these stripes are difficult to interpret. At best, they may represent some type of necklace, pectoral, or aegis.55

Although the breasts are most typically interpreted as indicators of fertility or nurturing, in actuality little evidence has been offered to support this claim. As has been pointed out in Chapters 6 and 7, there is no archaeological reason to associate figurines with hands on their breasts solely with female space or concerns. Nor, as per Chapter 3, is

55 E.g., Gilbert-Peretz, “Ceramic Figurines,” G/4931, described as white slip with thin red and yellow painted stripes across the torso; ibid., E3/12886, described as white slip with stripes of red paint above the bosom; ibid., E3/13016, described as white slip, traces of black stripes on arms, red and yellow stripes above breasts; ibid., E1/6143, described as white slip with traces of red stripes on this torso; ibid., D2/13658/ Kletter, Judean Pillar-Figurines, Addenda to Appendix 2, 852.C.2?, described by Kletter as having bands of red and yellow paint; Gilbert-Peretz, “Ceramic Figurines,” E1/16107, described as white slip with red, yellow, and black painted stripes above the bosom; ibid., E1/9284/Kletter, Judean Pillar-Figurines, Addenda to Appendix 2, 676.C.1, described by Kletter as having bands of red and yellow paint on the neck; Gilbert-Peretz, “Ceramic Figurines,” E1/10244, described as white slip with traces of yellow painted stripes above bosom; ibid., G/5797, described as white slip with red painted stripes on the torso.
there evidence for the use of female figurines in ancient Near Eastern rituals related to
gestation, birth, or infant mortality.

9.3.2 Comparanda

Given the infrequency of the hands-on-breast design on Iron Age pillar figurines
from Phoenicia and Cyprus\(^{56}\) and even from the Transjordan,\(^{57}\) as well as their
problematic dates, the most likely antecedents for the Judean design is probably the
female plaques from Syria and Palestine,\(^{58}\) and perhaps also Egypt\(^{59}\) and Phoenician

\(^{56}\) Press ("Philistine Figurines," 297-99) notes the infrequency of figurines with breasts in both the
Phoenician and Cypriote corpuses.

\(^{57}\) Although Hadley (Cult of Asherah, 196) mentions the plaque females with hands on their breasts from
Jordan, these are in the minority of the published corpus by the Iron Age. Examples include ‘Amr, “Study
of the Clay Figurines and Zoomorphic Vessels of Trans-Jordan,” II.A2.17; II.A2.18; II.A2.19; II.A2.24;
II.A2.25; II.A2.26; II.B2b.36; II.D1.71; II.D1.72. These nine examples are all plaque figurines and all from
Buseirah, where figurines holding tambourines and drums are not known. ‘Amr (ibid., 51) does include
more females in the hands-on-breasts category; but they have hands positioned well below the breasts on
the torso or have the hands extended out to the sides. Kletter, following Holland, adds one plaque figure
with left hand on breast (Kletter, Judean Pillar-Figurines, Appendix 4, 4.VII.2/ Holland, “Typological and
Archaeological Study of Human and Animal Representations," C.VI.c.1) and one hollow body with right
hand holding breast (Kletter, Judean Pillar-Figurines, Appendix 4, 4.III.12). These examples are badly
outnumbered by the more typical and more widely distributed females holding drums or tambourines,
known from both plaque and pillar examples. As to pillar styles in general, out of ‘Amr’s study (ca. 100
freestanding human figurine fragments, excluding model body parts) only 18 have pillar bodies. This
proportion remains consistent even in examples from current excavations. For example, Michele Daviau
(“New Light on Iron Age Religious Iconography: The Evidence from Moab,” SHAJ 7 [2001]: 322) shows
that molded figurines, whether free-standing or previously attached, greatly outnumber pillar figurines in
the Moabite region (an area underrepresented in ‘Amr’s study). Further, the majority of plaque and pillar
figurines are holding a disc pressed against the torso. In fact, Daviau shows that only 3 fragments have the
hands holding the breasts, in comparison with 20 holding a disc (ibid., 323, Table 3).

\(^{58}\) This is in agreement with Hadley (Cult of Asherah, 204), though her interpretation of the figurines as
symbols of fertility is contestable. Tadmor (“Female Cult Figurines in Late Canaan and Early Israel,” 139-
73) argues that the Late Bronze plaque figurines are not connected to the later pillar figurines. Part of
the problem is that Tadmor focuses on females holding implements, standing on animals and females with
arms at their sides. As Hadley (Cult of Asherah, 196) points out, Tadmor ignores the females holding their
breasts (Holland, “Typological and Archaeological Study of Human and Animal Representations," C.II.b),
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The rise of single-molded plaque figurines dates to the Akkadian period in the Diyala region of Assyria. They become increasingly popular in the first half of the

which come from Israel, Transjordan, and Philistia. For further disagreement with Tadmor’s hypothesis, see Keel and Uehlinger, Gods, Goddesses, and Images of God, 99-108.

On the plaque figurines from Middle and New Kingdom Egypt see Pinch, Votive Offerings to Hathor, 207-9. The New Kingdom figurines rarely show a woman holding her breasts. More recently, Elizabeth A. Waraksa (“Female Figurines From The Mut Precinct: Context and Ritual” [Ph.D. diss., Johns Hopkins University, 2007]) has written about Late Bronze plaque figurines at the Mut Precinct and their comparanda throughout Egypt. This corpus also consists of females with hands at their sides (ibid., 27-32). Waraksa criticizes Pinch’s interpretation of the objects as fertility figurines (ibid., 17-20, 92-97). For another critique of the fertility figure interpretation see Emily Teeter, “Piety at Medinet Habu,” Oriental Institute News and Notes 173 (2002): 1-6; Emily Teeter, Baked Clay Figurines and Votive Beds from Medinet Habu (Chicago: Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, forthcoming).

Eric Gubel, “From Amathus to Zarephath and Back Again,” in Cypriote Terracottas: Proceedings of the First International Conference of Cypriote Studies, Brussles-Liege-Amsterdam, 29 May-1 June, 1989 (ed. Frieda Vandenabeele and Robert Laffineur; Brussels-Liège: A.G. Leventis Foundation, Vrije Universiteit Brussel-Université de Liège, 1991.), 133. Gubel notes the presence of the nude female with hands on breasts in plaque form in Cyprus. He suggests the form flourishes in Phoenicia between the ninth and seventh centuries and that Cypriote versions, particularly those from seventh century Amathus, are of Phoenician influence. In contrast, the nude female with hands on breasts is not that common in Iron Age Cyprus. It rarely occurs in pillar form and even its manifestations on plaques are outnumbered by other forms by the Iron II. Moreover, the number of figurines dated on stylistic criteria rather than provenience could skew the dating for these plaques. For example, the large number of figurines from the Iron II at Kition included very few plaque figurines with hands on the breasts (Vassos Karageorghis, Excavations at Kition 6: The Phoenician and Later Levels: Part 2 (Nicosia, Cyprus: Published for the Republic of Cyprus by the Department of Antiquities; Printed by Theopress LTD, 2003), Reg. 4804, Pl. XXVIII; 4606 Pl. XXVIII. Both fragments are dated between 800 and 725 B.C.E. and attributed to Phoenician occupation at the site, which began after a break of ca. 150 years (Vassos Karageorghis, Excavations at Kition 6: The Phoenician and Later Level: Part 1 (Nicosia, Cyprus: Published for the Republic of Cyprus by the Department of Antiquities of Cyprus; Printed by Imprinta LTD, 2005), 108). For an alternate perspective see Smith (Art and Society in Cyprus, 212) who challenges Karageorghis’s interpretation of the stratigraphic sequence, arguing for continuous occupation between the Late Bronze and the Iron II, thus challenging the attribution of Floor 3 finds to the Phoenician colony.

Elise Aurerbach, “Terra Cotta Plaques from the Diyala and Their Archaeological and Cultural Contexts” (Ph.D. diss., University of Chicago, 1994), 23-24. Aurerbach notes that the main image among these early types is the nude female with arms folded on the abdomen. Barrelet (Figurines et reliefs en terre cuite de la Mesopotamie antique 1, 86) originally dated the rise of these plaques to the following Ur III period. Aurerbach argues that the plaque forms originally copied more schematic three-dimensional figurines (ibid., 117-18). She also notes that the nude female remains the most popular image through the Isin-Larsa period (ibid., 207).
second millennium at which time they spread to Syria; their diffusion into Palestine, Egypt, and Jordan is dated to the second half of the second millennium. Of the various subjects represented in Old Babylonian plaques, the nude female becomes the predominant subject in Late Bronze Syria. This style also continues into the Iron Age in Syria, particularly the Iron IIB-C, though a few examples are known from Iron I-IIA.

If the plaque figurines were, in fact, the intended antecedents for the hands-on-breast component, it may also be significant that the design appearing on the plaques is not only known from clay, but also from other artifacts. For example, a number of metal

---


63 Petty, Bronze Age Anthropomorphic Figurines, 40. There has been some discussion about the origin of the female holding her breasts. Glenn E. Markoe (Phoenicians [Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 2000], 25) suggests that the standing nude goddess with hands on her breast is north Syrian in origin, though there are Phoenician depictions of this image. Prüß (Die Amuq-Terrakotten, 128-29) notes that the female with hands on her breasts was already popular in Syrian art from the Middle Bronze Age and earlier, though not in plaque form. He concedes this image may have its distant origins in early Mesopotamian art but claims that it became associated with Syrian art well before the plaque-style was introduced. He does recognize that the technology and style of the plaque reliefs came from Mesopotamia, but he argues that seeking the origin of the naked female symbol (in whatever media) is probably fruitless.

E.g., several unpublished plaque fragments from Tell Rifa’at, housed in the Damascus museum (unknown reg., Case 20) are dated to between 950 and 612. These specimens are all very small with hands separate under the breasts, long hair, and feet pointing forward. In contrast, see Peter R. S. Moorey, “Ancient Near Eastern Terracottas with a Catalogue of the Collection in the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford,” (unpublished, 2001). Moorey claims that, after the Late Bronze, plaque figurines do not become popular again in Syria until the Achaemenid period. This dating seems to be in agreement with (if not influenced by) Poul Jørgen Riis, “The Syrian Astarte Plaques and Their Western Connection,” Ber 9 (1949): 70-77. For more on figurines of the Achaemenid period, see Shin’ichi Nishiyama and Satoru Yoshizawa, “Who Worshipped the Clay Goddess? The Late First Millennium BC Terracotta Figurines from Tell Mastuma, Northwest Syria,” Bulletin of the Ancient Orient Museum 18 (1997): 73-98. Also in disagreement with Moorey, see Prüß (Die Amuq-Terrakotten, 140, Tabelle 12; 150, Tabelle 13; 180, Tabelle 14; 191, Tabelle 15), who lists a number of plaque figurines of females holding their breasts dated throughout the Iron II, with stronger concentrations in the eighth century and forward. Plaque figurines are much less frequent during the Iron I-IIA and are of lesser quality (ibid., 326).
horse frontlets dated to the Iron II are decorated with this type of naked female image.\textsuperscript{65} These can hardly be an allusion to fertility or fecundity, at least related to females exclusively.\textsuperscript{66} Naked females standing \textit{en face} with other gestures also figure prominently on the Iron II ivory frontlets from Nimrud.\textsuperscript{67} Gubel points out that the female head is

\textsuperscript{65} Winter, Irene J. “North Syria as a Bronzeworking Centre in the Early First Millennium B.C.: Luxury Commodities at Home and Abroad.” in \textit{On Art in the Ancient Near East: Volume I: Of the First Millennium B.C.E.} (Culture and History of the Ancient Near East 34.1; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 340, 374, Fig. 2; repr. from \textit{Bronze Working Centres of Western Asia c. 1000-539 B.C.} (ed. John Curtis. London: Kegan Paul International, Ltd., 1988). Winter describes an equestrian frontlet from Tell Tainat. In the bottom register are two females facing forward and cupping their breasts. Neither have wings or the horns of divinity. Regardless, Winter likens them to the nude goddess on the Herald’s Wall at Carchemish who is likewise cupping her breasts but has both wings and the horns of divinity. The Carchemish orthostat is dated to the ninth century, and Winter thus dates the Tainat frontlet to somewhere between the ninth and seventh centuries (ibid, 358). Similar frontlets were found at Samos and Miletus (ibid, 341). On the Samos frontlet, see Walter Burkert, \textit{The Orientalizing Revolution: Near Eastern Influence on Greek Culture in the Early Archaic Age} (trans. Margaret E. Pinder and Walter Burkert; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1992), 16, 18, Fig. 2. The piece consists of three naked females holding their breasts in the top register above one naked female holding the heads of lions and standing on a lion in the bottom register. It also contains a dedication to Kings Hazael of Damascus, dating it to the ninth century. Note that the accompanying inscription mentions Hadad rather than any female deity. It was subsequently rededicated to Hera of Samos in whose sanctuary it was recovered. Burkert also mentions a similar piece associated with the sanctuary of Apollo in Eretria; he dates its rededication to the middle of the eighth century. He also notes gold jewelry and clay molded figurines of the naked female with hands on breasts in the Greek world dating to the eighth through seventh centuries. He believes the influence was transmitted from Syria (ibid., 20). Metal versions of this image are not limited to the Iron Age. Also in metals is a small (ca. 3 cm) molded bronze figurine of a nude female with hands on breasts from Ugarit housed at the Damascus Museum (reg. unknown, Case 8). The figurine features a Hathor wig and the feet face front. According to the museum information it is dated to 1400-1200 B.C.E. Another bronze example from Ugarit (unknown reg.) is housed in the Aleppo Museum. Also very small, the nude figurine has a Canaanite headdress, perhaps a necklace, squared shoulders with hands separately on each breast, and feet pointed forward. For an example of a naked female holding her breasts with a Hathor headdress and horned head covering see Keel and Uehlinger, \textit{ Gods, Goddesses, and Images of God}, 34-35, Fig. 25b. The piece comes from Tell el-Ajul and is dated to the Middle Bronze Age. See also ibid., 36-37, Fig. 27a, 27b for Middle Bronze IIB examples at Megiddo.

\textsuperscript{66} See Chapter 2 for some discussion of the debate over whether the nude female plaques represent goddesses. Examples of scholars who interpret these as goddesses, include Albright, “Astarte Plaques and Figurines,” 114; and Keel and Uehlinger, \textit{ Gods, Goddesses, and Images of God}, 97-103.

often adorned with a *phylacterion* and interprets the entire frontlet to be a *phylacterion* decorated with apotropaic symbols. Finally, the other imagery common on this corpus of blinkers and frontlets appears to support an apotropaic function, such as the *wdjt* eye, the winged scarab, sphinxes, Reshef, and Bes.

Frontal naked females, including some holding their breasts, also appear on cylinder seals from a number of periods where the *en face* position (in contrast with other images in the seals) may indicate a protective or apotropaic function. Though relatively uncommon in the southern Levant, two unprovenienced scaraboid seals with Ammonite inscriptions were published by Avigad. Both show the frontal naked female holding her winged clothed female with horns and sun disk and long tripartite wig and refers to her as “Astarte-Ishtar,” though any association between this image and Astarte in Phoenician religion should be dated to a later period. More common in the Nimrud corpus are the ivory frontlets with a “nude goddess,” e.g., ibid., 129, Fig. 17. In this case the female is frontal and nude with a long tripartite wig, a winged sun over her head, and holds both lotuses and animals in her hands. Another frontlet shows twin nude females with arms along their sides (J. J. Orchard, *Equestrian Bridle Harness Ornaments: Catalogues and Plates: Ivories from Nimrud (1949-1963) Fascicule I, Part 2* [London: British School of Archaeology in Iraq, 1967], 29, number 144, Pl. XXXI).

68 Gubel, “Phoenician and Aramean Bridle-Harness Decorations,” 130. Gubel associates this image with the Late Bronze Egyptian iconography of Qudshu. For more on that point, see below.

69 Ibid., 114-25.

70 Zainab Bahrani, *Women of Babylon: Gender and Representation in Mesopotamia* (London: Routledge, 2001), 88; Zainab Bahrani, “Sex as Symbolic Form: Eroticism and the Body in Mesopotamian Art,” in *Sex and Gender in the Ancient Near East: Proceedings of the 47th Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale, Helsinki, July 2-6, 2001* (ed. Simon Parpola and Robert M. Whiting; Helsinki: The Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project, University of Helsinki, 2002), 56-57. Bahrani draws attention to the fact that the “seductress,” as she calls the fully naked female, never interacts with other anthropomorphic characters on the seals. For the variety of naked females, including those with hands under or on their breasts, from Mesopotamian and Syrian cylinder seals see Pruβ, *Die Amuq-Terrakotten*, 127. Further, Auerbach (“Terra Cotta Plaques from the Diyala,” 208) notes that the adoption of the nude female in seals was preceded by the Akkadian-Old Babylonian plaques. She notes that, when borrowed into seal iconography, the nude female is “almost always a secondary or filler motif.”
breasts; but in both cases, the accompanying inscription proves the seal was owned by a male.\textsuperscript{71} A unique but comparable seal from the Israelite corpus shows a fully naked female with hands down at her sides and four wings; here, too, the inscription shows the seal was owned by a male.\textsuperscript{72} Moreover, Uehlinger has argued that seals may also have functioned as amulets for protection.\textsuperscript{73}

Turning to terracotta figurines, females with hands on their breasts also occur in Iron II Israel, particularly as appliqué on cult stands.\textsuperscript{74} They occasionally appear in early contexts as free-standing pillar figurines or in plaque form, though this gesture is much

\begin{footnotes}
\footnote{71}{Nahman Avigad, “Two Ammonite Seals Depicting the Dea Nutrix,” \textit{BASOR} 230 (1977): 63-66. The inscription of one seal says, “Belonging to Menachem, son of Samak, servant of the King;” and the other says, “Belonging to Bod’el, son of Nadab’el.” Avigad himself comments on the fact that the closest parallels are the Astarte plaques, usually interpreted as charms used by women in sympathetic magic. He admits that cannot possibly be their function here. For further treatment see Ulrich Hübner, “Das ikonographische Repertoire der ammonitischen Siegel und seine Entwicklung,” in \textit{Studies in the Iconography of Northwest Semitic Inscribed Seals: Proceedings of a Symposium Held in Fribourg on April 17-20, 1991} (ed. Benjamin Sass and Christoph Uehlinger; OBO 125; Fribourg: University Press; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993), 142-43. Hübner comments that this motif is relatively rare on northwestern Semitic seals from the Iron II (to which he dates the “Bod’el” seal). He does not consider the other seal to be Ammonite; but Benjamin Sass (“The Pre-Exilic Hebrew Seals: Iconism vs. Aniconism,” in \textit{Studies in the Iconography of Northwest Semitic Inscribed Seals: Proceedings from a Symposium Held in Fribourg on April 17-20, 1991} [ed. Benjamin Sass and Christoph Uehlinger; OBO 125; Fribourg: University Press; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993], 236) thinks that both may be Ammonite.}

\footnote{72}{For the only example of frontal females on a seal from Israel see Sass, “Pre-Exilic Hebrew Seals,” 233, Fig. 142; 236. The female’s arms are down to the sides; and she holds two implements, perhaps plants. It reads \textit{g’l bn š’l}.}

\footnote{73}{Christoph Uehlinger, “Northwest Semitic Inscribed Seals, Iconography and Syro-Palestinian Religions of Iron Age II: Some Afterthoughts and Conclusions,” in \textit{Studies in the Iconography of Northwest Semitic Inscribed Seals: Proceedings of a Symposium Held in Fribourg on April 17-20, 1991} (ed. Benjamin Sass and Christoph Uehlinger; OBO 125; Fribourg: University Press; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993), 273-74. He also notes the significance of the stone used to make the seals and the Mesopotamian connection between certain stones and apotropaic qualities (ibid., 273, n. 62).}

\footnote{74}{Tadmor (“Realism and Convention,” 322, n. 2) claims the most important sites for this type of applied female are from the Jezreel and Beth Shean Valleys, like Megiddo, Ta’anach, Beth Shean, and Tel Rehov. She also claims that women cupping their breasts are also attached to these shrines; women with arms alongside the body seem to be more common.}
\end{footnotes}
less common than other variations, such as women holding a disc, holding children, or with hands at their sides.\textsuperscript{75}

In contrast, the hands-on-breast design is common on Philistine plaque figurines and pillar-style figurines.\textsuperscript{76} Press interprets these as a Philistine adaptation of the Late Bronze plaque motifs.\textsuperscript{77} The popularity of the gesture in Philistia and Judah in the Iron Age betrays a possible southern predilection. As pointed out above, by far the most common type of figurine with hands on breasts from Jordan are the female plaque figurines from Buseirah, also a southern territory.

\textbf{9.3.3 Meaning and function}

\textbf{9.3.3.1 Abbreviation of the naked female}

Complicating a connection between the pillar figurines and the plaque figurines, the JPFs do not replicate the entire naked female image. Ancient Near Eastern art

\textsuperscript{75} For pillar styles, see Kletter, \textit{Judean Pillar-Figurines}, Appendix 5, 5.IV.6.10: hollow body from Tel el-Far‘ah North dated to the eleventh through tenth centuries; 5.IV.6.12: from Ta’anach undated; 5.IV.7.5: a solid body from Beth Shean; 5.IV.7.13: a solid body fragment from Megiddo, unstratified; 5.IV.7.20: a solid body fragment from Samaria, though according to Kletter it may be late; for plaque styles, see ibid., Appendix 5, 5.V.5.4: a plaque fragment from Ta’anach and a second from the same site (5.V.10.26), both undated; 5.V.7.21: from Megiddo dated to Level IVb, ca. 1000 (or 950 with new excavations); 5.V.10.23: a body fragment from Samaria E207.

\textsuperscript{76} Press (“Philistine Figurines,” 156-57) notes the most common style of Iron I handmade figurines have the hands outraised. The gesture also occurs in Iron Age Philistine plaque figurines and pillar figurines (ibid., 233). That being said, a number of other gestures are also depicted on plaque figurines (ibid., 276 Table 4). Note also that the total number of plaque figurines is dwarfed by the composite style with molded head in the Iron IIIB-C (ibid., 280). For figurines holding breasts (in both pillar and plaque form) from Ashkelon see ibid., I.A.3 number 61, Fig. 8.4; I.A.4, number 66, Fig. 9.4. For other Philistine sites, Press notes two Judean-style examples with solid-based figurines holding breasts from Miqne and Safi (ibid., 220). He also notes some hollow bodies with hands holding or supporting the breasts (ibid., 221).

\textsuperscript{77} Ibid., 297.
presents many examples of depictions combining only particular elements of a design, in order to stand for the whole. For example, Egyptian depictions of Hathor frequently borrowed only the head or the head and bust of the image in a type of synecdoche to indicate the meaning of the total image.78 This abbreviated form of the female image combined with other elements, like wings or a sun disc, is also known from Syrian and Phoenician art of the Iron II.79 The extraction of particular symbols of gods and their recombination into fantastical forms is known from Egyptian art as well. Hornung suggests that the recombination of multiple motifs increased the effectiveness of an image.80 Moreover, Niwiński argues that the media of miniatures (here specifically

78 E.g., see Robbins, Art of Ancient Egypt, 175, Fig. 206. This is a facsimile painting from the chapel of Amun-Ra where the bows and sterns of sacred boats consist of the heads of Mut. Accompanying cultic vessels in the painting hold many objects, including a Hathor mask on a pole. See also Thomas Staubli, “Den Namen Setzen”: Namens-und Göttinnenstandarten in der Südlevante während der 18 ägyptischen Dynastie,” in Iconography and Biblical Studies: Proceedings of the Iconography Sessions at the Joint EABS/SBL Conference, 22-26 July 2007, Vienna, Austria (ed. Izaak J. Halster and Rüdiger Schmitt; AOAT 361; Münster: Ugarit, 2009), 93-112; Abb. 3. Consider also at Deir el-Medina, the bust of the deified ancestor invoked the ancestor and received offerings (Robbins, Art of Ancient Egypt, 189-90); Florence D. Friedman, “Aspects of Domestic Life and Religion,” in Pharaoh’s Workers: The Villagers of Deir el Medina (ed. Leonard H. Lesko; Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1994), 111-17.


80 Erik Hornung, “Komposite Gottheiten in der ägyptischen Ikonographie,” in Images as Media: Sources for the Cultural History of the Near East and the Eastern Mediterranean (1st Millennium BCE) (ed. Christoph Uehlinger; OBO 175; Fribourg: University Press; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000), 1-20. Hornung suggests that these symbols may comprise monsters. Even more likely, he argues they are meant, not to comprise a single entity or icon, but to communicate a number of different aspects about a deity simultaneously; or they are symbols combined together to increase magical effectiveness. For more from Egypt see László Kákosy, “Bermerkungen zur Ikonographie der magischen Heilstatuen,” in Images as Media: Sources for the Cultural History of the Near East and the Eastern Mediterranean (1st Millennium BCE) (ed. Christoph Uehlinger; OBO 175; Fribourg: University Press; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000), 1-20.
scarabs and coffins of the Twenty-First Dynasty) requires that images be abbreviated, what he calls the *pars pro toto* rule.\textsuperscript{81} Even a few models of female breasts have been recovered from Deir el-Bahri.\textsuperscript{82}

If, in fact, the hands-on-breast component conveyed the general idea of protection, a durable but schematized version of the symbol would be sufficient to indicate the function. Moreover, if part of the significance of this iconography is that it be recognized as female rather than male, then a schematized rendering of the breasts would be enough to accomplish that task.\textsuperscript{83} Furthermore, if the breasts carry other associations, such as a possible connection with healing (see below), then these elements are more necessary than the pubic triangle or vulva. This does not preclude the possibility that the breasts on the Judean figurines may have been understood differently in Judah than elsewhere; rather, it indicates that the naked female image, including the female holding

\begin{quote}
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\textit{Votive Offerings to Hathor}, 211. Pinch claims the models of female breasts and models of genitals (in separate pieces) were votive offerings. She also notes the presence of pottery decorated with breasts.
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
In her treatment of Mesopotamian votive figurines, Bahrani (\textit{Women of Babylon}, 119) notes the lack of anatomical detail on votive images. Her explanation is that votives meant to represent female worshippers had to contain certain aspects to indicate the “femaleness” of the image and needed no further emphasis.
\end{quote}
her breasts, was used in a number of media by males as well as females and probably invoked protection.

9.3.3.2 The naked female and protection

Undergirding the association between the female holding her breasts and protection (as already suggested by the equestrian objects and seal impressions), this gesture, in either pillar or fully formed variety, is the most common anthropomorphic image applied to the Yavneh cult stands. Although Kletter identifies them as votive objects left in a temple (as yet undiscovered) and used for a number of purposes, he also notes that they depict architectural elements used in the construction of sacred spaces.

Unfortunately, Kletter misses some of the possible implications of his work, including those applying to the hands-on-breast design. He claims the females on the cult stands may represent the consort of the god worshipped in the temple space, depicted because “the god prefers nice, erotic images of his consort, rather than of himself, on his gifts.” Alternatively, many of the images on the cults stands, such as sphinxes, lions,


86 Kletter, “Function of Cult Stands,” 188.
bulls, caprids, and trees, are known in larger media from elsewhere in the ancient Near East, particularly temple and palace architecture (see Chapter 10), where they may function as images of protection and blessing.  

     Admittedly, large scale female images are not represented in most of the coterminous Neo-Assyrian wall reliefs. However, the paucity of large female images during the Neo-Assyrian period does not characterize other periods. In contrast, female images were common motifs on plaque figurines of the Old Babylonian period (see above). They are also occasionally found as parts of temple architecture, for example, a defaced female between two date palms carved in stone blocks from Tell al-Rimah.  

     Finally, female images in monumental architecture, including those holding their breasts,

---

87 Ziffer (“Iconography of the Cult Stands,” 78) argues that the tree is another manifestation of the goddess. In contrast, the sacred tree is a widely attested motif in the ancient Near East, particularly in the Neo-Assyrian period, and is found in combination with a range of characters including the apkallū, the king, bullmen, animals, and so forth. While it may be tied to a sense of fertility or blessing, it cannot be reduced to a singular meaning. For a similar conclusion about tree imagery see Pirhiya Beck (Imagery and Representation: Studies in the Art and Iconography of Ancient Palestine: Collected Articles [Institute of Archaeology, Tel Aviv University, Occasional Publications 3; Tel Aviv: Emery and Claire Yass Publications in Archaeology, Institute of Archaeology, 2002], 402) who points out the image goes back to the third millennium. Further, the tree has been associated with temple iconography in general (ibid., 407, 408 Fig. 14, 409 Fig. 15-16). For an examination of the tree in royal Assyrian iconography see Barbara Nevling Porter, Trees, Kings, and Politic: Studies in Assyrian Iconography (OBO 197; Fribourg: Academic Press; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2003), 11-37.

88 Julia Assante, “The Erotic Reliefs of Ancient Mesopotamia” (Ph.D. diss., Columbia University, 2000), 297. Assante comments on the general suppression of female images, particularly nude females, in Assyria and in Assyrian state art. She also notes the lack of female images on Babylonian state art, even during the Old Babylonian period when females were common on terracotta plaques (ibid., 289-97).

89 Theresa Howard-Carter, “An Interpretation of the Sculptural Decoration of the Second Millennium Temple at Tell al-Rimah,” Iraq 45 (1983): 64-72. The stone blocks were not found in primary context, and Howard-Carter argues they must have been associated with the ante-chamber door. Tellingly, the other carvings included two Humbaba heads and a bullman between date palms, apotropaic images that continue in use into the Neo-Assyrian and Neo-Babylonian periods.
do occur in Iron II Syria.\(^{90}\) Because the female, either fully naked or holding her breasts, was adopted on the cult stands along with other apotropaic characters, the best explanation might be that they serve an apotropaic function, as divine guardian figures.\(^{91}\)

---

\(^{90}\) E.g., the Carchemish orthostat dated to the ninth century (Winter, “North Syria as a Bronzeworking Centre,” 375, Fig. 3).

\(^{91}\) For comparable pieces see Beck (Imagery and Representation, 414) on the Ta’anach cult stands. Beck argues that the stands reflect local adaptation of the art of Phoenicia, Anatolia, and northern Syria, particularly that of the Neo-Hittite tradition. For fully frontal nude females holdings their breasts from the south, see Beck, Imagery and Representation, 185, Fig.1, 2, 3a. Beck proposes a reconstruction of two female fragments on either side of a model shrine façade from which they have become unattached. The females in question are adorned with a simple veil, similar to that found on the plaque figurines from Buseirah (see above). Beck bases this reconstruction on an example from Beirut, though here the hands are on the abdomen. For another interpretation of the Beirut shrine see Keel (Goddesses and Trees, New Moon and Yahweh, 41) who interprets the females as “tree goddesses.” Zevit (Religions of Ancient Israel, 329) claims the shrine dates to the Late Bronze Age, though its provenience is not known. For a more complete example of fully frontal naked females with arms at the sides, see the shrine from Pella (Beck, Imagery and Representation, 209, Fig. 10). For a shrine with several molded females applied to the front of what appears to be a temple façade, see Maeir and Dayagi-Mendels, “Elaborately Decorated Clay Model Shrine,” 111-23; Fig. 1, Fig. 2. This model shrine was retrieved from the antiquities market but has been authenticated. It contains two full size molded females holding drums, as well as seven female protomes from the bust to the head. Two of these appear to be integrated into the capiats of what should be pillar columns. They are stacked on top of the molded females in the place of actual columns. The standing females are flanked by three dimensional lions. Even earlier, from the Late Bronze a fenestrated “shrine house” with human figures reportedly came from the “Southern Temple of Rameses III” at Beth Shean. The human figures are hand-made and the figure considered a female (though breasts are not clearly apparent) holds two birds. The figure has pellet eyes with incised pupils, an incised mouth, and a headdress (Alan Rowe, The Four Canaanite Temples of Beth-Shan Part 1: The Temples and Cult Objects [Publications of the Palestine Section of the University Museum, University of Pennsylvania 2; Philadelphia: University Museum, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1940], 54-55, Pl. XVII: 1; LVIIA:1). A comparable fragment of a female unattached from the shrine was also uncovered (ibid., Pl. XXXV:2). A second shrine house with hand-made human figures was also discovered; the figure interpreted as a female (vulva is visible) is shown seated in the top register and only preserved from the waist down (ibid., Pl. XVII: 2; LVIA:3). A very early example of molded females applied to cultic vessels was found by Woolley at Alalakh in the Middle Bronze temple (Temple VII) (Leonard Wooley, Alalakh: An Account of the Excavations at Tell Atchana in the Hatay, 1937-1949 [Reports of the Research Committee of the Society of Antiquaries of London 18; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1955], 64). Uncovered on the floor of the shrine, the very broken cylindrical cult stand has five naked females holding their breasts and one hand-modeled male “warrior” figurine. Woolley calls the artifact a pot-stand or brazier (ibid., 248; Pl. LVIII: a, b). For a similar opinion, suggesting that molded naked females attached to the front of shrine boxes and cult stands represent guardian figures see Schroer, “Frauenkörper als architektonische Elemente,” 430-38. She likens them to the lamassu and šedu.
The fact that iconographic cult stands and model shrines are found in tenth and ninth century levels in Israel and Philistia, when anthropomorphic free standing figurines are relatively uncommon, suggests that the cult stands served as a bridge between Late Bronze and Iron IIB figurine traditions. Further undergirding this argument, the Yavneh cult stands include figures with a number of other gestures and implements common on plaque figurines, including hands down at the sides, on the lower abdomen, and holding instruments. They are even found superimposed on the heads of animals and along with sacred tree iconography. Thus, they cross an iconographic boundary between plaque figurines and three dimensional figurines. Furthermore, almost every cult stand combines female figurines with zoomorphic images. Whether or not the plaque figurines, including females with hands on their breasts, were originally intended for use as talismans, they appear to have been interpreted that way on the cult stands.

Many of the provenienced cult stands and shrines are associated with actual sacred spaces, further reinforcing the iconographic connection between naked female guardians and sacred space represented on the stands and shrines themselves. Furthermore figurines with some of these gestures are associated with shrine spaces in later contexts. For example, composite style figurines found outside Judah and Philistia


93 For figures with animals, see Kletter and Ziffer, "Catalogue 1," CAT28, 220-21. Pls 9:2; 69; 70:1; CAT29, 221, Pls 47:3; 70:2-3; CAT90, 247-48, Pl. 1:2-3; 40:1-2; 41; 123:3-4; CAT92, 248-49; CAT94, 249-50, Pl. 127:2-3; 128; CAT95, 250-51, Pl. 129-130; for figures with trees, see ibid., CAT15, 216, Pls. 8:2; 37:2-3; 60:1-3; CAT37, 224-25, Pls 11:1; 76-77; 78:1-2; CAT44, 227-28, Pls. 13:1; 84-85; CAT79, 243-44, Pls 20:2; 44:3; 114:3; CAT86, 246, Pl.21:2; 121; CAT90, 247-48, Pl. 1:2-3; 40:1-2; 41; 123:3-4; CAT92, 248, Pl. 23:2; 125:2-3; 126:1-2; CAT94, 249-50, Pl. 127:2-3; 128.
tend to hold implements like musical instruments or offerings like cakes or animals; on others the arms are upraised or are at the sides. These figurines have been recovered in a number of contexts; but they are particularly well represented in shrine contexts, especially in Cyprus and Phoenicia.\footnote{Press, “Philistine Figurines,” 322.} This designation might also tentatively be extended to sites in Jordan, like Deir ‘Alla\footnote{‘Amr, “Study of the Clay Figurines and Zoomorphic Vessels of Trans-Jordan,” 27. Hendricus Jacobus Franken (“Deir ‘Alla, Tell,” OÉANE: 2: 138) notes a shrine complex from the eighth century but also notes a large complex of houses with courtyards. Without further publication it is impossible to know whether the figurines came from the shrine or the houses. Still, of the large number of figure fragments (at least 50 human fragments of varying types and sizes) none clearly show the hands clutching the breasts. Rather the hands are shown below the breasts on the torso (‘Amr., “Study of the Clay Figurines and Zoomorphic Vessels of the Trans-Jordan,” II.A1b.16; II.A2.20; II.A2.22), down to the sides (ibid., II.A2.21; II.C1.41; II.C1.42; II.D4.93), out to the sides (ibid., II.A1b.13/ Kletter, Judean Pillar-Figurines, Appendix 4, 4.III.8), or holding a drum/tambourine (‘Amr, “Study of the Clay Figurines and Zoomorphic Vessels of Trans-Jordan,” II.B2a.33; II.B2a.34; II.B2a.35; II.D4.87), and in one case a woman holding a child (Kletter, Judean Pillar Figurines, Appendix 4, 4.IX.1).} and the Wadi et-Temed shrine.\footnote{Daviau (“New Light on Iron Age Religious Iconography,” 323, Table 3) shows that only 3 fragments from the shrine site have the hands holding the breasts, in comparison with 10 holding a disc, 1 holding bread, 1 with hands on the abdomen, and 4 undesignated. On the context of the shrine figurines, see Michele Daviau, “Ḫirbet el-Mudēyine in its Landscape: Iron Age Towns, Forts, and Shrines,” ZDPV 122 (2006): 24-25.}

In contrast, the Iron IIB-C Judean figurines, whose dominant hand position holds or supports the breasts, are almost never found in public shrine contexts (see Chapter 4 for Kenyon Cave I and Chapter 7 for the difficulty interpreting the Arad sanctuary). Press concludes the same for the Philistine figurines. Thus, in Iron IIB-C various gestures on female figurines become associated with different archaeological contexts; and people
used figurines holding their breasts to protect domestic spaces rather than public shrines
(see below). 97

9.3.3.3 The naked female and healing

One often overlooked function ascribed to the naked female is healing. Female images on stelae and associated with healing were known from New Kingdom Egypt, in particular stelae showing a naked female goddess (Qedeshet) with Resheph, known for his ability to heal and protect from sickness. 98 Further, Waraksa has argued for a

97 This is not to say that figurines with hands on their breasts are never found in shrine spaces or that figurines with other gestures are never found in domestic spaces; but there does seem to be a general trend suggesting figurines with hands on their breasts are predominate in domestic contexts while figurines holding offerings, etc. are predominate in known shrine contexts. Obviously, this reflects the current knowledge of iconographic types and may be subject to alteration with new discoveries and publications.

98 Maciej M. Münnich, “Two Faces of Resheph in Egyptian Sources of the New Kingdom,” in Iconography and Biblical Studies: Proceedings of the Iconography Sessions at the Joint EABS/SBL Conference, 22-26 July 2007, Vienne, Austria. (ed. Izaak J. Hulster and Rüdiger Schmitt; AOAT 361; Münster: Ugarit, 2009), 61-63; Fig. 8 and Fig. 9. The stelae in question show Qudshu/Qedeshet as a naked female standing on the lion or horse with snakes in her hand. Münnich points out that she was originally interpreted as a fertility symbol but that this interpretation does not account for the presence of Resheph. In contrast, he notes that snakes as well as the goddess and Resheph were associated with health and healing. On the various stelae in this group see Izak Cornelius, The Iconography of the Canaanite Gods Reshef and Ba‘al: Late Bronze and Iron Age I Periods (c 1500-1000 BCE) (OBO 140; Fribourg: University Press; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1994), 59-63, RR28-31, Pl. 20-23. Three of these come from Deir el-Medina. Cornelius also claims that Resheph is associated with healing and protection (ibid., 258-60). Elsewhere he notes that scholars have questioned whether the snakes and plants are related to Qudshu/Qedeschet or whether they are related to Min and Resheph. See Cornelius, Many Faces of the Goddess, 49. Cornelius argues they are her attributes. He concludes that Qedeshet is associated with healing power and a good life (ibid., 98). For another type of image combining snakes and females, three cobra figurines with applied pellet breasts were recovered from Late Bronze levels at Beth Shean. See Frances W. James and Patrick E. McGovern, The Late Bronze Egyptian Garrison at Beth Shan: A Study of Levels VII and VIII (2 vols.; University Museum Monograph 85; Philadelphia: University Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, University of Pennsylvania, 1993), 171; Fig. 83:2, 3; Fig. 85:2. The authors point out that cobra figurines are known from Egypt, particularly at el-Amarna, and occur most frequently in residential settings. They admit that varieties with breasts are not known in Egypt and conclude that these represent an amalgamation of the cobra figurines and the female plaque figurines at Beth Shean. If both snakes and breasts were associated with healing, the combination of the two symbols seems ideal.
connection between Egyptian female figurines and healing rituals. Likewise, Teeter points out that symbols of fertility in the Egyptian corpus “were often more general allusions to health and regeneration.”

In a similar sense, anthropoid jars from the Eighteenth Dynasty depict a woman expressing breast milk into a cup. In fact, anthropomorphic vessels of a woman holding one or both of her breasts have been found in Palestine as well, for example at Gezer, which served as a cultural crossroads between Egypt in the Late Bronze Age, Philistia in the Iron I, and Judah in the Iron II. A similar female anthropomorphic vessel was found in a favissa of the Stratum XI temple at Tell Qasile, though the female’s hands are on the torso rather than the breasts. In this case, the nipples are perforated,

99 Waraksa, “Female Figurines from the Mut Precinct.”

100 Teeter, “Piety at Medinet Habu,” 4.

101 James P. Allen, The Art of Medicine in Ancient Egypt (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005), 33, Fig. 27-28.

102 R. A. Stewart Macalister, The Excavations of Gezer 1902-1905 and 1907-1909: Vol. 1 (London: Published for the Committee of the Palestine Exploration Fund by John Murray, 1912), 305-6, Fig. 162. This is an anthropomorphic vessel with small breasts. The hands are separately attached under each breast, and the breasts have incised nipples. The face is pinched with modeled ears, an incised mouth, coffee bean eyes, a headband, necklace, bracelets, and vulva. The base of the vessel consists of two short legs with incised toes. The piece comes from Tomb 7 dated by Macalister to the Fourth Semitic Level. See also R. A. Stewart Macalister, The Excavations of Gezer 1902-1905 and 1907-1909: Vol. 2 (London: Published for the Committee of the Palestine Exploration Fund by J. Murray, 1912), 420, Fig. 505, 421. This piece is a vessel with no legs, two breasts, one hand on the torso, and one under the breast. The head is missing. Macalister suggests it belongs in the Third Semitic period due to its shape; no provenience is listed.


perhaps suggesting use as spouts. Although the vessels from Palestine have sometimes been included in the category *Gravidenflaschen* and interpreted as containers for oil used to prevent stretch-marks and tissue damage in pregnancy, no archaeological or textual evidence verifies this hypothesis.

105 Christian Frevel, “Gifts to the Gods? Votives as Communication Markers in Sanctuaries and Other Places in the Bronze and Iron Ages in Palestine/Israel,” in *Syro-Palestinian Religions and the Hebrew Bible* (ed. Izak Cornelius and Louis Jonker; ADPV 37; Wiesbaden, Germany: Harrassowitz, 2008), 35. Frevel interprets this piece as a libation vessel and as a votive symbolizing the person who performed a fertility rite for a successful pregnancy. Unfortunately, the vessel is not explicitly marked as a pregnant woman. Note, Frevel mistakenly attributes the clay bottle to Stratum XII. Keel and Uehlinger (*Gods, Goddesses, and Images of God*, 106) call this a “medicinal vessel.” Mazar (*Tell Qasile: Part One*, 78-81, Fig. 18, 121) suggests a libation vessel related to fertility, but he also notes the possibility that the vessel may have contained milk. The fact that the vessel may have been used with a funnel found in the same deposit should confirm that it held liquid, but the type of liquid was not tested (Amihai Mazar, *Excavations at Tell Qasile Part Two: The Philistine Sanctuary: Various Finds, The Pottery, Conclusions, Appendixes* [Qedem 20; Jerusalem: the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1985], 79, Fig. 31:12).

106 On this interpretation of several Egyptian anthropomorphic vessels, see Emma Brunner-Traut, “Gravidenflasche: Das Salben des Mutterleibs,” in Archäologie und Altest Testament: Festschrift für Kurt Galling zum 8. Januar 1970 (ed. Arnulf Kuschke and Ernst Kutsch; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, Paul Siebeck, 1970), 35-48. These anthropomorphic vessels are all of alabaster or ivory, their hands are on a distended abdomen (interpreted as pregnancy) or occasionally they hold a horn (interpreted as an oil horn), and the breasts are often missing. When the breasts are represented, they are in low relief and underemphasized.

107 On the application of this theory to several vessels found in Palestine see M. Weippert, “Kanaanäische ‘Gravidenflaschen’: Zur Geschichte einer ägyptischen Gefäßgattung in der asiatischen ‘Provinz,’” *ZDPV* 93 (1977): 268-82. Some of the examples from Palestine in Weippert’s study have one hand on the breast, e.g., a specimen from ez-Zaheriye. He also includes the vessel from Gezer referred to above (ibid., 269. no. 2). Further, he includes an anthropomorphic vessel found in the “Temple of Amenophis III” at Beth Shean, though this vessel does not have breasts nor is the gender necessarily clear. In the original publications, the hands are on the abdomen and appear to clutch a molded and applied circle of clay (Rowe, *Four Canaanite Temples*, Pl. XLVIIA. 1-2). James and McGovern (*The Late Bronze Egyptian Garrison at Beth Shan*, 168; Fig. 79:1) argue that the vessel is male and that it clutches the remains of a broken spout, meant to represent the penis; thus they disagree with Weippert in identifying it as one of the *Gravidenflaschen*. Another example comes from Tell el-Far‘ah South, though it does not include a head. The arms are down to the sides and the vessel has two applied breasts (Keel and Uehlinger, *Gods, Goddesses, and Images of God*, 106-7, Fig. 127b). Weippert also includes the example from Tel Qasile (Weippert, “Kanaänäische ‘Gravidenflaschen,’” 272, no. 6), although, as in the case of Beth Shean, the excavation report disagrees (Mazar, *Tell Qasile: Part One*, 80). For a helpful summary of the issue, see Urs Winter, *Frau und Göttin: Exegetische und ikonographische Studien zum weiblichen Gottesbild im alten Israel und in dessen Umwelt* (Fribourg: Universitätssverlag Fribourg Schweiz; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1983), 372-74. Winter (ibid., 373-74) and Weippert (“Kanaänäische Gravidenflaschen,” 275-79) both acknowledge that the Palestinian vessels have a much wider range of gestures than the Egyptian examples in Brunner-Traut’s.
Another explanation for these anthropomorphic vessels is that they either held milk for healing rituals or that the liquid in the vessel was imbued with the healing properties associated with the female form of the vessel. Supporting this conclusion are the often overlooked texts attributing medicinal properties to breast milk. Allen notes that in Egyptian literature breast milk was “also included in medical prescriptions for head colds, burns, rashes, and fever in adults as well as infants.”

Robbins also notes the use of mother’s milk in Egyptian medical prescriptions. In the Hebrew Bible even animal milk is a symbol of abundance, being highly valued for its associations with health and prosperity.

In the realm of Ugaritic mythology, KTU 1.16-5.25-30, an excerpt from the Kirtu Epic, describes El “pinching off some clay” and forming the healing goddess, “Shatiqatu.” As pointed out in Chapter 2, El does not associate the task with any of the major deities but rather with a generally unknown third-tier goddess and her female study but seem to interpret this as localized adaptation. The fact that some of these vessels are not clearly depicted as pregnant is largely overlooked.

Allen, *The Art of Medicine in Ancient Egypt*, 34.


E.g., the “land flowing with milk and honey” theme broadly repeated in the Pentateuch. In Num 16:13 even Egypt is referred to as a land flowing with milk and honey; and in verse 14 the promise of such a land in Canaan is compared with the inheritance of fields and vineyards. In Deut 6:3 the land flowing with milk and honey is combined with the promise that “it will go well” with Israel and that she will “multiply greatly.” In Deut 11:9 the text speaks about prolonging their days in this land. Deut 31:20 refers to the Israelites eating and becoming satisfied in the land flowing with milk and honey. Milk is considered an honorable gift for guests as well (Gen 18:8; Judg 5:25) and a drink fit for royalty (Isa 60:16).

image. Moreover, this goddess does not appear in any other Ugaritic literature, suggesting two possibilities. She may have been a lower-level goddess who was not normally mentioned. Alternatively, the name may simply reflect the meaning of the root 'tg, referring to the image’s function as one who “causes to pass away” the illness. If this is the case, the text does not refer to a set iconographic image with particular attributes but to the act of making a divine female clay image to deal with Kirtu’s sickness. According to 6.2-14, Shatiqatu enters Kirtu’s house, driving away illness before her through charms. Furthermore, she wipes away his sweat and “opens his throat” so he can eat, interpreted by some as an allusion to nursing. In the end, the “goddess” acts as an intermediary in some type of healing ritual; and the healing is attributed not to Shatiqatu but to El. In sum, traditions connecting females, breasts, healing, and protection were widely known in Syria, Egypt, and Palestine from the Late Bronze Age through the Iron II and seem to form the backdrop for the Judean figurines.

112 Lowell K. Handy, Among the Host of Heaven: The Syro-Palestinian Pantheon as Bureaucracy (Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1994), 140, 144.

113 Handy (ibid., 139, n. 29) considers the name a šin stem from the root ‘tg. See Ludwig Kohler and Walter Baumgartner (The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament [ed. and transl. M. E. J. Richardson; 2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1995], 904) for עתק. They also suggest the name of the goddess may be a safel meaning “she who removes, causes to go past.” Furthermore, Baruch A. Levine and Jean Michel de Terragon (“Shapshu Cries out in Heaven’: Dealing with Snake-Bites at Ugarit (KTU 1.100, 1.107),” RB 95 [1988]: 481-518) argue that healing rituals at Ugarit usually involve major deities as well as human or semi-divine intermediaries.

114 Hennie J. Marsman, Women in Ugarit and Israel: their Social and Religious Position in the Context of the Ancient Near East (Oudtestamentische Studiën 49; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 423. Unfortunately, Marsman does not discuss this interpretation but seems to believe it is an obvious point based upon the text.

115 Handy, Among the Host of Heaven, 144.
9.4 Molded heads

9.4.1 Stylistic considerations

From the perspective of durability and detail, the heads are the most developed aspects of the figurines. The detail is especially emphasized in the molded figurines by two production steps—the molding of the face in clay and its subsequent painting. Furthermore, the significance of two dominant styles—molded and pinched heads, with various sub-styles, is often overlooked. At most, interpreters may refer to the hand-pinched style as “bird-head” figurines and suppose that the style reflects some discomfort with anthropomorphic representations (see Chapter 2).

The molded-head figurines represent a specific use of technological style and design elements. First, the use of molds indicates a general agreement among artisans about the important aspects of the figurine head.\(^{116}\) Second, the head is clearly the most detailed and well-preserved aspect of the figurine. Third, molding would have required some reinforcement by hand, thus still suggesting a significant investment of time and energy on the part of the artisan. Fourth, it had to be prepared separately and attached to the clay body secondarily, requiring a further production step.

As stated above, despite the variations in molded faces, the consistent features include open, forward-staring eyes, eyebrows, noses, and closed lips in a slight smile.

\(^{116}\) Petty (Bronze Age Anthropomorphic Figurines, 38) is discussing Late Bronze frontal molds. See also Julia Assante, “Style and Replication in ‘Old Babylonian’ Terracotta Plaques,” 1-29. Assante discusses Old Babylonian plaques and molded standardization. She argues that the standardization process creates designs that are authorless. Thus the images do not derive their authority by referring to a prototype from another medium, such as sculpture, but from their “authorlessness.” As such, the act of molding represents a general social acceptance of the icon itself, its repeatability; this is integral to the meaning of the image.
When paint is preserved on molded heads it is usually red; but sometimes black or yellow paint appears on the hair, neck, or face. The current state of preservation for the Jerusalem figurines does not indicate that the molded features were outlined with different colors of paint, though it is possible the hair may have been painted a different color than the face. The significance of the red paint on the face remains a mystery. For Egyptian figurines, Waraksa has argued that red is the color associated with magico-medical rituals and even execration. Some textual evidence suggests that red may be associated with protection and aversion in Israel as well.

---

117 For figurines with red paint on the head, see Gilbert-Peretz, “Ceramic Figurines,” D1/12507, E1/9329, E1/10143, G/5723, G/2320, E1/5954, E1/19035, G/4471, D2/20652, E1/3065, G/5631; Holland, “Typological and Archaeological Study of Human and Animal Representations,” A.III.c.4, A.VI.a.2, A.VI.e.2, A.VIII.b.1. For other colors on the heads, see ibid., A.III.d.7, which has black paint on the hair and red on the face, Gilbert-Peretz, “Ceramic Figurines,” E1/856, with red paint on the face and yellow on the neck, and ibid., E1/6268, with red and yellow paint on the head.

118 An example of a molded head with eyes painted black comes from Tell en Nasbeh; see Holland, “Typological and Archaeological Study of Human and Animal Representations,” A.II.c.11/Kletter, Judean Pillar-Figurines, Appendix 2, 148.B.2.A. Kletter says red paint was on the face and black paint was on the eyes.

119 Waraksa ("Female Figurines from the Mut Precinct," 119-31) argues that the female figurines from the Mut precinct were intentionally broken. As is stated elsewhere, evidence for intentional breakage among the Judean figurines is lacking. However, a close connection between the color red and malevolent forces in Egyptian spell literature may suggest that, if red were conceived a similar way in Judah, an element of sympathetic magic may have entered into figurine function.

120 In the Hebrew Bible, ram’s skins dyed red (דַּם) are used to construct the tabernacle (Exod 25:5; 26:14; 35:7, 23; 36:19). In this case the color may be associated with protection. Scarlet (םִּינֵּנ) is also used, possibly for protection, in childbirth (Gen 38:28, 30); and it is the color of the cord Rahab uses to indicate the location of her and her family that they might be spared (Josh 2:18, 21). Red (םִּינֵּנ) is also involved in the ritual of the red heifer (Num19:1-10) in which rituals of aversion are paramount, although Athalya Brenner (Colour Terms in the Old Testament [JSOTSupp21; Sheffield: Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Press, 1982], 64-65) suggests the heifer may have been brown. Along similar lines, scarlet (םִּינֵּנ) thread is used in rituals of transference and aversion in Leviticus, particularly for the purification from skin disease (Lev 14:4, 6, 49, 51, 52). Scarlet and red are interchangeable, as scarlet (םִּינֵּנ) is also used to describe materials in the tabernacle, referred to as “red” in Exodus. (Num 4:8). Further, in the red heifer ritual, scarlet cloth (םִּינֵּנ) is burnt with the heifer (Num 19:6). This is not to say that red and scarlet were not used to evoke other images, such as beauty, prosperity, or blood, but that in some ritual contexts
The predominant style of molded head in Judah is quite distinct from molded heads found in neighboring areas. The molded heads from Judah prefer the short wig style, most common from Old Kingdom Egypt. It was revived in the archaizing features of Iron IIB art, particularly that of Phoenicia and Syria. Of interest is the fact that the wig style is not common on the Iron Age plaque figurines from Syria. Rather, many of

121 The Old Kingdom wig style is short, ending at the chin, and often covers the ears. The return of this style in the ninth through sixth centuries is a side effect of the archaizing features of Egyptian art in the Third Intermediate and Late periods (Kathryn A. Bard, *An Introduction to the Archaeology of Ancient Egypt* [Malden, Mass.: Blackwell, 2008], 270; Robbins, *Art of Ancient Egypt*, 209, 210, 212-13). In Egyptian convention the more typical means of depicting female hair is with a tripartite wig or with an enveloping wig; both reach at least to the shoulders (Robbins, *Women in Ancient Egypt*, 184-85). As for Phoenician art, Markoe (*Phoenicians*, 145) notes that waxing and waning Egyptian influence correlates with Egypt’s political power. Thus, Egyptian influence in Phoenician art peaked in the eighth through sixth centuries (after a long lacuna) during the Twenty-Second Dynasty. Eric Gubel (“Multicultural and Multimedial Aspects of Early Phoenician Art, c. 1200-675 BCE,” in *Images as Media: Sources for the Cultural History of the Near East and the Eastern Mediterranean (1st Millennium BCE)* [ed. Christoph Uehlinger; OBO 175; Fribourg: University Press; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000], 210) pushes that date back further, and suggests that increased Egyptian interactions with the Lebanese coast during the Iron I inaugurated an era of renewed Egyptian influence. He also notes Sheshonq’s successful campaigns into Palestine. For the stylistic differences between Syrian and Phoenician depictions of Egyptian motives see Irene J. Winter, “Phoenician and North Syrian Ivory Carving in Historical Context: Questions of Style and Distribution,” in *On Art in the Ancient Near East: Volume I: Of the First Millennium B.C.E.* (Culture and History of the Ancient Near East 34.1; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 187-224; repr. from *Iraq* 38 (1876): 1-22. Winter distinguishes between a Phoenician and a north Syrian style in regards to ivories. Both are Egyptianizing; but the Syrian style has larger images, *en face* images, and is rougher than Phoenician craftsmanship. This makes the Judean style more similar to Syrian molds, ivories, and seals that those of Phoenicia. At the same time, Winter claims that the north Syrian luxury goods cease around the end of the eighth century, which would limit the amount of influence exerted on Jerusalemite art. In some contrast with Winter, however, some of the ivories from Til Barsip (in north Syrian style) were probably in circulation through 600 B.C.E. according to the excavators, though the construction of the ivories may date to the eighth century; the main period of their use should be prior to the second half of the seventh century. See Guy Bunnens, “Carved Ivories from Tel Barsib,” *AJA* 101 (1997): 438.

122 Pruß (*Die Amuq-Terrakotten*, 143) notes the commonality of the hairband in Syria, which he interprets as a typical component of north Syrian style across a number of genres beginning as early as the second
the examples of such wigs (though not all) are known from supernatural creatures (such as sphinxes) on seals, ivories and metal reliefs. In Phoenicia as well, the short wig is common on seals and is worn by both sphinxes and high-status humans, like the king. The strong iconographic connection between the figurine faces and seals is not necessarily coincidental. Gubel points out that it was primarily through the mass production and distribution of Phoenician seals that the Aramaeans, Ammonites, Moabites, and Israelites adopted Egyptianizing trends in their local art in this period.

This style of wig is seen on divine figures from seals found in Israel and Judah.

millennium. Neither is this short wig a typical component on Phoenician figurines as it is on seals, ivories, and metalwork.

123 Many of these occur on seals. In regards to seals, Markoe (Phoenicians, 154) notes that Phoenician seal carving of the eighth through sixth centuries focused on Egyptian religious and magical themes, particular those associated with regeneration and protection. He also notes the close relationship between motifs on the seals and those on the Phoenician metal bowls and ivories, suggesting the repetition of the same motifs across multiple media.

124 Gubel, “Iconography of Inscribed Phoenician Glyptic,” 101-29. This begins already by the end of the ninth century (ibid., 106; Figs. 10-11). Both examples are males holding scepters. More examples come from a group of seals dated from the seventh through fifth centuries (ibid., Fig. 41, 43-54). In these examples the wig tends to cover the ears. With the exception of Fig. 41, where the wig is on the head of a sphinx throne upon which a deity is seated (note that deity is not wearing the wig but a tall hat with flap or sidelock), the rest are interpreted as the king (most wear the Egyptian double-crown). Further, the wig style appears on Phoenician inspired seals depicting a winged male, e.g., (ibid, 125, Fig. 64, 69).

125 Gubel, “Multicultural and Multimedial Aspects of Early Phoenician Art,” 199. Elsewhere Gubel (“Iconography of Inscribed Phoenician Glyptic,” 107) notes the “intimate links” between the work of ivory carvers and seal cutters, as well as metal workers.

126 Sass, “Pre-Exilic Hebrew Seals,” 210-11. Fig. 62, 63. The anthropomorphic figure on Fig. 62 is kneeling on one knee on a lotus flower and is flanked by two falcon headed deities. The hands are raised forward and are bent at the elbow, and the winged sun-disk is above his head. Sass (ibid., 228) likens the figure to Horus, suggesting it is in fact a divine representation. The second seal, Fig. 63, is a human head and torso with two wings, a scorpion tale, and a winged sun-disk.
In comparison with representations of human female hair, such as those on the Lachish relief,\textsuperscript{127} it is doubtful that the hairstyle was intended to depict actual human fashion from the Iron IIB-C\textsuperscript{128} and possible that it was used to depict beings that serve and protect, as indicated by its occurrence in seals (see above). Even where it occurs on humans, for example on the Til Barsip ivories, it appears on musicians and servants, probably components of a feast preparation scene.\textsuperscript{129} The wig appearing on ambiguous attendants serving gods (sphinxes) and on those serving the royal house or the temple (servants)\textsuperscript{130} suggests an overlapping reference to servants and intermediaries.\textsuperscript{131}

\textsuperscript{127} Paul Collins, \textit{Assyrian Palace Sculptures} (Austin, Tex.: University of Texas Press in cooperation with the British Museum Press, 2008), 90. Women appear with long veils reaching down their back.

\textsuperscript{128} Viewing ancient art as if it depicts reality, as does a photograph, is badly misleading. Perhaps only in the palace reliefs of the Assyrian kings does realism begin to play a larger role in artistic representation (see Chapter 10). As Gay Robbins points out (\textit{Proportion and Style in Ancient Egyptian Art} [Austin, Tex.: University of Texas, 1994], 21), “[Egyptian] [a]rtists were not reproducing the world as they saw it but were interpreting it as a series of concepts. This means that they produced images that had no direct relationship with reality but were constructed according to known conventions in order to convey desired information to the observer.”

\textsuperscript{129} E.g., a round female head facing forward with short wig that lines the sides of the face (Bunnens, “Carved Ivories from Tel Barsib,” 438-39, Fig. 3) and a human head in profile with short Egyptian wig falling behind the ears and a possible headaddress (ibid., 439, Fig. 4). The genders of these pieces are ambiguous, though in Old Kingdom wigs the hair of females is often divided down the middle of the head and combed to either side, as is the case in Fig. 3. The excavator suggests this piece may have belonged to a nude female and is in the style of other north Syrian ivories, like those from Nimrud. In the case of Fig. 4, it may have belonged to a sphinx, as is represented on a number of ivories in this period. The excavator suggests it is in Phoenician style, which has a stricter Egyptianizing feel. Note tha the same short wig with ears visible (as in Fig. 4) occurs on another piece depicting musicians and male figures carrying food, probably in preparation for a feast (plaque is broken); this piece is more similar in style and execution to the Nimrud corpus than to Phoenician ivories (ibid., 441-42, Fig. 6).

\textsuperscript{130} See also Gubel (“Multicultural and Multimedial Aspects of Early Phoenician Art,” 209, Fig. 27) for two ivory plaques from Nimrud where the worshippers, who are supporting a ram-headed sphinx, are wearing the short wig.

\textsuperscript{131} Handy, \textit{Among the Host of Heaven}, 162-63.
Furthermore, the molded heads could have copied the Hathor wig of previous plaque figurines, had that been desired. Thus, the fact that the wig design in Judah is primarily an ambiguous style worn by human or divine intermediaries (rather than a recognizable major goddess) is not simply incidental. The preference for this style of wig may further argue that the molded head design entered Judah through Syria or Phoenicia/northern Israel, rather than being a direct copy of Egyptian iconography or Late Bronze plaque figurines from the south.

9.4.2 Comparanda

JPFs from the Shephelah and the Negev dated to the ninth century are some of the oldest known examples. As stated above, most of the composite style figurines (molded head on a wheel-made or hand-made body) from Philistia date to the seventh century,

132 For examples of Late Bronze plaque figurines with Hathor wigs as well as those with other types of headdresses see Izak Cornelius, “The Headgear and Hairstyles of Pre-Persian Palestinian Female Plaque Figurines,” in Bilder als Quellen/Images as Sources: Studies on Ancient Near Eastern Artifacts and the Bible Inspired by the Work of Othmar Keel (ed. Susanne Bickel, Silvia Schroer, Renee Schurte, and Christoph Uehlinger; OBO Special Volume; Fribourg: Academic Press; Göttingen: Vandenhoek & Ruprecht, 2007), 241-49. Most of his examples have the arms down at the sides or holding objects. Prüß (Die Amuq-Terrakotten, 129) contrasts the Iron Age plaques from the Syrian interior with the Late Bronze plaques from the coastal region and Egypt that use the Hathor headdress. Even in Kletter (Judean Pillar-Figurines, Appendix 5, 5.V.2.1-33 and 5.V.3.1-7), the majority of datable examples of plaque figurines with the Hathor headdress fall into the Late Bronze Age and Iron I; the vast majority come from Gezer.

133 Tallay Ornan, “A Complex System of Religious Symbols: The Case of the Winged Disc in Near Eastern Imagery of the First Millennium BCE,” in Crafts and Images in Contact: Studies in Eastern Mediterranean Art of the First Millennium BCE (ed. Claudia E. Suter and Christoph Uehlinger; OBO 210; Fribourg: Academic Press; Göttingen: Vandenhoek & Ruprecht, 2005), 232-34. Ornan makes a similar argument for the winged disc on lmlk impressions, claiming that the cultural milieu of eighth century Syria and Mesopotamia provides a more historically plausible background for the seals’ incorporation into the storage jars. Glenn E. Markoe (“The Emergence of Phoenician Art,” BASOR 279 [1990]: 16-23) argues that Egyptianizing influence waned after the fourteenth century and until the eighth century. During this time Aegean/ North Syrian influence was stronger in Phoenician and Levantine art.
though it is assumed the style began in the eighth century. The Cypriote corpus dates to the seventh and sixth centuries. Molded heads are not known at most sites in Syria, and the few examples that do exist are dated to the eighth and seventh centuries.\footnote{Pruß, \textit{Die Amuq-Terrakotten}, 228.}

Furthermore, Pruß suggests that these few heads must be imports from the southern Levant.\footnote{Ibid., 227, 230.} According to Moorey, the earliest molded heads on pillar-style bodies in Syria come from Tell Rifa’at in the seventh century.\footnote{On the Rifa’at figurine see Pruß, \textit{Die Amuq-Terrakotten}, 227, though he does not give a date. He claims it is similar in style to his number 295, Taf. 35 from Tell Judaidah, dated from 900-800/750; he notes this is much earlier than the other examples and probably comes from the eighth or seventh centuries (ibid., 228). On the Rifa’at figurines see Nea Nováková, \textit{Terres cuites de Tell Erfad} (Prague: Musée Náprstek, 1971), 149–53, Pl. 37; for a comparable example from Tell Afis see P. D’Amore, “La coroplastica di Tell Afis,” in \textit{Tell Afis et l’Ètà de Ferro} (ed. Stefania Mazzoni; Seminari di Orientalistica 2. Pisa: Giardini Editori e Stampatori in Pisa, 1998), 416–17, Fig. 1:1.}

As suggested above, they do occur in the Transjordan but are overshadowed by fully molded female plaque figurines. They are totally unknown from Egypt. The Phoenician figurines are still difficult to date at the present time, though even the earliest examples date to the first half of the eighth century (and these only poorly reported). Outside of Judah, molded heads do occur in earlier contexts in northern Israel and on the coast.\footnote{Beck (\textit{Imagery and Representation}, 210-15) argues for a continuum between Phoenician and north Israelite art. She also criticizes the view that art with Egyptianizing motifs must come from Phoenician artisans. She points to northern Israel as another possible center of production.} As was argued, they appear to arise early in the material record of the north, including contexts dated to the Iron I, Iron IIA, and early Iron IIB.
One of the Yavneh stands also suggests the molded heads come from a northern tradition. The Yavneh favissa, dated to the end of the ninth and beginning of the eighth centuries, contained one shrine (CAT6) with molded features out of 119 shrine items. Ziffer claims that the use of molded heads must have only just begun at the site in this time.\textsuperscript{138} One of the most interesting things about CAT62 is that it was one of the few stands not produced from local clay. Although the exact provenience for the clay was not identified, it may have been imported from somewhere on the northern Levantine coast, perhaps north of Akko.\textsuperscript{139} Thus, this evidence may show that the molded heads entered into Philistine iconography from the north.

\textsuperscript{138} Ziffer, “Iconography of the Cult Stands,” 66. The shrine in question is CAT62 (Kletter and Ziffer, “Catalogue 1,” 237-38, Pl. 19:1; 106:3-5; 107:1). Although the figures are very worn, the molded heads appear to have “three to four long tresses of hair.” The heads are attached to very schematic bodies, without legs, arms, or breasts. Thus, it is unclear if these figures are intended to represent humans. Another possibility would be sphinxes such as the sphinxes on the model shrine from Megiddo, with molded heads on elongated applied bodies (Beck, \textit{Imagery and Representation}, 169). For the handmade variety of female sphinxes on a shrine box/cult stand, dated to the late ninth-early eighth centuries, see Kletter and Ziffer, “Catalogue 1,” CAT50, 231, Pls. 15:1; 40:3; 91:2; 92:1-2; for sphinxes of indeterminate genders, see ibid., CAT51, 231, Pls. 15:2; 92:3; 93:1-3. Note all of these examples of sphinxes are depicted without wings, though wings are more common on guardian sphinxes in ivory and stone. For sphinxes with wings on a similar cult stand see Beck, \textit{Imagery and Representation}, 169. The fact that wings appear in some cases and not others suggests that they are not requisite in guardian/apotropaic imagery. Thus, the lack of wings on female iconography is not necessarily indicative.

9.4.3 Meaning and function

The attention given to the molded head may relate to the function of the image. More specifically, if the molded head style arose in a Phoenician-north Israelite milieu, the protome tradition may be of note. The molded faces on the pillar figurines may be masks; or, if they are not actual masks, they may share the same ritual focus on facial features that is represented in the protomes. This interpretation may be undergirded by the red paint that survives on many JPF faces. It does not cover the entire body, as might be the case if the paint simply represented skin.

Protomes occur in Late Bronze and Iron I contexts in Philistia, at sites like Tel Qasile and Ashdod. Ben-Shlomo suggests they may be linked to Phoenician culture. Masks have also been uncovered in northern Israel at Hazor and Beth Shean and in the Shephelah at Gezer. Moreover, the Phoenician protomes may have been inspired by

140 William Paul Andersen, 

141 Mazar, Tell Qasile: Part One, 84-6, Fig. 21-22; Moshe Dothan and David Ben-Shlomo, Ashdod 6: The Excavations of Areas H and K (1968-1969): With Contributions by Donald T. Ariel, Esti Dueitch, Amir Golani, Othmar Keel, Edward F. Maher, Zinovi Matskevich, Amihai Mazar, Henk K. Mienis, and Stefan Münger (IAA Reports 24. Jerusalem: Israel Antiquities Authority, 2005), 199-200, Fig. 3.87.

142 David Ben-Shlomo, Philistine Iconography: A Wealth of Style and Symbolism (OBO 241; Fribourg: Acaemic Press; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2010), 79.

143 Yigael Yadin et. al., Hazor 1: An Account of the First Season of Excavations, 1955 (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1958), Pl. CLXIII; Pl. LX:10. Unfortunately the piece was found in a cistern (Locus 9024) in a 1.0 m thick
Late Bronze Age Canaanite tradition. According to Brown, female protomes consist of “busts or heads with necks, sometimes hollowed out in the back, without eye or mouth holes.” They are often either wheel-made or impressed in molds. Female masks (with eye holes) are also known. Human masks also come from the Jerusalem corpus, where the most securely dated example is from the eleventh century.

level dated to the Late Bronze II (ibid., 128). The overall form is wheel-made with incised and modeled features (ibid., 138). The face has round eye holes but no beard, making it difficult to identify any possible gender. See also Yigael Yadin et. al., *Hazor 2: An Account of the Second Season of Excavation, 1956* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1960), Pl. CLXXXIII. This cultic mask has similar features, though the eyes are almond-shaped. It was also hand-made rather than wheel-made and has modeled features rather than incised features (ibid., 115). It was found near the remains of two potter’s stone wheels in an installation referred to as a pottery workshop (ibid., 101-2). It is also dated to the Late Bronze II; for Beth Shean, see Rowe, *Four Canaanite Temples*, Pls. XXI:18; LXIVA:3, 4. Note that this piece comes from the “Late Ramesside level,” dated to the end of Rameses III, and the “Philistine Era,” including a wide span of time from ca. 1167-302 B.C.E. (ibid., ix). For another mask see James and McGovern, *The Late Bronze Egyptian Garrison at Beth Shan*, 168; Fig. 79:2. This mask fragment (forehead only) was found in a portico of the Late Bronze temple Level VIII (previously dated to the reign of Amenhotep III). They argue the piece is handmade; see also Macalister, *The Excavations of Gezer: Vol 2*, 233, Fig. 383, 234. All that remains are the circular eye holes, the nose, and a ridge above the eyes representing the brow or eyebrows. Macalister dates the piece to the Second Semitic level.

Markoe (“Emergence of Phoenician Art,” 14-16) summarizes this position. He complicates matters by claiming that while the Late Bronze Canaanite tradition should be considered the background for the general practice, second millennium Cyprus may have been the inspiration for the particular form. See also Culican, “Some Phoenician Masks and Other Terracottas,” 65. He claims Phoenician and Cypriote masks have “Canaanite” forbears, referring to masks from Hazor, Beth Shean, and Gezer (see previous). For the same opinion, see Mazar, *Tell Qasile: Part One*, 84.

Brown, “Perspectives of Phoenician Art,” 18-19. The female masks and protomes are not depicted in the grotesque style as are some male masks. They often have an Egyptianizing headdress, eyebrow, almond eyes, nose, and lips. Unfortunately, all of the examples included on page 19 are slightly later and from western sites.

For two Phoenician examples from Akhziv found in Tomb 29, see Culican, “Some Phoenician Masks and Other Terracottas,” Fig. 13. These examples actually have eye holes. The masks have almond-shaped eyes, eyebrows, noses, and slightly smiling mouths. In at least one of the masks the ears are shown. Both have a wig proceeding down the neck. Another example with eye holes also comes from Akhziv (ibid., Fig. 16). See also Culican, ibid., Fig 14. This piece without eye holes is from a tomb group at Sarafand. Culican dates it to ca. 600 B.C.E. Another un-photographed female protome comes from the American University
Phoenician protomes and masks are well represented in graves, while the Palestinian masks and protomes often occur in temples and could easily fall into the realm of apotropaic objects.\textsuperscript{148} Because the molded heads on northern figurines are most frequently found on figurines holding instruments, objects, with hands to the side, or hands on the abdomen, these may reinforce an association between masks worn in shrine rituals and figurines depicted in gestures associated with shrine rituals.

Furthermore, molded heads and busts without bodies are sometimes attached to shrine boxes. Although the object is not provenanced, such a shrine box from a private collection is decorated in the front with several molded females, two of which are fully molded and are holding drums. Seven are represented by the upper torso and head. The authors date the piece to the early Iron II and cautiously argue for a provenience (based on stylistic criteria) to northern Israel or northern Transjordan.\textsuperscript{149} Schroer interprets these

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{147} Gilbert-Peretz, “Ceramic Figurines,” E1/10325, dated to Stratum 10 (625-586 BCE) in a foundation trench of the Ashlar House in Area E West; ibid., E1/14470 from Stratum 15 (eleventh century) found on the floor of a two-room structure cut by a foundation trench from the later Ashlar House.

\textsuperscript{148} Culican (“Some Phoenician Masks and Other Terracottas,” 67) points out that the “Canaanite” masks are found in shrines. Brown (“Perspectives of Phoenician Art,” 20) notes that masks and protomes are uncommon in settlements but are better represented in graves and temples. They are smaller than life-size masks, and were probably not worn. Their function is still debated, but one option is apotropaic. For a summary of temple find spots for the masks see Mazar, \textit{Tell Qasile: Part One}, 84. Mazar also notes that the masks may have been apotropaic (ibid., 85).

\textsuperscript{149} Maeir and Dayagi-Mendels, “Elaborately Decorated Clay Model Shrine,” 119-20.
\end{flushright}
types of females on shrine boxes (including this particular piece) as guardian figures.\textsuperscript{150} Another shrine box recovered somewhere in the vicinity of Mount Nebo also has two female upper bodies molded into the metope above the door.\textsuperscript{151}

The technological shift from producing molds for the entire female body to producing molds only for the head is more difficult to trace. Returning to the model shrine from the Moussaieff collection, the authors conclude that the large fully molded females were made from a different mold than the smaller protomes.\textsuperscript{152} Thus, it is possible that the artisan possessed a mold that only reproduced the head and bust of the female. It would be a small step from this type of representation to molds that produce the face alone.

Thus, on model shrines a reduced image of the fully molded female, or a protome, could be used in combination with or in place of the full female. Reducing the female to

\textsuperscript{150} Schroer, “Frauenkörper als architektonische Elemente,” 437-38.

\textsuperscript{151} Keel and Uehlinger, Gods, Goddesses, and Images of God, 163. They date the piece to the ninth or eighth centuries, though this date must be based on the iconography since the provenience is unknown. For a picture of the shrine see Zevit, Religions of Ancient Israel, 331-32, Fig. 4.14. Zevit says that the shrine was found with an assemblage, including two perforated tripod cups, a horse figurine, miniature vessels, and lion figurines that were probably fragments of another shrine box. Upon further examination, the only evidence that these objects were found as an assemblage is the word of the antiquities dealer from Jerusalem who sold the objects to Saul Weinberg. They are currently housed in the Museum of Art and Archaeology at the University of Missouri-Columbia. Photographs and drawings furnished by the museum show that the two females have arms beside the body; their arms may come to rest on the abdomen, though the image cuts off prior to that point. The faces have a long tripartite wig with twisted vertical locks alongside the face, running behind the ears. The molded faces show the eyes, eyebrows, nose, and lips; and a long pendant lies between the breasts. The figures seem to have been molded separately (from the same mold) and then attached to a niche inside the metope. They flank what may be simple capitols, topping the pillars lining the shrine’s door. The rest of the piece is whitewashed and painted in black and red geometric designs. On the figurines, remains of black paint are visible in the photographs, particularly on the hair.

\textsuperscript{152} Maeir and Dayagi-Mendels, “Elaborately Decorated Clay Model Shrine,” 113-14.
her head alone is known from other media as well, for example the Hathor heads with wings from Syria. These may appear hovering above a full female image or may replace a full female image. When considered in combination with the masks and protomes, a protective or apotropaic association seems likely.

9.5 Handmade heads

9.5.1 Stylistic considerations

The hand-pinched heads were created in tandem with the bodies and are more schematic. Where paint has been preserved on these heads, it may have been used to indicate the eyes and some facial features, though this is still more ephemeral than the molded designs, which were also painted. When paint is preserved on the simple heads, it is usually red though occasionally yellow is present as well; black stripes may appear around the neck. The majority of these heads lack any indication of hair-style.

153 Bisi, “Antécédents éblaïtes d’un apotropaïon phénico-punique,” Fig. 1g.

154 No pinched faces with painted eyes survive in the Jerusalem corpus, but see an example from Tell en Nasbeh. Holland, “Typological and Archaeological Study of Human and Animal Representations,” A.I.c.8/Kletter, Judean Pillar-Figurines, Appendix 2, 135.A.3.A, is a head with turban and sidelocks in which the turban is painted orange, the face is red, and the pupils are black. It also has a “collar” with orange, red, and black geometric patterns. In contrast, a figurine from Gibeon (Holland, “Typological and Archaeological Study of Human and Animal Representations,” A.I.a.13/Kletter, Judean Pillar-Figurines, Appendix 2, 48.A.1.Ap) has horizontal stripes in red and yellow along the face, suggesting that paint may not have traced facial features but created geometric designs. For a similar example from Gibeon, see Holland, “Typological and Archaeological Study of Human and Animal Representations,” A.I.a.16/Kletter, Judean Pillar-Figurines, Appendix 2, 42.A+.1.Ap.

Further, where sub-varieties exist, particularly the turban or turban with sidelocks, these bear little resemblance to known Egyptian, Phoenician, or Syrian iconography. Rather, the closest comparanda may be the turban with ear caps known from figurines on Cyprus as well as depictions of Assyrian hair-styles on seals, like the head-band or turban, most often seen on worshippers or cultic officiates. Not that these

simple head with red and yellow paint; A.I.a.27: a simple head with yellow paint; Gilbert-Peretz, “Ceramic Figurines,” E1/8475: a simple head with red and yellow paint; for black paint, see ibid., E3/13115: a simple head with two black stripes around the neck.

156 Gubel (“Multicultural and Multimedial Aspects of Early Phoenician Art,” 210-11) notes that Phoenician art did not adopt Assyrian details or motifs. If molded heads were created in the Phoenicia/north Israelite milieu, this may be the reason molded heads do not betray any features typical to Assyrian art but depend upon Egyptianizing features.

157 The bands around the head of figurines are most common on hand-made heads of male figurines, though they are also sometimes seen on females in active poses. See Vassos Karageorghis, Aspects of Everyday Life in Ancient Cyprus: Iconographic Representations (Nicosia, Cyprus: A. G. Leventis Foundation, 2006), 116, Fig. 99; 121, Fig. 104 [though unclear if actually female]). The band appears to represent either hair, following across the forehead and down behind the ears, or a headdress when it circles the head with ear flaps added separately. Additionally, the band is often decorated with applied concentric circles suggesting a headdress rather than hair. In most cases, whether male or female, the ears are formed by applied pellets, thus far unknown in the Judean heads. Of course, the ability to tell the difference between male and female figurines is often problematic.

158 Tallay Ornan, “The Mesopotamian Influence on West Semitic Inscribed Seals: A Preference for the Depiction of Mortals,” in Studies in the Iconography of Northwest Semitic Inscribed Seals: Proceedings of a Symposium Held in Fribourg on April 17-20, 1991 (ed. Benjamin Sass and Christoph Uehlinger; OBO 125; Fribourg: University Press; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993), 68-71, Fig. 66-68. These three seals are classified as West Semitic in origin but with Mesopotamian influence; they have Hebrew, rather than Aramaic, inscriptions. They all show a highly schematized figure with a turban and locks/flare running down the side of the head. Ornan interprets the figures as worshippers because they lack the typical marks of deities (horns, special costume, animals, divine attributes) and they stand with arms outstretched and bent at the elbow in the typical posture of a worshipper. Although these are dated to the Neo-Babylonian period (ibid., 52), they were made locally and seem to reflect local assimilation of Mesopotamian motifs. Often the gender of the larger group of which these seals are a part is difficult to discern. Sometimes the figures with this style of headdress have a beard and sometimes they do not. They are always shown with a skirt, and breasts are never depicted; though this could be due to the view of the figures in profile. Ornan points out that Assyrian styles and motifs are not in evidence on Phoenician seals (ibid., 71).
two groups are mutually exclusive, since the figurines from Cyprus arise while the island is under Assyrian domination. When paint is preserved, the turban may be yellow, while the faces are usually red.\footnote{For paint on the turban, see Holland, “Typological and Archaeological Study of Human and Animal Representations,” A.I.b.3: a simple head with turban; A.I.c.1: a simple head with turban and sidelocks; Gilbert-Peretz, “Ceramic Figurines,” G/8253: simple head with turban and sidelocks, though she does not state whether yellow paint is on the head, turban, or sidelocks; for red faces see ibid., G/11026, G/8227: with red and yellow stripes on the face and neck. Personal examination indicates that the yellow may be on the turban while a red stripe lies below the turban and above the eyes and another red stripe is under the chin; Holland, “Typological and Archaeological Study of Human and Animal Representations,” A.I.c.4, though he does not state whether the red paint was on the face, the turban, or the sidelocks; A.I.e.2 described as “dark brown paint” over right eye and on forehead. The paint was probably originally red. This may be a male figurine.}

9.5.2 Comparanda

Possible comparanda with pinched head figurines is problematic because the hand-pinched style in Judah, and especially Jerusalem, contrasts with contemporaneous molded-head pillar figurines from neighboring regions. Furthermore, the closest stylistic comparanda from the same period come from locations further afield.

From figurines found in the Transjordan, the small numbers of hand-pinched heads usually have applied pellet eyes (very rare on Judean figurines) and probably represent males.\footnote{Duncan (Digging Up Biblical History 2, 87-88) believed the closest parallels to the simple pinched heads were Cretan figurines. Karageorghis (“Coroplastic Art of Cyprus,” 13) characterizes the figurine tradition at the end of the Late Bronze as one in decline, consisting of “poor imitations” of Cretan figurines.}

\footnote{‘Amr, “Study of the Clay Figurines and Zoomorphic Vessels of Trans-Jordan,” I.A.2; I.A.3; I.B2.8; I.B1.5; II.B3.39 (‘Amr calls this a female, but only the head survives); II.C.2.48 (no breasts visible in drawing); I.B1.7; I.A.1; I.B1.6; I.A.4; II.A2.23 (hermaphrodite).}
it occurs in Kition levels from the Iron I through the sixth century. In the case of Kition, examples may have applied pellet eyes; more commonly, the eyes may be painted in the depressions.

The continuation of pinched heads into the Iron II is not unique to Kition. Press notes a surprising number of Mycenaean-style figurines in Iron II contexts within Philistia, especially the Psi figurines (females with hands out to the sides) and the like the goddess with uplifted arms. He believes the new traditions of the seventh century were the result of contacts with the Levant, particularly Phoenicia. Frieda Vandenabeele (“The Terracottas of the Cypro-Geometric Period,” in Cypriote Terracottas Proceedings of the First International Conference of Cypriote Studies, Brussels-Liége-Amsterdam, 29 May-1 June 1989 [ed. Frieda Vandenabeele and Robert Laffineur; Brussels-Liége: A.G. Leventis Foundation, Vrije Universiteit Brussel-Université de Liège, 1991], 57-58) also states that Cyprus has few figurines from the Cypro-Geometric period (1050-750 B.C.E.) and suggests that the majority of human figurines are of the “goddess with uplifted arms” style borrowed from Crete. During the late Iron II handmade heads are predominantly male (Vassos Karageorghis, The Cyprus Museum (Nicosia, Cyprus: C. Epiphaniou, 1989), 72-73, Fig.72; 80, Fig. 78; 80, Fig. 79; 82, Fig. 80). Even when females are depicted in active poses with handmade bodies, their faces may be impressed with a mold, although this is less common (ibid., 86, Fig. 85). Still, the most common females with handmade heads on Cyprus are the “goddess with upraised arms” style that, as per above, continues into the Iron II from earlier Iron I traditions and becomes less popular toward the end of the eighth century and into the sixth century.

162 Although Karageorghis (Excavations at Kition 6: Part I, 108) argues for a totally new population—the Phoenicians—at the site beginning in 800, this population must have adopted certain customs from the previous inhabitants. For example, Karageorghis admits the continuity of bucraonia as masks in religious ritual, a custom known from the Early and Middle Bronze Ages on Cyprus (ibid., 109). Elsewhere Karageorghis (Excavations at Kition 6: Part 2, 9) admits that the “goddess with uplifted arms” type was known throughout the island from the eleventh century to the late Cypro-Archaic period. Thus, the Phoenicians living at the site adopted the construction of this style, as is evident by the multiple figurines of this type from levels dated to 800-550 at Kition. If Smith (Art and Society in Cyprus, 212) is correct, the new Phoenician temples were not constructed until Floor 2A (725 B.C.E.) and the continuity of this form may simply reflect continuous religious practices from the older population. Still, at least two fragments are known after 725 (Karageorghis, Excavations at Kition 6: Part 2, Reg. 1168; Reg. 4775, Pl. LVI).

163 For applied eyes, see Karageorghis, ibid., Reg. 5237, Pt. II, dated to 1050-1000 by the excavator; for painted eyes, see ibid., Reg. 4765, Pl. LVI.
Ashdoda figurines. According to Press, the Philistine Psi figurines rise to popularity in the eleventh century, at which time the Ashdoda style is introduced. After this point the “hybrid of Aegean style and local gesture continues well into the Iron II,” as evidenced by the Yavneh cult stands (see below) of the ninth century and the later Ashdoda style heads, found as late as the seventh century. The figurines in question usually have applied pellet eyes—which Press considers a marker of Philistine style, though they occasionally have incised eyes instead. He also notes they are more similar to Psi figurines of the late thirteenth to twelfth centuries in their low polos or absence of polos, applied pellet breasts, and variety of decorated patterns.

The pinched heads found on females applied to the cult stands at Yavneh deserve further comment. There are several interesting parallels with the pillar figurine corpus. Although found in a favissa, none of the cult stands show any evidence for burning during use. Nor is there any evidence the cult stands were broken during use or

164 Press, “Philistine Figurines,” 266. Press expresses some reservations about the reliability of the context data for the dating, claiming many of the Psi-style Mycenaean influenced figurines occur in secondary rather than primary contexts. Thus, there is a possibility these were created in the Iron I and used into the Iron II (ibid., 267).

165 Ibid., 274.

166 Ibid., 275. Agreeing with Press, that the Yavneh material reflects a hybrid of Aegean style and Canaanite gesture, see Ben-Shlomo, Philistine Iconography, 70.

167 Press, “Philistine Figurines,” 176, 177, 182.

168 Ibid., 179.

intentionally broken before being discarded in the pit. Unfortunately, although Kletter successfully divides the corpus into typological units, no data seems to suggest typological change. The excavators claim that the same motifs and stylistic elements are consistent throughout the depth of the deposit.

What separates the Yavneh materials from the other comparanda is the fact that pinched heads appear on female bodies holding breasts, including those with pillar bases. In her iconographic report, Ziffer draws many parallels with Cypriot examples. Most importantly, the pinched head style with applied and incised features is comparable with Mycenean and Cretan clay figurines, mentioned above, as well as

---


171 Ibid., 54-57. The excavators believed they detected at least four distinct layers in the favissa, but they were all deposited in a single event. Thus, archaeological context does not aid in dating the various iconographic and stylistic shifts over time. Moreover, the pit was badly disturbed prior to excavation by a bulldozer as well as modern looting.

172 Kletter and Ziffer, “Catalogue 1,” CAT84, 245, Pl. 21:1; 43:1 bottom; 119; 120:1; CAT85, 246, Pl. 41:1; 120:2-3; CAT86, 246, Pl.21:2; 121; CAT92, 248-49, Pl. 23:2; 125:2-3; 126:1-2; CAT113, 257-58, Pl. 26:1; 143:2; 144; CAT123, 261, Pl. 150:2; CAT28, 220-21, Pls 9:2; 69; 70:1; CAT29, 221, Pls 47:3; 70:2-3; CAT57, 234, Pls. 7:1; 17:2; 99-100; CAT90, 247-48, Pl. 1:2-3; 40:1-2; 41; 123:3-4.

173 Ibid., CAT37, 224-25, Pls 11:1; 76-77; 78:1-2; CAT44, 227-28, Pls. 13:1; 84-85; CAT49, 230, Pls. 2:2, bottom; 14:2; 90:1, 3; 91:1 (claims ridges beneath figures represent legs but conjectural at best ); CAT59, 236, Pls 33:1; 103:2-3.

174 Ziffer (“Iconography of the Cult Stands,” 63-64) discusses the open-work structure of the stands, which she likens to Cypriote four-sided metal stands. She also compares the numerous clay pieces attached to the stands by means of pegs to techniques used in Cypriote figural representations from the Early Bronze through the Late Bronze Age (ibid., 65).
anthropomorphic vessels from Tell Qasile and Dor, and other figurines in Philistia (see above).  

Hand-made styles also occur at sites in northern Israel, such as Beth Shean, Megiddo, Samaria, Dan, and Dor; a number of examples come from Gezer in the Shephelah on the border with Philistia. Many of these fragments are male or the gender is undetermined; and most of the datable fragments come from the Iron I or early Iron II.

For later examples, pinched heads are known from Syria in the seventh and sixth centuries on female figurines from Tel Ahmar/Til Barsip. Figurines of a similar style were also uncovered at Carchemish, Deve Hüyük I, and Kefrik. All have applied pellet

---

175 Ibid., 66. For Tel Qasile, see Mazar, Tell Qasile: Part One, 78-82; for Dor, see Ephraim Stern, “The Sea Peoples Cult in Philistia and Northern Israel,” in “I will Speak the Riddles of Ancient Times”: Archaeological and Historical Studies in Honor of Amihai Mazar on the Occasion of his Sixtieth Birthday (ed. Aren M. Meir and Pierre de Miroschedji; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2006), 390.

176 For Beth Shean, see Klettner, Judean Pillar-Figurines, Appendix 5, 5.IV.5.1; 5.IV.5.41; for Megiddo, see ibid., Appendix 5, 5.IV.5.10-14; for Samaria, see ibid., Appendix 5, 5.IV.16-19; for Dan, see ibid., Appendix 5, 5.IV.5.37; for Dor, see ibid., Appendix 5, 5.IV.36; for Gezer, see ibid., Appendix 5, 5.IV.2-8.

177 Several unpublished fragments (unknown reg.) are housed in the Aleppo museum, reportedly from Tel Ahmar, the ancient Aramaean city of Til Barsip. One specimen has a simple headdress, similar to the turban style of the Judean figurines. It has an applied necklace, individually applied small breasts, and applied pellet eyes on a pillar body. The arms are broken but appear to extend out to the sides. The other variety has a much more elaborate headdress and pellet eyes. The arms appear to bend back toward the body, but the fragment is broken through the torso. The headdress appears similar to the more fanciful headdresses on the Middle Bronze figurines. For a published example see Arlette Roobaert and Guy Bunnens, “Excavations at Tell Ahmar-Til Barsip,” in Archaeology of the Upper Syrian Euphrates the Tishrin Dam Area: Proceedings of the International Symposium Held at Barcelona, January 28th-30th 1998 (ed. Gregorio del Olmo Lete and Juan Luis Montero Fenollós; Aula Orientalis Supplement 15; Barcelona: Editorial Ausa, 1999), 176, Fig. 9: the torso of a woman holding a baby. See also Prüß, Die Amuq-Terrakotten, 219.

178 Peter R. S. Moorey, “Ancient Near Eastern Terracottas,” 227: numbers 353, 356. Moorey notes that the Carchemish figurines all come from the period immediately preceding the 604 destruction and suggests that the excavated area included several houses of the seventh century; he does not specify whether the exact context of the figurines is known. See also Prüß, Die Amuq-Terrakotten, 217. The figurines from Deve Hüyük I come from a cremation graveyard dated to the seventh century, including fragment 358 (ibid., 228-29; Peter R. S. Moorey, Cemeteries of the First Millennium B.C. at Deve Hüyük, Near Carchemish,
eyes; and most have hands covering where breasts should be, though the breasts are not depicted. They also tend to have applied decoration, like headdresses, necklaces, and arm bands. Another pinched head with pellet eyes and a headdress with perforations (similar to Middle Bronze headdresses) comes from Tell al-Judaidah in a probable early Iron Age context. Though this type is most common in the Iron IIC, Pruß argues that the form begins as early as the tenth-eleventh centuries. As above, this style predominates in Neo-Hittite areas, with the notable addition of Tel Ahmar.

Salvaged by T.E. Lawrence and C.L. Woolley in 1913 [BAR International Series 87; Oxford: Archaeopress, 1980]. 100 no. 427, fig. 17. At Kefrik the figurines are associated with a cremation tomb dated to the seventh century, including figurine 362 (ibid., 148, no. 566, fig. 24). Fragment 363 was found at the same site (ibid., 148, no. 567, fig. 24). From the same region Moorey includes several unprovenienced fragments of the same style (fragments 365-367)(Moorey, “Ancient Near Eastern Terracottas,” 229).

179 Personal communication with Lynn Swartz Dodd concerning fragment Z-1084. At the time of communication (February 2010) the assessment of the stratigraphy was still in preliminary stages. Further, see Pruß, Die Amuq-Terrakotten, 211, number 251-257, Taf. 29-30. Four of these come from Judaidah and three from Carchemish, though they have a variety of gestures (none with both hands on breasts). He argues that the style with a pinched head on a rough body (pillar in form) may have begun in the early Iron Age. Pruß also notes the presence of “Northsyrian Pillarfigurines,” which he considers a standardization of the rough figurines (ibid., 216-25). For the latter see (ibid., 218-33; 223-24), many of which come from Judaidah.

180 Ibid., 222, Tabelle 16, though he notes that the dates of the Carchemish figurines (at least eight fragments) cannot be determined.

181 Bunnens notes the possibility that a political relationship existed between Carchemish and Tel Ahmar. Guy Bunnens, “Aramaeans, Hittites and Assyrians in the Upper Euphrates Valley,” in Archaeology of the Upper Syrian Euphrates the Tishrin Dam Area: Proceedings of the International Symposium Held at Barcelona, January 28th-30th 1998 (ed. Gregorio del Olmo Lete and Juan Luis Montero Fenollós; Aula Orientalis Supplement 15; Barcelona: Editorial Ausa, 1999), 614. On thi point he is following David Ussishkin, “On the Dating of Some Groups of Reliefs from Carchemish and Til Barsip,” AnSt 17 (1967): 181-92. Bunnens remarks on the possibility that the two sites shared artisans for relief carving. He also notes that the Neo-Hittite figurative art may have been the artistic koine for royal propaganda, regardless of the political or ethnic identities of the inhabitants.
Pinched heads are also known from the Egyptian corpus, particularly Waraksa’s Type 4 from the Mut Precinct. The figurine body is probably formed in a rough mold, but has little decoration and only the breasts to indicate the figurine is female. Unlike other types, impressions alone indicate eyes rather than applied features.\textsuperscript{182} Waraksa dates this type to the Third Intermediate through Late periods.\textsuperscript{183}

9.5.3 Meaning and function

In addition to the varied technological production (hand versus mold), the main distinction of the hand-pinched style is that the mouth is not usually depicted. This is in contrast with the eyes and nose, which are modeled rudimentarily and perhaps painted. In relation to Middle Bronze Age figurines, Petty argues that the presence or absence of a mouth is important. Referring to the \textit{mīs.pî} ritual, Petty claims that the absence of mouth may prevent the figurine from being ritually activated, solidifying its status as a magical object.\textsuperscript{184} To be specific, Petty argues that “omission of the mouth suggests that the figure

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{182} Waraksa, “Female Figurines from the Mut Precinct,” 37, Fig. 5.
\textsuperscript{183} Ibid., 40. She notes the possibility that this style is related to her Type 3, which has a square-ish molded head (only the outline, not the facial features are molded) with applied and incised decorations. Neither type is shown holding breasts.
\textsuperscript{184} Petty, \textit{Bronze Age Anthropomorphic Figurines}, 29. The presence or absence of molded mouth may not be significant. In the case of Assyrian figurine rituals, though the figurines contain molded features, including mouths (see Chapter 3), the rituals contain no instructions for a typical \textit{mīs.pî} ceremony of activation. Thus, it cannot be inferred that the presence of a mouth indicates a figurine may be a deity in need of activation. If by the Iron IIB-C the mouth had become a matter of course rather than an important feature for the function of the image then its absence may suggest nothing significant.
\end{flushright}
is not a being but rather a depiction of a being. From this perspective, the difference between hand-pinched and molded heads is significant.

From another perspective, if the hand-pinched figurines are a highly schematized version of the female image, then perhaps the mouth (like the pubic triangle and vulva) had become non-essential. If the most important aspects are the forward-staring eyes and the breasts, then the mouth can be omitted. Nor would this necessarily contrast with the molded heads, if their lips are actually features of masks whose mouths do not move (see above). Though this point must remain conjectural, the two styles share other features. In both hand-made and mold-made heads, the faces are often painted red. Both styles depict the same range of gestures and forward-staring eyes, suggesting an overlap in function. Even the different styles of headdress (short wig versus turban and sidelocks) are both found in other media associated with cultic officiates and intermediaries. If both styles served the same ritual function, then the molded heads may have decreased in popularity in the Jerusalem corpus simply because they were more difficult to manufacture (for other hypotheses, see below).

---

185 Ibid., 38. Petty goes on to argue that the molded mouth of the Late Bronze Syrian plaque figurines is not significant, since the author of a mass-produced molded image is already anonymous. She thus argues that the authorless molded figurines, because their creator is masked, could not be activated. That having been said, even cult images become “authorless” as a necessary part of the activation ceremony. On this point see Hurowitz, “Mesopotamian God Image,” 147-57.
9.6 Conclusions

9.6.1 Chronological and regional development

As demonstrated in Chapter 5, the earliest pinched head figurines in the Jerusalem corpus were an Ashdoda type head from the Iron I\textsuperscript{186} and a ninth century pinched head with button eyes.\textsuperscript{187} In Chapter 7 it was argued that figurines with pinched heads arose early in the Jerusalem corpus but without the hands-on-breast gesture on a pillar body, a style that was adopted largely at the end of the eighth century. It appears that the pillar body holding its breasts with molded head occurs in earlier contexts in Jerusalem, perhaps as early as the first half of the eighth century. Given the known iconographic traditions, what might account for the spread of these styles to Jerusalem and their respective patterns? Furthermore, it has been claimed in Chapter 7 that pinched heads were always more popular in Jerusalem and the hill country than molded heads and that molded heads decreased in popularity in the late seventh and sixth centuries in comparison to pinched heads. This pattern also begs some explanation.

The fairly wide distribution of Mycenaean style pinched heads on pillar bodies in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries\textsuperscript{188} may explain a shift away from the frontal mold at

\textsuperscript{186} D1/13251 in Gilbert-Peretz, “Ceramic Figurines,” Fig. 18:11; Pl. 9:8-9. This is an “ashdoda type” solid figurine, with a flattened head, a large nose, and applied button eyes.

\textsuperscript{187} G/11769 (Gilbert-Peretz, “Ceramic Figurines,” Plate 1:8, Fig 10:13) is a mini human figurine with rounded head, pinched face, and applied button eyes. There is a crack in the arms and body; and the figurine is broken in the middle, containing no sign of breasts. There is no break on the torso where the arms (no longer preserved) may have been attached, so it is safe to assume they extended out to the sides.

\textsuperscript{188} Press (“Philistine Figurines,” 182) discusses both centuries, arguing that thirteenth-century figurines were known at Levantine ports like Ugarit, Tell Abu Hawam, and Ashkelon, while in the twelfth century fewer figurines are found but from a wider geographic region; local imitations become more common. See
some coastal sites in the Iron I and IIA, including the introduction of pinched heads and schematic bodies at Philistine sites. The hand-made style was then modified to fit either cult stands or free standing figures and adapted to local gestures, at which time it spread to other sites in northern Israel and Judah. Perhaps this shift was expedited by the general societal breakdown of the Late Bronze Age when traditional artisan communities responsible for mold-made plaques may have been interrupted. Later in the seventh and sixth centuries these heads may have been adapted to Assyrian style with the addition of the turban or turban and sidelocks.

Pruß has argued for a similar development in the figurine tradition of Syria.\(^{189}\) If the Syrian hand-made pillar bases and pinched heads result from Aegean influence, this might explain why figurines from Judah and Syria have similar technological characteristics in the Iron IIB-C. Rather than a relationship of direct dependence, they may both trace their roots to Aegean influence introduced at the end of the Late Bronze Age and the beginning of the Iron I.\(^{190}\)

\(^{189}\) Pruß, *Die Amuq-Terrakotten*, 200-202. He lists two Psi-figurines from other parts of Syria (Çatal Hüyük, and Tell Judaidah) and notes that neither is imported. Both date to the early Iron Age and are the later style of Psi-figurines.

\(^{190}\) Stefania Mazzoni, “Syria and the Periodization of the Iron Age: A Cross-Cultural Perspective,” in *Essays on Syria in the Iron Age* (ed. Guy Bunnens; Ancient Near Eastern Studies Supplement 7; Louvain: Peeters, 2000), 34, n. 11, n. 12. Mazzoni includes a helpful summary and references on the debate concerning whether the Sea Peoples or local peoples were responsible for resettling Syrian sites, particularly along the coast. There is no reason that both Aegean and local elements could not have been represented in these rebuilds.
The new style of molded heads arose in the tenth-ninth centuries under northern Israelite-Phoenician influence, possibly related to the mask/protome tradition. Molded heads were appended to bodies with a number of gestures, though bodies holding the breasts are uncommon in the north. The technological style with molded head may have made its way into the Philistine coast and Judah separately or into Philistia by way of Judah, since the datable examples in Judah are earlier. More specifically, many of these examples come from the Shephelah; and Judean style fragments were uncovered at Philistine sites on the border with the Shephelah in the early eighth century. Upon arrival in Judah and Philistia the molded heads were most frequently appended to bodies holding their breasts. The increasing centralization of Jerusalem in the first half of the eighth century and any population movement in preparation for Sennacherib’s siege may have brought the molded heads to Jerusalem (see Chapter 10).

Both hand-modeled and molded human figurines are known from cult stands/model shrines in the Late Bronze Age through the Iron IIA, suggesting they served as a bridge between the Late Bronze and Iron IIB-C figurine traditions. Of these, females holding their breasts are more common in Philistine sites. These types of images were typically associated with shrine or sanctuary spaces. Though the explanation for this phenomenon must remain conjectural, it may be related to production organization. The distribution of cult stands/model shrines contrasts with the Late Bronze plaques associated with many domestic structures in Palestine and Egypt. Perhaps the resurgence of figurine art in the Iron II was facilitated by centralized workshops associated with cultic centers in Philistia and northern Israel.
Supporting the Shephelah, Philistia, and northern Israel as centers of production are the location of the known molds. Plaque and pillar figurine molds have been uncovered at Beth Shemesh, Lachish, and Gezer in the Shephelah, Tel Batash, Ashdod, and Tel Gemmeh in Philistia, and Ta’anach, Megiddo, and Samaria from northern Israel. Similarly, molds come from Deir ‘Alla in the Transjordan, also a site with a large number of figurines, and Tell en Nasbeh. Many of these sites produced both plaque and pillar figurines, suggesting that the renewed figurine production in the Iron Age continued in locations associated with plaque figurines as well.

---

191 For Beth Shemesh, see Kletter, *Judean Pillar-Figurines*, Appendix 5, 5.VIII.1: a female head; for Lachish, see ibid., Appendix 5, 5.VIII.2: a female head; 5.VIII.3: a molded head and upper body; for Gezer, see ibid., Appendix 5, 5.V.2.2 and 5.V.8.14: plaques from Gezer. Given the problems with dating at Gezer, these plaques might date to an earlier period and would thus fall into the realm of Philistia or Canaan.

192 For Tell Batash, see ibid., Appendix 5, 5.V.9.19-21: plaques; for Ashdod, see ibid., Appendix 5, 5.VIII.12: a female head and torso with hands on the breasts; for Tell Gemmeh, see ibid., Appendix 5, 5.VIII.13-14: molded heads.

193 For Ta’anach, see ibid., Appendix 5, 5.V.1.38: a plaque; for Megiddo, see ibid., Appendix 5, 5.V.5.1; 5.VIII.19: plaques; 5.VIII.16-18, 20: molded heads; for Samaria, see ibid., Appendix 5, 5.VIII.15: a plaque from E207.

194 Ibid., Appendix 5, 5.VIII.9-10: female heads.

195 Ibid., Appendix 5, 5.VIII.4: a plaque.

196 This does not imply that other locations where molds have not been found were importing figurines from these sites. As per Chapter 6, figurines tend to be locally made which implies local artisans must have had their own molds. It seems molds were reused and kept with the artisan for some length of time. These particular sites may have preserved molds in the archaeological record because of the intensity of figurine production in these locations, as confirmed by the large numbers of figurines from these areas. For a similar opinion that suggests intensity of production may have been greater in the north at sites like Megiddo, see Keel and Uehlinger, *Gods, Goddesses, and Images of God*, 327. Keel and Uehlinger hypothesize that the Judean heads may have been imported, given the dearth of molds from Judah; but they note that no provenience studies had been completed at the time of their publication. The current study (Chapter 6) proves that heads were not normally imported or exported.
The absence of molds from Jerusalem is most unusual in comparison with the patterns elsewhere, given the number of figurines retrieved from the site. Of course, if figurines were produced outside the city walls, then few excavations would have the opportunity to recover molds from the locations where they were used. Furthermore, the popularity of pinched heads may decrease the frequency of molded heads and the likelihood that molds would be preserved.

Also of interest, no plaque figurines have been recovered from the city. Unlike other sites, the female figurine tradition in Jerusalem seems to have begun with free-standing figurines. Perhaps the absence of molded figurine production in earlier periods affected artisans’ willingness or ability to adopt the molded head design.

9.6.1.1 Trade relations, artistic developments, and ideology

Because it has been shown that figurines were not usually traded (see Chapter 6), what scenario might explain the movement of symbols and production techniques from one territory to another? The spread of crafts is often attributed to the Phoenicians, but figurines constitute a unique category. Although some private commerce may have occurred during the Iron II, trade was often controlled directly or indirectly by Assyrian policy; and Phoenician trade, particularly that facilitated by the Assyrian Empire, was known to focus on imported raw materials like wood and luxury goods like garments,

metals and ivories.\textsuperscript{198} Thus, there is little evidence for importing or exporting non-pottery clay items like figurines. Markoe emphasizes that Phoenician figurines were not traded objects, even from one city within Phoenicia to another.\textsuperscript{199} Thus any influence exerted by one location on another must be incidental rather than mercantile.

This does not preclude the general exchange of images and technologies. For example, Gubel has remarked on the relationship between the Phoenician overland trade routes and figurine style, especially in regard to female plaque figurines and bell-shaped figurines.\textsuperscript{200} Gubel compares similar iconographic styles from Cyprus through the Transjordan in the Iron II, arguing that various similarities result from cultural interactions facilitated by this route. In particular, Markoe notes the increased access to the Red Sea through the Hejaz of Jordan afforded to Tyre by its cooperation with Damascus in the end of the ninth through the beginning of the eighth century.\textsuperscript{201}

The molded, mask-like faces with bodies holding instruments and offerings or with arms at their sides were popular at sites connected along the overland trade routes from Cyprus to the Red Sea. Because Jerusalem was largely unconnected in the ninth and early eighth centuries, perhaps these alternative gestures remained less popular. Furthermore, molded heads are absent in other locations unconnected to the overland trade routes.

\textsuperscript{198} Ibid., 23; Markoe, \textit{Phoenicians}, 93.

\textsuperscript{199} Ibid., 158-59. Markoe, however, posits a larger degree of influence for the plaque figurines than for the wheel-made pillar figurines.

\textsuperscript{200} Gubel, “From Amathus to Zarephath and Back Again,” 132-36.

\textsuperscript{201} Markoe, \textit{Phoenicians}, 41.
Cyprus-Red Sea trade routes, particularly in the Iron IIC, such as Egypt and northern Syria, where hand-pinched figurines are more dominant. In comparison, figurines with hands holding the breasts are popular in Philistia, Judah, and possibly in Edom, suggesting some influence shared by cultures connected along the southern Arabian route.

There could also be a chronological explanation. If Syria, Phoenicia, and northern Israel were indirectly responsible for the mold-made heads in the Jerusalem artistic tradition, Jerusalem benefited only by the tail end of the trend. By the second half of the eighth century, northern Syria, Damascus, and northern Israel were all conquered by the Assyrians, limiting their influence. By the end of the eighth century, the time during which figurines were becoming increasingly important in Jerusalem, the Shephelah was decimated as well. Even in Syria, after the collapse of north Syrian industry and the Assyrian conquest, the figurine tradition is of the hand-pinched variety in comparison with imported ivories that maintain the Phoenician-distilled Egyptianizing style in luxury goods.

Perhaps only secondarily was the preference for pinched heads a more conscious choice by the Jerusalem community, possibly motivated by a now-longstanding tradition or, more provocatively, by a community increasingly resistant to outside practices, fueled

---

202 Sass (“Pre-Exilic Hebrew Seals,” 199; following Keel and Uehlinger, Gods, Goddesses, and Images of God) suggests that Egypto-Phoenician iconography was more common in the ninth and eighth centuries on seals, while the late eighth to the seventh centuries saw Assyrian and/or Syrian iconography. Sass also points out (ibid., 244) that eighth century Judah did produce seals with Phoenician influence and even seems willing to argue that some Phoenician influence continued into the seventh century.
by its increasing stake in the international community, by direct competition brought about by trade relations in the seventh and sixth centuries,\(^\text{203}\) and by an increasing sense of national identity that solidified style patterns for ideological reasons.\(^\text{204}\) Jerusalem

---

\(^{203}\) In a somewhat comparable situation, Tel Ahmar, which was Aramaean and subsequently absorbed into the Assyrian Empire, produced hand-pinched figurines and no known molded heads (at least none published). In contrast, the head style associated with the ivories has the more detailed Egyptianizing design. These fragments of ivories were recovered from within and around the large building in Area C that was destroyed in the second half of the seventh century (Bunnens, “Carved Ivories from Tel Barsib,” 436). It seems possible that this building might be associated with Assyrian elite or Assyrian-sponsored local elites. On this point see Peter M. M. G. Akkermans and Glenn M. Schwartz, \textit{The Archaeology of Syria: From Complex Hunter-Gatherers to Early Urban Societies (ca. 16,000-300 BC)} (Cambridge World Archaeology; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 382. They note the elite nature of the lower city. Roobaert and Bunnens (“Excavations at Tell Ahmar, 169) argue that the building and the lower city are associated with Assyrian culture. The possibility that local figurine traditions preferred continuity with Middle Bronze, Late Bronze, and Iron I Syrian clay figurine traditions rather than the Phoenician and north Syrian Egyptianizing style of elite goods is suggestive. Roobaert and Bunnens (ibid., 169) also note, “the only category of objects that seems to be more original is represented by the clay figurines. Female figurines with a circular headdress and horses with complicated harness seem typical of the Euphrates valley.” For more on the incorporation of Assyrian cultural elements by the local community at Til Barsip see Barbara Neving Porter, “Assyrian Propaganda for the West: Esarhaddon's Stelae for Til Barsip and Sam'al,” in \textit{Essays on Syria in the Iron Age} (ed. Guy Bunnens; Ancient Near Eastern Studies Supplement 7; Louvain: Peeters, 2000.), 151-52. Neving Porter argues for a local (rather than Assyrian) population that maintained some western connections while adopting a number of Assyrian traits. Another case study, that of Egypt, shows that in addition to the frontal molding on some figurines there existed more rudimentary styles. For example, Waraksa (“Female Figurines from the Mut Precinct,” 33-34) Type 3 consists of a roughly molded flat figurine with prominent hips, incised lines in the pubic area, a heavy wig or hair with lappets that run down to the shoulders ending in bulbs, applied eyes, pinched noses, no mouths, applied breasts, incised navel, and outstretched arms. Waraksa dates this style to Dynasties 18-25/26 (ibid., 36). Type 4 has a similar style, although with less applied or incised decoration and a pinched head. Thus, these styles of figurines have little in common with the molded plaques or with other styles of Egyptian figur representation, such as wall paintings or sculpture (ibid., 137). For a similar interpretation of these pinched heads from Egypt see Teeter, “Piety at Medinet Habu,” 1-6 and Teeter, \textit{Baked Clay Figurines and Votive Beds}. Teeter notes that these figurines contrast sharply with the molded clay plaques of the New Kingdom as well as with elite art forms such as paintings and bronze statuettes.

\(^{204}\) Panitz-Cohen (“Pottery Assemblage,” 129) notes the similarity in pottery types from the early Iron II between Judean Shephelah and Negev sites, like Lachish, Beth Shemesh, and Arad, and the southern coastal and inner coastal sites like Ashdod, Tell Qasile, Tel Batash, and Tel Safit. She also notes that these assemblages become much more regionally distinct by the seventh century. These ceramic similarities have been interpreted as the result of Judean rule over Philistia during the United Monarchy. On this point see Seymore Gitin, “Philistia in Transition: The Tenth Century BCE and Beyond,” in \textit{Mediterranean Peoples in Transition: Thirteenth to Early Tenth Centuries BCE} (ed. Seymore Gitin, Amihai Mazar and Ephraim Stern; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1998), 176. Regardless of whether this interpretation is correct, only after Assyria takes possession of the region does a full regional style develop. Prior to that
should be contrasted with the figurine traditions in Philistia and northern Israel, where hand-pinched styles had occurred in the Iron I-IIA but were largely abandoned in the eighth though sixth centuries.

The foundation for such ideological motivations can only be surmised but perhaps a similar distaste for these surrounding traditions is in evidence in biblical texts and their antagonism toward Phoenician, north Israelite, and Philistine influence. If such a school of thought came to be centered in Jerusalem, it would provide a plausible explanation for why the Phoenicianizing north Israelite style, though present, was never as popular as the hand-pinched style. It may also explain why plaques, still produced in other regions like Philistia, Moab, Ammon, and Edom, are absent from the Jerusalem corpus.

9.6.2 Three dimensionality

If it is correct to argue that free-standing figurines in Judah entered the iconographic repertoire by means of appliqué on cultic stands, then what does this shift from attached to free-standing figurines indicate about changing functions? It seems most likely that the figurines keep their apotropaic function but are no longer limited to cultic contexts. This might parallel Neo-Assyrian guardian figurines, which appear in temples and palaces in Iron Age contexts and become more popular as individual figurines found point the permeability, particularly between Philistia and the Shephelah, may explain why figurine styles cross borders in these two regions.

540
in the rooms of non-monumental space in the ninth through sixth centuries. Further, the new style of female figurine may have been useful in the new exorcistic, apotropaic, and healing rituals, in comparison with the figurines used in rituals like šep lemutti (Chapter 3). These types of rituals took place outside of temple space and often in the home (on this point see Chapter 10).

This development also suggests a democratization of these types of protective images, with figurine rituals taking place outside temple spaces. This democratization may also be reflected in the clay types characteristic of Jerusalem figurines. Chapter 6 argues that the vast majority of Jerusalem figurines were constructed from different clays than those used for pottery vessels, especially by the end of the seventh century. Additionally, a range of clays were used to create figurines, probably suggesting a number of manufacturers rather than one central production unit. In comparison, studies of cultic items and regular pottery from other sites such as Horvat Qitmit, ‘En Hazeva, and Yavneh, showed that both pottery items and cultic items were made from the same local clays. These sites differ from Jerusalem and other Judean sites by having favissae, implying a different deposition and use for the cultic implements. There may

---

205 Although some of these images have a long pedigree, reaching back to Old Babylonian plaques, many do not.

206 Ben-Shlomo and Gorzalczy, “Petrographic Analysis,” 157; Jan Gunn neweg and Hans Mommsen, “Instrumental Neutron Activation Analysis of Vessels and Cult Objects,” in Horvat Qitmit: An Edomite Shrine in the Biblical Negev (ed. Itzhak Beit Arieh; Tel Aviv University, Institute of Archaeology Monograph Series 11; Tel Aviv: Institute of Archaeology, Tel Aviv University, 1995), 280-86; Jan Gunn neweg, Thomas Beier, Ulrich Diehl, D. Lam brecht, and Hans Mommsen, “‘Edomite’, ‘Negbite’, and Midianite Pottery from the Negev Desert and Jordan,” Archaeometry 33 (1991): 239-53. Like Yavneh, the other sites may be associated with a non-Judean population, though debate on this issue is far from resolved given the state and quality of publications for ‘En Hatseva and Tell Kheliefeh.
also have been a different organization for the producers of shrine artifacts in which cultic items were produced by one main workshop employed or governed by shrine officials.

Yet a further question begged by the switch to free-standing figurines is whether the figurine represents a divine entity or whether it replicates a statue of a divine entity.\(^\text{207}\)

Female images on model shrine boxes or cult stands may be interpreted as images of cult images.\(^\text{208}\) Assante has posited the same for naked females on Old Babylonian cylinder seals.\(^\text{209}\) Of course, this interpretation of the shrines as “model shrines” implies that they replicate an actual, full-sized form, a fact far from provable. Thus far, as mentioned above, females integrated into the front of temple and palace architecture are known from large buildings in Egypt and northern Syria, as reliefs, columns, capitols, or orthostats. Outside of the Late Bronze Hathor pillars at Timnah, no comparable materials exist in the southern Levant to clarify whether the shrines and cult stands here would have been considered a copy of larger forms.\(^\text{210}\) Nevertheless, it still seems clear that the female images were applied to shrines and stands to function as guardian figurines.

---

\(^\text{207}\) Cornelius (\textit{Many Faces of the Goddess}, 63-64) includes a helpful overview of various scholars who have proposed that plaque and pillar figurines were replicas of cult images.

\(^\text{208}\) For this phenomenon as it relates to depictions of Aššur, see Berlejung, “Die Reduktion von Komplexität,” 37.

\(^\text{209}\) Assante (“Style and Replication in ‘Old Babylonian’ Terracotta Plaques,” 7) suggests they are pictures of a plaque or figurine, though she does believe that the figurine reflects a cult-statue original.

What significance might there be for removing the female guardian figurine from its association with sacred architecture? By divorcing the figure from its function guarding the sacred space housing a major deity and/or its cultic image, perhaps this implies an elevation of these mid-range deities and an expansion of their uses. What was originally intended to guard only the most elevated spaces—those associated with palace and temple—is by the ninth through the sixth centuries used to guard everyday spaces of citizens from multiple levels of society. As a corollary, perhaps the image no longer evokes another cultic image—that of guardian figurines in sacred spaces—but it itself has become the unmediated vessel for the guardian figure.

9.6.3 Dissemination of female images

Overall, from where did Judah derive her iconic female image of the eighth through sixth centuries? From a historical perspective, the dissemination of female images is complex; and the case of Mesopotamia provides a helpful example. Female plaque images, including many with hands holding the breasts, were more common in the third-second millennium, during which time they spread through Syria to Palestine, Jordan, and Egypt. They appear to take a hiatus in Assyria and Babylonia until the Iron IIB.

Van Buren argues that the female with clasped hands, holding breasts, or suckling a child in frontal molding becomes more popular again from the time of Ashurnasirpal
(884-859 B.C.E) forward. As per Chapter 10, in many ways Ashurnasirpal’s reign marks a reintroduction of Syrian motifs into Assyrian art, particularly in temple and palace contexts. Furthermore, even as early as the Iron I or Iron IIA, several of the female figurines share features with Syrian figurine styles. Moreover evidence from Van Buren’s catalogue suggests that the female plaques are more common in the late ninth, eighth, and seventh centuries B.C.E. In the same period, Sennacherib was the first Assyrian monarch to carve female colossi in palace doorways, an influence that may have come from Sennacherib’s experience with the western territories. The fact that these female images are incorporated as apotropaic guardians is significant and betrays something of the use of female images in the eighth century.

211 Van Buren, *Clay Figurines of Babylonia and Assyria*, xlvi. For females with clasped hands see ibid., numbers 103-114; for females holding breasts see ibid., numbers 165-168; for females suckling a child see ibid., numbers 211-227 (standing); 229-233, 242 (seated); 397 (on a seat). See also the same frontal molded female with hands at her sides (ibid., numbers 192-195).

212 Ibid., number 187 lacks provenience and is dated to 1000 B.C.E. It is a female holding her breasts. Van Buren likens several of its stylistic elements to Hittite figurines and Syrian figurines. Number 351 from Aššur and dated to 1200 B.C.E. is a small female head with pointed cap or hair, with applied eyes and pierced ears for rings. Van Buren likens it to Hittite sculpture. Number 352 also from Ashur and dated to 1200 B.C.E. is a small female head with an elaborate headdress with almond eyes. Van Buren suggests it must have been made under foreign influence.

213 For the late ninth century see ibid., numbers 211-214 (standing suckling a child); 242 (seated suckling a child); for the eighth century see ibid., numbers 105-111 (clasped hands); 165-168 (hands on breasts); 215-219 (standing suckling a child); 229-232 (seated suckling a child); for the seventh century see ibid., numbers 112-113 (clasped hands); 192-195 (hands at sides); 220-227 (suckling a child).

Still, the Iron II plaques are found with the same types of images and in the same contexts as the earlier Mesopotamian figurines. The majority of provenienced fully molded figurines come from temples.\textsuperscript{215} Moreover, the majority of these figurines were associated with sites in Babylon rather than Assyria.\textsuperscript{216} In comparison with the male figurines and monster figurines that are frequently found in a double mold as well as in relief on small plaques, very few females are found in three-dimensional form.\textsuperscript{217} Furthermore, in contrast with Syrian iconography, only four Iron IIB-C figurines have their hands on their breasts.\textsuperscript{218}

Thus, many of these female plaques share common motifs and depositional patterns with plaques from the Old Babylonian period. Like the female colossi, the female images in the Iron IIB-C are depicted in traditional Mesopotamian styles. The figurines are not a simple borrowing of Syrian artistic conventions. The resurgence of female images may have been a response to increasing interactions with Syrian art; but

\textsuperscript{215} Van Buren, \textit{Clay Figurines of Babylonia and Assyria}, numbers 104-105 (temple of Ninmakh); 107 (temple of Ninurta); 111 (temple of Ishtar); 166 (temple of Ninurta); 193 (temple of Ninurta); 220 (Temple ‘Z’); 227 (temple of Ninurta); 229 (Wuswas temple); numbers 211 (palace of Shalmaneser III); 274 (Old Palace of Ashur in later phase).


\textsuperscript{217} Ibid., 274, from Ashur is a hollow enamelled figure; ibid., 353, is also from Asher and is a head with tang; ibid., 354, another head from Kish.

\textsuperscript{218} Van Buren (Ibid., 32) claims that this style was common throughout the later Assyrian period but one wonders why more examples were not included in the catalogue were that the case. Nor is it clear what the author means by the later Assyrian period. She does include 14 examples from ca. 300 B.C.E. through 150 B.C.E.
the particular gestures, forms, and perhaps functions of the female image were interpreted through a local lens.

Ultimately, female images wax and wane all over the ancient Near East. Even in areas that lack female images for long periods of time, such as Babylon, when the images resurface they do so in local style. While the popularity of female images may result from interactions with other peoples, only rarely are exact stylistic and iconographic elements adopted whole cloth from one region to another.

As a result of the myriad local variations it is difficult to determine whether the Judean figurines were meant to represent a particular female deity. It has been argued that the images do not seem appropriate for the depiction of human females. At the same time, there is no clear iconographic tradition that associates this female image (or its variants) with a known high goddess. The closest female iconography from Egypt is that of Qedeshet (though she does not hold her breasts). Gubel argues that Qedeshet/Qadshu/Qadesh was the daughter of Ptah in Memphite theology and was considered the “personification of the Eye of Re’ or the ‘Udjat of Atum.” This makes her a divine protector. Further, Gubel argues that her association with Reshef on the “Min-Qadshesh-Reshef” stelea, suggests that she operates in the realm of potency and fertility, particularly manifested with protection and healing in battle in the case of the ivory horse trappings (see above) (“Phoenician and Aramean Bridle-Harness Decorations,” 132). Although Gubel seems to look for a Sidonian precursor to these images, he also seems unaware of their similarities with terracotta plaques of the Late Bronze Age in the southern Levant and Egypt. Cornelius (Many Faces of the Goddess, 87) points out that Qedeshet appears to be popular with “private” people rather than the official cult of Egypt.

---

219 Gubel, “Phoenician and Aramean Bridle-Harness Decorations,” 130. Gubel does not interpret Qudshu as the hypostasis of Astarte and Anat, nor does he interpret her as Asherah. For a history of that debate see Cornelius, Many Faces of the Goddess, 94-96. He makes the case for an independent deity named Qedeshet (ibid., 96) associated with protection and healing (ibid., 98). Gubel argues that Qudshu/Qadshesh was the daughter of Ptah in Memphite theology and was considered the “personification of the Eye of Re’ or the ‘Udjat of Atum.” This makes her a divine protector. Further, Gubel argues that her association with Reshef on the “Min-Qadshesh-Reshef” stelea, suggests that she operates in the realm of potency and fertility, particularly manifested with protection and healing in battle in the case of the ivory horse trappings (see above) (“Phoenician and Aramean Bridle-Harness Decorations,” 132). Although Gubel seems to look for a Sidonian precursor to these images, he also seems unaware of their similarities with terracotta plaques of the Late Bronze Age in the southern Levant and Egypt. Cornelius (Many Faces of the Goddess, 87) points out that Qedeshet appears to be popular with “private” people rather than the official cult of Egypt.
taken into Egyptian iconography and only secondarily a name and theology were created to incorporate her into the pantheon.  

Nor is there any clear evidence for a particular female deity associated with the naked female holding her breasts in the Syrian iconographic tradition, which transmitted the naked female type into Palestine and Egypt. Even proceeding back to the naked female type in Mesopotamia, she remained unaffiliated with major goddesses. Thus, at no point through the Iron IIC has this iconographic type (or most naked female types) been clearly associated with a named goddess of the pantheon, whether in Mesopotamia, Syria, Transjordan, Philistia, Israel, or Judah. The ambiguity of the image and its polyvalence may be responsible for its wide distribution and perhaps fundamental to the meaning and function of the image. If the image is, in fact, apotropaic in nature, the wide attestation would be explained. The image itself comes to be associated with power and

220 Cornelius (ibid., 49-50) notes that en face figures are uncommon in Egyptian relief. This suggests that, even when borrowed into Egyptian iconography, an apotropaic quality was maintained. Further, Keel and Uehlinger (Gods, Goddesses, and Images of God, 66) point out that the naked female holding her breasts is popular in north Israelite plaques, including those without the Hathor headdress, in the early Late Bronze Age. In contrast, plaques in the south at the beginning of the Late Bronze have stronger Egyptianizing features, including the headdress; they tend to hold their arms out to the sides grasping implements and often standing on the back of animals. Elsewhere (ibid., 103) Keel and Uehlinger claim that the Astarte plaques and Qudshu types “cannot be treated as completely separate entities.” This is largely based on the use of females on cult stands, already outlined above. Yet they also resist equating them (ibid., 105), noting that the Astarte plaques might represent a lower goddess than the Qudshu types. In contrast, Prüß notes the differences between the Iron Age plaque figurines from the Syrian interior and the Late Bronze plaque figurines found on the southern coast of Syria, Lebanon, in the coastal region of Israel, and in Egypt. The coastal varieties have the Hathor headdress unknown on north Syrian counterparts. He also notes that the coastal/Egyptian type tend to hold implements or plants. Although he suggests there was little mutual dependence between these two types, he argues they are parallel developments from a common source (ibid, Die Amuq-Terrakotten, 129).

221 Aurerbach (“Terra Cotta Plaques from the Diyala,” 342) claims that the deities commonly identified on other artistic media, such as Ishtar, Shamash, and Ea, never or rarely occur in plaque format. Assante (“Style and Replication in ‘Old Babylonian’ Terracotta Plaques,” 6-7, 8) argues the same thing. For the few plaques with subjects known from official art or glyptic art see ibid., 11-13.
protection, no matter what personality, if any, might be associated with it in any given locale.

The problem with JPFs has always been the absence of a direct iconographic antecedent in any material or medium. These clay figurines represent a new creation taken from individually known elements. Thus, whether this creation represents one holistic image is not readily apparent. The alternative, tracking the individual design components and their unique combination, still suggests a tentative but informed function for the image, as one intended to protect, heal, and preserve. It may also suggest that the extended search for the figurines’ identity is misguided.
CHAPTER 10: CONCLUSIONS: FIGURINES IN HISTORICAL CONTEXT

The materials investigated throughout this dissertation suggest that JPFs, at least those from Jerusalem, were used in rituals of protection and healing. This is supported by ritual texts from Mesopotamia as well as the iconographic developments in Judah and surrounding areas. It has also been suggested that the Neo-Assyrian Empire provided the backdrop for figurine rituals in the Iron IIB-C, though actual figurine iconography was more influenced by local Levantine traditions.

To test this hypothesis this chapter outlines the spread of rituals of protection and healing in the Iron II Near East (10.1). It also demonstrates that the Neo-Assyrian Empire had a significant impact on various aspects of Judean society (10.2) and on the healing and apotropaic rituals in the Mediterranean at large, even as far afield as ancient Greece (10.3). The chapter then briefly summarizes healing rites as they appear in the Hebrew Bible (10.4) as well as the role of intermediary semi-divine entities in protection and healing (10.5.) to indicate that rituals involved in protection and healing best explain the figurines’ iconography and archaeological deposition. Finally, the chapter summarizes the various types of evidence explored throughout the dissertation and their implications for understanding figurine development and function (10.6).
10.1 Healing rituals in the ancient Near East

It has been argued that ritual technique is more easily adopted than iconography because technai can be borrowed from another culture and adapted to local systems. Thus, it is less likely that an exact iconographic image will be transplanted from one place to another but possible that a method of ritual performance may be assimilated while preserving the uniqueness of local and regional systems.

One particular type of ritual technique that spread during the eighth and seventh centuries is healing rites. It is not that local cultures were devoid of their own healing rituals; but it seems to have become palatable to canvas far and wide for extra-national deities and practices, particularly in regard to healing and sickness. The most obvious

---


2 As for the inclusion of healing rites within religious ritual, Scurlock (“Physician, Exorcist, Conjurer, Magician,” 69-80) has already argued that older scholastic models differentiating between secular medicine and sacred healing in Mesopotamia are highly problematic. Additionally, see Robert D. Biggs, “Medicine, Surgery, and Public Health in Ancient Mesopotamia,” Journal of Assyrian Academic Studies 19 (2005): 1, 10-15. Biggs agrees that any distinction is highly problematic, though he divides his article into separate functions for the asû and the āšipu. See also Stefan M. Maul, “Die ‘Lösung vom Bann’: Überlegungen zu altorientalischen Konzeptionen von Krankheit und Heilkunst,” in Magic and Rationality in Ancient Near Eastern and Graeco-Roman Medicine (ed. H. F. J. Horstmanshoff and Marten Stol; Studies in Ancient Medicine 27; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 79-91. Maul argues that the āšipu was entrusted with both magico-religious and medical treatments.
biblical examples are the Syrian general Na’amān in 2 Kgs 5 and Ahazia consulting Baal-zebub of Ekron (2 Kgs 1:2-16).

In the eighth century even the Assyrian Empire increasingly adopted images of Babylonian deities and guardians in palace construction and in figurine rituals (Chapter 3). Parpola notes the presence of Egyptian dream interpreters, Hittite augurs, and Babylonian scholars as royal advisors in the Assyrian court. Private individuals also hired Babylonian scholars to teach the arts of exorcism, astrology, and extispacy.

While interactions prior to the Iron Age may have accounted for the spread of some rituals, the Iron II saw unique developments in Mesopotamian healing rites. Ancient Sumer and Old Babylon possessed medical traditions, but the diagnostic and

---

3 See also Noegel, “Greek Religion and the Ancient Near East,” 34.

4 Hector Avalos, Illness and Health Care in the Ancient Near East: The Role of the Temple in Greece, Mesopotamia, and Israel (HSM 54; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995), 283.

5 Julian Reade, “Ideology and Propaganda in Assyrian Art,” in Power and Propaganda: A Symposium on Ancient Empire (Mesopotamia) (ed. Mogens Trolle Larsen; Copenhagen Studies in Assyriology 7; Copenhagen: Akademisk, 1979), 335, 341. Reade notes that Babylon was considered the “traditional home of wisdom and magic.”


7 Parpola, “Neo-Assyrian Ruling Class,” 264. It is unclear how frequently private individuals hired ritual experts. In the present case, the individual was denounced to the king because these arts were considered a “royal prerogative.” For more see Simo Parpola, “The Man Without a Scribe and the Question of Literacy in the Assyrian Empire,” in Ana šadê Labnâni lû allîk: Festschrift für Wolfgang Röllig (ed. Hartmut Kühne and Paolo Xella B. Pongratz-Leisten; AOAT 247; Neukirchen-Vluyn, Germany: Neukirchener Verlag, 1997), 315-23, n. 18. For a more widespread set of examples, some of which date to the Bronze Age, see Burkert, Orientalizing Revolution, 42.

A prognostic handbook was in preparation between 1430 and 1050 B.C.E. and was redacted under the patronage of Adad-apla-iddina (1068-1047 B.C.E.). Assurbanipal (668-627 B.C.E.) also preserved a large collection of these texts in his Nineveh library; and another collection was found in Ašşur. Assurbanipal’s collection should be considered in light of the continuous sickness of his father, Esarhaddon, and Esarhaddon’s consistent interest in religious matters in general, and in medical rituals in particular.

Thus, the spread of medicinal practices, including those associated with figurines, is best situated during the Assyrian Empire, with significant increase in codification and

---

9 Ibid., 6-7.

10 Von Soden concurs with Scurlock’s dates, suggesting that most omen observations were collected only in the first millennium, more specifically the eighth and seventh centuries, though these may be the result of many generations of gradual accumulation. See Wolfram von Soden, *The Ancient Orient: An Introduction to the Study of the Ancient Near East* (trans. Donald G. Schley; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1994), 155-56. Likewise, von Soden suggests the great medical works arose in the first millennium, with most copies dating from 700 B.C.E. and beyond (ibid., 163).

11 On this see Sarah Chamberlin Melville, *The Role of Naqia/Zakutu in Sargonid Politics* (SAAS 9; Helsinki: Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project, Institute for Asian and African Studies, University of Helsinki, 1999), 81; Nevling Porter, *Images, Power, and Politics*, 68-71. Nevling Porter discusses Esarhaddon’s temple building program in Assyria. The fact that Babylonian deities feature prominently even in Assyrian figured texts associated with illness (as well as other rituals associated with *TDP*), also suggests a development largely dated to the Iron II. Although Assyrians already worshipped Marduk, the patron god of Babylon, in the fourteenth century, by the Neo-Assyrian period he was an established minor deity in Assyrian religion. Increasing attention was given to him by Assurnasirpal II (883-859 B.C.E.) and Sargon II (721-705 B. C. E.) (ibid., 137-38); but it was Esarhaddon who intensified the role of Marduk, also a key deity for exorcists and diviners, in Assyria (ibid., 120-31, 137-48). This followed a period of decline in Marduk’s position under Sennacherib (ibid., 138-40). In terms of politics, by the reign of Shalmaneser III (858-824 B.C.E) the Assyrians and Babylonians were involved in each other’s political operations, not that these were always friendly in nature. Even more significant, Tiglath-Pileser III ruled as king of Babylonia and was acknowledged as such in the Babylonian tradition (ibid., 28-29, 78-79). Further, Sennacherib’s siege of Babylon resulted in the capture of several Babylonian deity statues (including Anu and Šamaš) and their expatriation to Assyria, although they were subsequently returned to various Babylonian cities during Esarhaddon’s or Ashurbanipal’s reigns (ibid., 60-6, 148). Esarhaddon also rebuilt significant parts of Babylonia after Sennacherib’s destructive campaigns there (ibid., 6-7), and his government administered Babylonian temples with the help of middle and lower level local officials (ibid., 38, 62-64). Esarhaddon’s son was subsequently installed on the Babylonian throne (ibid., 133-36).
collection during the Neo-Assyrian Empire. As suggested in Chapter 3, performing the medical rituals in this period were the \textit{asū}, a type of pharmacist or healer, and the \textit{āšipu},\textsuperscript{12} whose patron goddess was Gula, a deity who often acted as an intermediary between the patient and the god or goddess responsible for the patient’s illness.\textsuperscript{13} In addition to deities, spirits were commonly attributed with the ability to inflict illness.\textsuperscript{14} Even the selection of bricks for royal building projects may have been motivated by the stones’ apotropaic and healing qualities.\textsuperscript{15}

Once again, this does not imply that Palestine knew no healing rituals or that Late Bronze figurines were never used in healing rituals.\textsuperscript{16} Rather, it is to suggest that contacts facilitated by the Assyrian Empire in the Iron II provide a better \textit{sitz im leben} for a renewed interest in healing rites than does the literature and figurines from Egypt that

\footnotesize

\textsuperscript{12} Scurlock and Andersen, \textit{Diagnoses in Assyrian and Babylonian Medicine}, 7, 10.

\textsuperscript{13} Ibid., 9. Avalos (\textit{Illness and Health Care in the Ancient Near East}, 100) claims that Esarhaddon was responsible for clarifying the place of Gula in the health professions. Avalos also lists a number of texts that refer to Gula as an exorcist and delineates the many medical functions she performs such as handling bandages, ointments, and scalpels, in addition to her roles listening to the people and providing “soothing incantations” (ibid., 108-10). He also explains that illnesses were recognized as coming from a particular god or goddess, and Gula was often seen as an intermediary leading the patient back to the god or goddess who caused the illness (ibid., 191, 227).

\textsuperscript{14} Scurlock and Andersen, \textit{Diagnoses in Assyrian and Babylonian Medicine}, 11-12.

\textsuperscript{15} John Malcolm Russell, “Sennacherib’s Palace Without Rival Revisited: Excavations at Nineveh and in the British Museum Archives,” in \textit{Assyria 1995: Proceedings of the 10th Anniversary Symposium of the Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project Helsinki, September 7-11, 1995} (ed. Simo Parpola and Robert M. Whiting; Helsinki: Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project, Department of Asian and African Studies, University of Helsinki, 1997), 299-300. Russell is citing an inscription from the east side of Kuyunjik that has a monumental gateway lined with a pair of inscribed bull colossi. The text refers to the apotropaic and healing functions of a number of stones from various locations, including stones for the prevention of plagues. Russell assumes these stones were subsequently used to build Sennacherib’s palace.

\textsuperscript{16} For the renowned of Egyptian healers in the second millennium, see Michael L. Brown, \textit{Israel’s Divine Healer} (Studies in Old Testament Biblical Theology; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Zondervan, 1995), 41-42.
date from the Late Bronze Age and earlier. The break in figurine traditions between the Late Bronze Age and Iron II in Judah and the different pattern of figurine and cult stand deposition during the Iron I and IIA (associated with shrine or temple spaces) stand between the pillar figurines and the Late Bronze plaques. Furthermore, several iconographic elements suggest a closer connection between Judah, Syria, and Phoenicia than between Judah and Egypt (Chapter 9).

Thus, new state formation patterns facilitated by the Assyrian Empire in the Iron II may have provided the general stability needed for society to develop healing rituals and perhaps a class of specialists to perform them. The content of such rituals in Palestine probably built upon long-standing traditions in the Levant, such as the association between healing and the naked female (see Chapter 9); but the renewed interest and capability may have been facilitated by the Assyrian Empire.

10.2 The case of Assyrian influence on Judah

Assuming that the Assyrian Empire provided a setting for the transmission of ritual technique, including the use of clay figurines in healing rituals, some doubt still exists as to the timing, extent, and nature of Assyrian influence in Judah and Jerusalem. Otzen claims that significant political and military influence affects this region beginning in the second half of the eighth century with the activities of Tiglath-Pileser III.17

17 Benedikt Otzen, “Israel under the Assyrians,” in Power and Propaganda: A Symposium on Ancient Empire (Mesopotamia) (ed. Mogens Trolle Larsen; Copenhagen Studies in Assyriology 7; Copenhagen: 554
Conversely, already in the time of Tiglath-Pileser I the Assyrians began to establish a relationship with the Phoenician city-states. Furthermore, there appears to have been some relationship between the Phoenicians and Israel as well, including the distribution and manufacture of Egyptian and Egyptianizing goods. Aubet also documents a number of tribute transactions and political interactions between the Assyrians, the Phoenicians, and the Syrians in the end of the ninth through the beginning of the eighth centuries. Likewise, Winter presents evidence for cultural contacts between northern Syria and Assyria as early as Tukulit-Ninurta II (890-884 B.C.E.). Thus, even before direct political control of the southern Levant, the Assyrians, through their relationship to the Phoenicians and Syrians, were already affecting economic and cultural interactions in the region.

Akademisk, 1979), 251. For more on the process of integration of provinces into the Assyrian center and the concomitant social, economic, and linguistic measures, see Parpola, “Neo-Assyrian Ruling Class,” 261-62.


Ibid., 268. On the combination of Egyptian, Assyrian, and Hittite forms in Phoenician ivory production, see ibid., 277.

Aubet, The Phoenicians and the West, 90-92.


Note, however, Na’aman claims that Assyrian activity in the eleventh century had minimal impact, even on Syria, though he does not consider any of the foregoing evidence. See Nadav Na’aman, “Forced Participation in Alliances in the Course of the Assyrian Campaigns to the West,” in Ah Assyria...: Studies in Assyrian History and Ancient Near Eastern Historiography Presented to Hayim Tadmor (ed. Mordechai Cogan and Israel Eph’al; ScrHier 33; Jerusalem: Magnes, 1991), 80. He does, however, argue that the
As for Judah, scholars often remark that the Assyrians never transferred the territory from vassal state into province. Postgate argues that client kingdoms were treated differently from the provinces of Assyria; they do not join Assyria nor do they worship (or provide mandatory offerings to) the state god. Rather, their yearly tribute payment is made to the king. He further claims that these client states enjoyed “ethnic and cultural diversity” as a result of Assyrian power.

This picture may give the impression that Judah was not influenced by Assyrian policy and culture. In contrast, regardless of whether Judah was transformed into a province, Assyrian influence must have been exerted on Judean society. The east-west demarcation line for the Assyrian province of northern Israel ran directly north of

increased interactions with the Assyrian Empire began before the reign of Tiglath-Pileser III, beginning instead with Ashur-dan II (932-912).

23 See also William W. Hallo, “From Qarqar to Carchemish: Assyria and Israel in the Light of New Discoveries,” BA 23 (1960): 33-61; Morton Cogan, *Imperialism and Religion: Assyria, Judah, and Israel in the Eighth and Seventh Centuries B.C.E.* (SBLMS 19; Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1974), 72. Otzen hypothesizes that the reason is two-fold. First, Judah provides a buffer state against Egypt, which it directly borders in the south. Additionally, Otzen argues that Assyria’s commercial interests in establishing trade may have influenced treatment of several of these states (ibid., “Israel Under the Assyrians,” 256-58). While Otzen does not specifically refer to Judean trade, he does argue that the initial treatment of Israel may have resulted from its access to coastal trade; transferring Israel into a set of provinces after her rebellion was also related to Assyria’s access to trade. Judah’s access to the southern Arabian trade route would make it valuable as well.


Jerusalem. This fact, in addition to Judah’s vassal status and known tribute debt, makes it impossible to claim that Assyrian expansion and empire had no impact on Judean social, economic, and political organization.

When Assyria’s influence has been cited, it is often in a negative sense. For example, it has sometimes been argued that Jerusalem expanded in the eighth and seventh centuries under the reigns of Hezekiah and Manasseh as a direct result of Assyrian military activity. According to Broshi’s classic argument, Hezekiah’s kingdom expanded due to the influx of refugees from the conquest of Samaria in 722 B.C.E. and again from the Shephelah after 701 B.C.E. Schniedewind also posits a number of textual arguments for the theory’s accuracy.

More recently, however, Na’aman has challenged the validity of both Broshi’s and Schniedewind’s positions, arguing that any acceptance of northern refugees was unlikely. Rather, he attributes Jerusalem’s population increase to the Shephelah’s destruction. Jerusalem became even more significant at this time, since it housed a

26 Otzen, “Israel Under the Assyrians,” 257.
substantial portion of Judah’s total population in the late eighth to early seventh centuries; and the evidence suggests that this was due, in part, to its relationship with the Assyrian Empire.\textsuperscript{30}

Unfortunately, nowhere does Schniedewind note the evidence for the significant contraction of Jerusalem’s size in the seventh century, as has been shown both at the City of David (Chapter 5) and the Jewish Quarter (Chapter 7).\textsuperscript{31} This contraction was probably a result of the dispersal of Shephelah refugees after the siege of Jerusalem,\textsuperscript{32} facilitated by the relative peace following Sennacherib’s withdrawal and Judah’s tribute payment. The new stability allowed Jerusalem’s agricultural hinterland to expand and settlements such as Gibeon and Ramat Rachel to develop.\textsuperscript{33} Finkelstein has also argued that this regained stability in the seventh century and the expansion to the Negev was facilitated

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Finkelstein, “Archaeology of the Days of Manasseh,” 177. See also Lipschits, Sergi, and Koch, “Royal Judahite Jar Handles,” 19. They argue that lmlk stamp distribution shows the Shephelah was significant for Judah’s economy in the eighth century but centralization shifted importance to Jerusalem and, secondarily, to the hill country settlements (like Ramat Rahel, Gibeon, and Mizpah) in the seventh century.
\item Schniedewind groups the eighth and seventh centuries together and his evidence for Jerusalem’s expansion in the seventh century, under Manasseh, is almost entirely textual. As for archaeology, he mentions only the possibility that Kenyon’s city wall should be dated to the seventh century rather than to Hezekiah (Schniedewind, “Jerusalem, the Late Judahite Monarchy, and the Composition of Biblical Texts,” 382 n.20). As was shown in Chapter 5, the dating of Shiloh’s areas, including a continuation of the Kenyon wall, to the end of the eighth century, make Schniedewind’s contention highly unlikely. He further argues that the surrounding agricultural settlements and the substantial remains at Gibeon and Ramat Rachel argue for Jerusalem’s prominence during Manasseh’s reign (ibid., 381-82).
\item Na’aman, “When and How Did Jerusalem Become a Great City?” 40-42.
\item Ibid., 40-41.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
by Assyrian permission to interact with the southern trade route.\(^{34}\) Seen from this perspective, the divergent types of goods, particularly elite goods, found in Area G of the City of David (including South Arabian script) (see Chapter 6) are a direct result of Assyrian hegemony. Thus, the general political situation of Iron IIB-C Judah, including Jerusalem’s centrality, was facilitated by Assyrian imperial policy.

Furthermore, Byrne has argued that the social landscape of Iron IIB Israel and Judah was reformatted in attempts to satisfy Assyrian tribute requirements.\(^{35}\) Postgate characterizes this period as the “imperial phase” of the Neo-Assyrian Empire, concentrated during the reigns of Sennacherib, Esarhaddon, and Assur-ban-apli. While the administrative structure remains consistent from the time of Tiglath-Pileser III, Assyrian economic and civil structures during the stability of the later years (particularly the seventh century) differed from that during the initial years of border expansion and consolidation.\(^{36}\) This suggests an increasingly entrenched relationship between the

---

\(^{34}\) Finkelstein, “Archaeology of the Days of Manasseh,” 178-79.


\(^{36}\) Ibid., 194.
Assyrian provinces and vassal states of the empire and the Assyrian center, particularly in the end of the eighth and into the seventh century.

Finally, some scholars have argued that Assyria withdrew from Palestine and Syria before Josiah’s reign (prior to 640). In contrast, Na’aman claims the evidence supports Assyrian activity in the area until the 620s at which time Assyria granted control to Egypt. Thus, the influence of the Assyrian Empire may have extended throughout the seventh century as well.

Also arguing against a purely antagonistic relationship between Judah and Assyria, Lipschits, Sergi, and Koch claim that the development of Judah’s administrative system during the first half of the eighth century was encouraged by its relationship with Assyria. They suggest that the intricate administrative system evidenced by lmlk jar handles could not have been developed in the short time before during Hezekiah’s reign and before Sennacherib’s attack. Rather, the system was developed when Judah initially became an Assyrian vassal kingdom under the pressure of tribute and taxation in kind in


the last quarter of the eighth century. Far from being a resistance measure to Assyria, the new system facilitated Judah’s economic relationship to Assyria as well as an administrative structure throughout southern Israel.

As to religion in particular, the most common assumption has been that the syncretistic practices attributed to Ahaz or Manasseh in the Hebrew Bible reflect an Assyriaizing impulse; and these were subsequently opposed by Josianic reform. The situation was certainly not that simple. In contrast, McKay and Cogan both argue that Ahaz’s altar may have been constructed in Syro-Phoenician style, seen in Damascus rather than Assyria. McKay still claims that reproducing the altar in the Jerusalem temple was necessitated by Ahaz’s new political relationship to the Assyrian Empire but

---

39 Lipschits, Sergi, and Koch, “Royal Judahite Jar Handles,” 6-7. As evidence, the authors cite agricultural intensification in the late eighth century, technological changes in agricultural production installations, the standardization of Judahite pottery, the introduction of marked weights, and the production of larger storage jars.

40 McKay, Religion in Judah under the Assyrians, 1-4. McKay dates the beginning of this movement to Oestreicher in 1923 and claims several of his premises were accepted throughout the following decades. These include characterizing both Ahaz and Manasseh as Assyrian vassals worshiping the Assyrian pantheon and interpreting Josiah’s reforms as rebellion against Assyrian sovereignty. Cogan demonstrates that the prominent view in the nineteenth century was that Assyria made little impression on Israelite apostasy. See Cogan, Imperialism and Religion, 1. He also argues that scholars began using Assyrian imperial policy to explain Judean practice as early as 1875 (ibid., 2).


42 For example, see Schniedewind, “Jerusalem, the Late Judahite Monarchy, and the Composition of Biblical Texts,” 385). See also Theodor Oestreicher, Das deuteronomische Grundgesetz (Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie 27/4. Gütersloh, Germany: Bertelsmann, 1923), 37-58.

43 McKay, Religion in Judah under the Assyrians, 6-7; Cogan, Imperialism and Religion, 73-77. Note that Cogan prefers Syrian rather than Phoenician influence.
that the style was more likely Syro-Phoenician than Assyrian. Similarly, the religious practices under Manasseh may be attributed to Canaanite or Phoenician influence; and even the presence of astral deities may be related to cultures outside that of Assyria. Thus, as with the figurines, Assyrian influence cannot be verified or denied based solely on whether Judah directly borrowed Assyrian iconography.

More compelling, Machinist has argued that several key passages in First Isaiah reflect a personal knowledge of Assyrian royal propaganda. Sparks also posits a relationship between Assyrian practice and the development of First Isaiah, particularly in regards to the Judean interest in borders and boundaries and kingship imagery associated with Yahweh. Sparks argues that these shifts resulted in an eighth through seventh century intensification of Judean religious identity and “exaltation of its national God.”

44 McKay, Religion in Judah under the Assyrians, 8; Cogan, Imperialism and Religion, 85-88.

45 McKay, Religion in Judah under the Assyrians, 20-23. The exception may be Manasseh practicing witchcraft and divination and associating with mediums and spiritists in 2 Kgs 21:6.

46 Ibid., 45-59.


48 Kenton L. Sparks, Ethnicity and Identity in Ancient Israel: Prolegomena to the Study of Ethnic Sentiments and Their Expression in the Hebrew Bible (Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1998), 201-2, 217. Sparks sees some influence on Hosea and Amos as well, though these are less well-documented in his study. For possible Assyrian influence on Deut 28:20-44 see Hans Ulrich Steymans, “Eine assyrische
Parpola has gone so far as to suggest a direct relationship between Yahwistic monotheism and that of Assyrian state religion and its worship of Aššur, particularly as propagated throughout the Assyrian Empire between 900 and 600 B.C.E. Furthermore, Halpern argues that the varying relationships with Assyria by Hezekiah, Manasseh, and Josiah were responsible for the jettisoning and demonization of rural tradition like “high places,” the development of iconoclasm and monotheism, changes in burial customs, reorganization of social hierarchy, rise of individuality, and the popularization of literary elite; and all this was intimately tied to the centralization of Jerusalem as an urban center at the end of the eighth and throughout the seventh centuries.

Vorlage für Deuteronomium 28, 20-44,” in Bundesdokument und Gesetz: Studien zum Deuteronomium (ed. Georg Baulik; Herders biblische Studien 4; Freiburg: Herder, 1994), 119-41; but see also Tigay (Deuteronomy, 497), who acknowledges the Assyrian parallels but insists that the blessings and curses were also known in local Israelite tradition.

49 Simo Parpola, “Monotheism in Ancient Assyria,” in One God or Many?: Concepts of Divinity in the Ancient World (ed. Barbara Nevling Porter; Transactions of the Casco Bay Assyriological Institute 1; Chebeague, Maine: Casco Bay Assyriological Institute, 2000), 167. Parpola argues that Aššur was understood as the “sum total of all the gods” already by the mid-eighth century (ibid., 172).

50 Ibid., 206. Parpola also claims this belief is not restricted to the elite but was “systematically propagated, by all possible means and over extended periods of time, to all segments of Assyrian population as well as to neighboring nations” (ibid., 167). He does not, however, fully support this assertion with documentary evidence other than the Succession Treaty of Esarhaddon. For a criticism of Parpola’s theory, arguing that Assyrians still worshipped a large number of deities, see Barbara Nevling Porter, “The Anxiety of Multiplicity: Concepts of Divinity as One and Many in Ancient Assyria,” in One God or Many?: Concepts of Divinity in the Ancient World (ed. Barbara Nevling Porter; Transactions of the Casco Bay Assyriological Institute 1; Chebeague, Maine: Casco Bay Assyriological Institute, 2000), 217-18, 223-28, 234, 238-39, 254, 256, 258, 263, 266, 268.

51 Baruch Halpern, “Jerusalem and the Lineages in the Seventh Century BCE: Kinship and the Rise of Individual Moral Liability,” in Law and Ideology in Monarchic Israel (ed. Baruch Halpern and Deborah W. Hobson; JSOTSupp 124; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991), 59-91. Despite the extensive materials presented by Halpern, he takes for granted the historical accuracy of a Josianic reform, as represented in the biblical text. Still, his points about the destruction of Jerusalem’s hinterland, the
Thus, influence from the Assyrian Empire was a force for the general reorganization of Judean religious practice and belief rather than the direct importation of Assyrian deities. At most, McCay argues that the transfer to vassal status and the implications for Yahweh’s supremacy, as well as the increased interaction with foreign elements on Judah’s borders, may have contributed to an increased interest in other deities and practices. Cogan also sites a number of general changes including trade, ivories, Judahite soldiers in the Assyrian army, the spread of languages, borders with Assyrian provinces, and disillusionment with Yahweh.

In light of these data, it is not surprising that the iconographic forms adopted by figurine makers in Jerusalem were not mere copies of Mesopotamian iconography. More likely, the rise of figurines in the late ninth/early eighth century appears to have been influenced by the increased use of small clay figurines in apotropaic and healing destruction of the countryside, and the centrality of Jerusalem do fit the historical facts, regardless of the degree to which they can be synchronized with the biblical narrative of Kings and Chronicles. Similarly, while Halpern presents several of these changes as calculated losses incorporated into Hezekiah’s reforms (interpreted by him as historically accurate), they could have resulted from the Assyrian destruction and the integration of Jerusalem into Assyrian hegemony, regardless of the historical accuracy of Hezekiah’s reform movement.

52 McKay, Religion in Judah under the Assyrians, 11, 71. Note that McCay calls these practices “superstitious and pagan rites.” Obviously the nomenclature is problematic, but his larger point remains compelling.

53 Cogan, Imperialism and Religion, 92-95.

54 Desa Rittig (Assyrisch-babylonische Kleinplastik magischer Bedeutung vom 13.-6. Jh. v. Chr. [Munich: Verlag Uni-Druck, 1977], 69) notes only one female figurine fragment, from a brick capsule next to the northwest temenos wall at Ur, dated to the Late Babylonian period. As noted in Chapter 3, the clay figurines associated with apotropaic and healing rituals in the texts were not representations of females. In contrast, as per Chapter 9, female plaque figurines were created in the Iron II but these have no known textual correlate.
rites, while the exact iconographic combination of symbols and forms was a unique and local manifestation.

10.3 Greece as a comparative test case

Greece is an interesting comparative case, because it, like Judah, was never under direct Assyrian control. Despite this fact, the eighth through sixth centuries in Greece are identified as the Orientalizing period; and this included the spread of magico-medical practice. Thus, the dissemination of ritual technologies can be tested by examining cultural interactions even further afield than Judah. This does not imply that the same situation obtained in both Greece and Judah but rather that the Assyrian Empire provided the historical setting for the spread of ritual technologies.

Even more than Mesopotamia, it is sometimes argued that healing rituals in Greece belonged either to medicine or to magic. For example, Fritz Graf argues for a separation between magic and medicine in the fifth century with the Hippocrates physicians. Graf believes this movement, which portrays magicians as charlatans, helped delineate magic as a subset of religion distinct from science.55 From this point of view, Greek medicine seems to reject Mesopotamian healing practice.

Fowler, however, complicates this division, noting that the same school of doctors mentioned by Graf is elsewhere comfortable with a number of “magical” rituals,

including sleeping in temples, dreams, and divination.\(^{56}\) Scarborough also demonstrates that no real distinction between religion and medicine is apparent in drug lore, whether the texts come from Homeric Greece or the *Papyri Graecae Magicae* of later centuries.\(^{57}\) From this perspective, it is much easier to identify ways in which Greek tradition accepted practices from the Near East.

This is not to suggest that contacts between the religions of Greece and the Near East were absent in the Bronze Age,\(^{58}\) but rather that a “renaissance” of Greek religion in the eighth century is often attributed to increasing contacts between the Aegean and Assyria.\(^{59}\) Beginning with Tiglath-Pileser III and his defeat of Urartu and subsequent control of Byblos and Tyre, and continuing through the reigns of Shalmaneser V, Sargon

---


\(^{59}\) Thomas believes that by the classical period, Greek authors, especially those describing medicinal practices, were more concerned with Egypt. At the same time, she cannot deny the evidence that suggests contacts were made between Greece and Mesopotamia in the Archaic period. See Rosalind Thomas, “Greek Medicine and Babylonian Wisdom: Circulation of Knowledge and Channels of Transmission in the Archaic and Classical Periods,” in *Magic and Rationality in Ancient Near Eastern and Graeco-Roman Medicine* (ed. H. F. J. Horstmanshoff and Marten Stol; Studies in Ancient Medicine 27; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 175-85.
II, Sennacherib, and Assurbanipal, the Assyrian Empire was increasingly involved in Aegean matters in both trade and warfare. Assyrian control over Phoenician territories helped undergird Phoenician control of Cyprus at sites like Kition by the end of the eighth century and into the seventh century and is further demonstrated by the basalt stela of Sargon II set up at Kition in 707 B.C.E.

Furthermore, some scholars have hypothesized that foreign itinerant seers and purification priests in Greece spread “sacred, ‘magical,’ and medical traditions.” As further proof, Noegel cites the introduction of Gallo and Lamia, child-killing demons, the Gorgon masks, and dog images in the eighth and seventh centuries. Faraone also mentions the introduction of incense burning, purifactory rituals, hepatoscopy, and foundation deposits; and, following Burkert, Scarborough hypothesizes that the Homeric passages describing travelling craftsmen skilled in medical and herbal lore resulted from a “continuous and gradual infiltration of medical and herbal lore from the


61 Smith, Art and Society in Cyprus, 11. See also Burkert, Orientalizing Revolution, 11-14.

62 Noegel, “Greek Religion and the Ancient Near East,” 30. See also Burkert, Orientalizing Revolution, 55-64. Bukert expresses a note of caution on the purification priests. He admits that “suggestive possibilities” connect the Greek purification rituals to that of the āšipu but no “inconvertible proofs.” Rather, Burkert’s evidence consists of similar ritual actions but performed for different purposes. He attempts to relate the use of rituals to combat illness in Mesopotamia to the use of similar rituals for social purity in Greece but admits the substantial challenges to the theory.


64 Faraone, Talismans and Trojan Horses, 26-27. Note that he is following Burkert rather than making a new argument. For the spread of hepatoscopy, there is evidence that its popularity arose already in the Bronze Age rather than the Neo-Assyrian period in the Near East, but Burkert claims it spread to Greece again in ca. 700 B.C.E. (Burkert, The Orientalizing Revolution, 48-49.)
Near East and Egypt. Geller likewise notes the possibility that NAM.BÚR.BI rituals and Šurpu style rituals were used in Greece for cure and protection from portended or actual disease.

In regard to figurine rituals and healing, Burkert makes a number of observations. He first identifies the close parallels between Mesopotamian and Greek depictions of the afterlife and the difficulties caused by the dead, including illness. Burkert then describes the use of figurines as effigies to protect against sorcerers and the dead in Akkadian and Egyptian texts and likens these texts to a number of Greek texts. Admittedly, most of Burkert’s textual evidence is later, but he interprets the texts as representing earlier practices. He also notes the spread of the cult of Gula, the goddess of healing, as shown

---


68 Ibid., 66-71. In particular, he cites a “voodoo doll” from the Periclean era at Athens, Theocritus, Plato, and a fourth century B.C.E. text from Cyrene.
by Akkadian style bronze dog figurines excavated from the seventh century levels at the
Hera sanctuary on Samos.  

Elsewhere, Burkert argues that the rationale undergirding Platonic descriptions of
“mendicant seers” who help cure psychosomatic illnesses is similar to the rationale
undergirding Assyrian incantation priests who provide explanations of diseases. He also
compares Assyrian practices with the purification procedures of some Greek magicians.  
Furthermore, by comparing Mesopotamian and pre-Hypocratic Greek medicine, Geller
concludes that “some type” of relationship must have existed between them, going so far
as to suggest that the Babylonian-style medicine was the one major system of medicine
prior to the fifth century.  

While agreeing that ritual techniques and logics related to protection and healing
spread in the Orientalizing period, Faraone argues that, in the case of images, “belief in
protective statues was probably a widespread cultural phenomenon throughout Palestine,
Syria, and Anatolia.” He further claims that “the use of magically animated statues at
the threshold and elsewhere is a cultural phenomenon shared by all eastern Mediterranean

69 Ibid., 75. Gula, under a number of related names, is not unique to the seventh century; but the epithet,
“the great healer,” referenced by Burkert, does occur specifically in the seventh century treaty of
Esarhaddion with Baal of Tyre and the Succession Treaty of Esarhaddion (Brown, Israel’s Divine Healer,
71). In these cases Gula is also referred to as an agent able to cause harm should the treaty be broken.
71 Geller, “West Meets East,” 59-60. Geller does not consider internal developments in Mesopotamian
practice, preferring instead to talk about one long-standing tradition stretching from the second millennium
to the Parthian period. At least in regards to figurines in these rituals, this monolithic continuity has been
contested (see below).
72 Faraone, Talismans and Trojan Horses, 27.
cultures but that the habit of building them in monumental size and of durable stone is a separate and more specialized practice” which spread to Greece in the eighth century, not due to “new found belief in the efficacy of such images” but because of political and economic stability that allowed large-scale building and on technological developments.\textsuperscript{73}

Unfortunately, Faraone’s evidence for this timeless belief is problematic. He first assumes that protective statues were widespread, even though he admits “actual statues have rarely survived outside Syria and Mesopotamia.”\textsuperscript{74} In actuality, as has been shown in Chapter 3, there is little archaeological or textual evidence for the practice of small protective statues in Assyria or Mesopotamia, particularly those in the home, prior to the ninth through sixth centuries. Furthermore, there is little evidence of their presence in Israel, Judah, or any of the Transjordanian kingdoms in the Iron I or Iron IIa, with the possible exception of Philistine hand-pinched figurines, though these also decrease between the Iron I and II. Furthermore, hand-pinched Cypriot figurines in the Iron I/IIa are also fairly small in number in comparison to later composite figurines (see Chapter 9).

Second, although Faraone believes protective images were common in Israel prior to the eighth and seventh centuries, his evidence for Israelite practice rests on the biblical cherubim and teraphim, which he assumes are equated with lamassu and shêdu in Hittite

\textsuperscript{73} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{74} Ibid.
lexica. He does not consider the date of the texts in question or any updated linguistic commentary on the problematic Hebrew terminology.

Third, he does not consider the possibility that the large scale and small scale images made from different materials represent two related but different ritual developments. He writes, “these buried figurines fashioned and deployed by specially trained priests apparently served the same purpose as the larger monumental portal statues discussed already.” He does not deal with the differences in technological characteristics of the statues (such as style or material), clientele, or purpose of the rituals.

Though Faraone concludes that the full manifestation of these royal protective images emerges in ninth century under Assurnasirpal II, he does not consider the

---

75 Faraone, Talismans and Trojan Horses, 27. There is no discussion of the date for any of the texts in question, which include Gen 3:24; 31:19; 1 Sam 19:13, 16, and Ezek 21:26; and the sources Faraone cites date to 1922, 1932, and 1966.

76 For the problematic nature of the etymology of teraphim, see Karel van der Toorn and Theodore Lewis, “תְּרָפִים,” TDOT 15: 778-79. The authors suggest that the Hittite etymology has found some support mainly because the Hebrew lexica do not provide a convincing etymological argument. They also conclude that, even were the theory to be accurate, it reveals very little about Israelite religion.

77 Winter, “Le Palais Imaginaire,” 111. Winter discusses the differences between royal palace reliefs and cylinder seals, suggesting attention must be paid to the differing goals and audience.

78 Faraone, Talismans and Trojan Horses, 24. This may result from the fact that Faraone uses ancient Near Eastern evidence of small statues, elite metal objects, and large protective images interchangeably to provide the backdrop for understanding the guardian statues in the myths associated with Hephaestus (ibid., 21-24).

79 Ibid., 21. In actuality, already by 1056 B.C.E. the combined building projects of Tiglath-Pileser and Ashur-bel-kala produced a number of different gate guardians constructed in Ashur. See Collins, Assyrian Palace Sculptures, 23. Even if the building projects of Assurnasirpal II were considered a watershed, these still predate the majority of small figurine finds by at least a century if not two. See also Irene J. Winter, “Ornament and the ‘Rhetoric of Abundance’ in Assyria,” in On Art in the Ancient Near East: Volume 1: Of
possibility that the motivations for monumental royal sculptures may be unique. For example, it has been suggested that the integration of certain types of large protective images in monumental royal art was driven by an impulse to demonstrate Assyrian domination over the lands in its empire.\(^{80}\) Moreover, Reade notes that, when placed in their original context, these palace guardian figurines would not have appeared so prominent as they do in the scholarly literature that focuses on them and takes them out of architectural context.\(^{81}\) Moreover, Winter argues that the period after Assurnasirpal saw the decrease in mythological elements in large-scale royal art in favor of historical narratives, largely because the audience admitted to the king came increasingly from

---

\(^{80}\) Collins, Assyrian Palace Sculptures, 23. In addition to the lions and lamassu, Tiglath-Pileser I adopted a number of images from the Mediterranean and Iran with the intent of showing the extent of the Assyrian Empire. For the unique internal changes to supernatural guardian figurines in temple complexes from the second millennium until 700 B.C.E. see Julian Reade, “Religious Ritual in Assyrian Sculpture,” in Ritual and Politics in Ancient Mesopotamia (ed. Barbara Nevling Porter; AOS 88; New Haven: American Oriental Society, 2005), 9. Reade (“Ideology and Propaganda in Assyrian Art,” 335) also notes a preponderance of “Assyrian” images in palace sculpture of the ninth century, but subsequently these were added to and replaced by images from Babylon and the western provinces. Furthermore, in her investigation of Assurnasirpal’s palace in particular, Winter claims that the genii statues function in a unique way. Those in the throne room were intended to communicate the sacral position of the king. See Irene J. Winter, “Royal Rhetoric and the Development of Historical Narrative in Neo-Assyrian Reliefs,” in On Art in the Ancient Near East: Volume I: Of the First Millennium B.C.E. (Culture and History of the Ancient Near East 34.1; Brill: Leiden, 2010), 9-10, 21, 23; repr. from Studies in Visual Communications 7 (1981): 2-38. The incorporation of genii in the palace of Sargon II (725-705 B.C.E.) is also understood to be demonstrating the king’s role as protector of the past (ibid., 36, n. 21).

\(^{81}\) Reade, “Ideology and Propaganda in Assyrian Art,” 335. Reade notes the exterior walls were largely plain except for these “magical” decorations at entrances and crenellations. He also notes magical figures would also appear on the lower parts of the throne room façade (ibid., 336). Some may also have been placed in the throne room or on a reception wing (ibid., 338). He finally notes that the king as worshipper was the scenes most widely viewed, particularly on stelae which were designed for public appearance.
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outside Mesopotamia and would lack the symbolic knowledge to interpret the mythological and cultic scenes. Finally, Wiggermann notes the differences (and similarities) between texts describing figurines in the home versus similar images on orthostats in the royal palaces, with only the former motivated by portended evil or sickness.

Ultimately, Faraone is probably correct to suggest that the use of images to protect against evil is a wide-spread phenomenon (certainly not limited to the Mediterranean), but incorrect to assume no further specificity for particular manifestations or disseminations of these rituals is possible. More likely, the increasing use of figurines in healing and protective rituals at this particular time may have been facilitated by the spread of Assyrian influence throughout the Mediterranean.

82 Winter, “Royal Rhetoric and the Development of Historical Narrative,” 38-39, 41-42. Note, however, that genii, fish-priests, and griffins did not disappear entirely from royal art but became lesser components of the overall reliefs. On this see Winter, Palaise Imaginaire, 127 n. 15.

83 Wiggermann, Mesopotamian Protective Spirits, 97. While Wiggermann recognizes some similarities between the ritual texts and Assyrian palace reliefs, he notes a number of differences, perhaps the most important being the guardian figurines described in the ritual are installed in response to some dire event, perhaps sickness, while the royal sculptures were erected simultaneous with the building. Thus, the royal sculptures are not motivated by portended evil or sickness, but by a prima facia desire to secure divine approval.

84 Faraone (Talismans and Trojan Horses, 80-81) makes the same general statements for rituals binding, burning, and burying figurines. Although his examples come from Maqlû, NAM.BUR.BI texts, and the Hand of Ghost texts, dated, in large part, to the ninth through sixth centuries (Chapter 3), he suggests statues were treated this way “[i]n Assyria continuously from the second millennium down to the Persian conquest.” Even if one or two spells from the second millennium were found, this would hardly support a continuous practice spanning two thousand years. Further, this chronological spread is substantiated for Egypt but only with the caveat that the majority of evidence comes from Middle Kingdom, with a resurgence in evidence from the Hellenistic period, as Faraone admits (ibid., 79). Ultimately, Faraone’s own lack of chronological specificity may be to be blame for his difficulty in establishing dissemination patterns, rather than a continuous and unchanging ritual behavior endemic to the entire eastern Mediterranean.
10.4 Healing rituals in the Hebrew Bible

Despite the significant differences between Mesopotamian and biblical texts, Mesopotamian practice shares some important similarities with healing rituals mentioned in the Bible. In both cases persons who were ill assume the illness resulted from their own actions, and in both societies a deity is attributed with causing the illness. Even more, in both cases patients were to remain in the home rather than travel to the temple.

Moreover, Avalos tentatively posits a shift in healing procedures in Israel, from the sick travelling to shrines and the temple to their being excluded from these spaces. For example, in the Shiloh tradition Hannah visits the shrine to petition for healing from her infertility (1 Sam 1). Avalos argues that the tradition responsible for the Shiloh story must have been earlier than that in Leviticus; thus earlier Israelite healing rituals allowed the sick to petition Yahweh at shrines. Avalos also claims that the bronze serpent was associated with the temple and used for healing petitions prior to its removal by Hezekiah.

---

85 This is not to downplay the significant differences but to show that some similarities are apparent.

86 Avalos, Illness and Health Care in the Ancient Near East, 258.

87 Avalos (ibid., 173-82) discusses the centrality of the home in Mesopotamian health care. See also Chapter 3. For people confined to the home in Israel see ibid., 249, 251-54.

88 Ibid., 336.

89 Ibid., 338-49. In contrast with its creation in Num 21, where the serpent was treated as an intermediary object in a ritual targeting Yahweh, by 2 Kgs 18:4 it is the object of veneration (ibid., 348). See also Handy, Among the Host of Heaven, 140-44. The object is described as a metal image, an important distinction that stands between it and clay figurines and may explain why it was eventually prohibited.
In contrast, after removing the serpent, Hezekiah does not reportedly enter the temple to seek healing for his own illness.  

Avalos also notes that Solomon’s prayer in 1 Kgs 8, which he dates to the postexilic period, instructs the sick to spread their hands toward the temple rather than come near or enter the temple. Priestly temple proscriptions also require those with an illness to remain in the home.

Unlike the āšipu of Mesopotamia, the Bible does not preserve a record of healing rituals performed by the priest, whose main concerns in the text relate to identifying purity and impurity. Rather, when stories mention healing, the agent is usually the prophet. Avalos argues that by the time P was completed, whether dated to the preexilic or postexilic periods, neither temple nor the priesthood were associated with therapeutic ritual.

This does not necessarily imply that healing rituals were not performed. The Bible preserves another set of texts that refer to “healers.” Because Avalos assumes the Bible proscribes a strict monotheism, he argues that this term refers to illicit health care.

_________________________

90 Avalos, *Illness and Health Care in the Ancient Near East*, 357.

91 Ibid., 344. As proof that the prayer does not simply reflect an exilic community, three other times in the same prayer people are encouraged to come to the temple (ibid., 355).

92 Ibid., 327-31. He also notes that the Shiloh shrine did not prohibit the blind, since Eli continued serving after becoming blind (ibid., 334-35). This is also at variance with priestly legislation.

93 Ibid., 365-67. See also Brown, *Israel's Divine Healer*, 96-97; though Brown interprets the root ᵣᵉʳ as meaning “to make whole” or “restore” which may imply healing but has a broader semantic range.

94 Avalos, *Illness and Health Care in the Ancient Near East*, 260-276. The prophet’s methods are depicted as simpler than many (though not all) Mesopotamian healing rituals.

95 Ibid., 395.
officials. In contrast, he claims that Yahweh is the one who heals and that his approved intermediaries, like the prophets, are never called healers.\textsuperscript{96}

If, however, passages with a disapproving tone were written later, then nothing suggests that such occupations were disapproved of during the monarchy. In fact, a bulla of a seal belonging to a “healer” was actually recovered in the City of David excavations from Area G, the elite quarter (Chapter 5). Furthermore, many of the passages to which Avalos refers are not condemning healers but are using the metaphor to condemn Israel for attempting to heal her great sin. They also indict Israel for looking for healing without first applying for repentance from the god against whom she has sinned.\textsuperscript{97}

Avalos is correct to note that the majority of biblical texts referring to healing refer to Yahweh as healer, though as pointed out elsewhere, there is no reason to believe that a material used to aid in healing rituals would have threatened Yahweh’s supremacy. In fact, even in the Ugaritic texts (Chapter 9), the healing, though accomplished through the use of Shatiqatu, is attributed to El.

\textsuperscript{96} Ibid., 286-87.

\textsuperscript{97} See for example Jer 8:22; 46:11; 51:8-9. Rather than passages demonstrating that a human healer is always ineffective, as Avalos suggests (ibid., 290), these passages actually rely upon the common practice of going to healers and using materials, like balm, for healing purposes. The fact that they do not work in these cases is because Judah’s sin is so great. In the case of Asa in 2 Chr 16:12, by the postexilic period healers may have been considered non-Yahwistic. This does not necessarily apply to conceptions in the Iron IIB-C. Antagonism toward healers would compliment certain attitudes toward the sick and their exclusion from the temple that Avalos describes (ibid., 375-76 for Qumran). Furthermore, he shows that the healer actually receives a positive evaluation from Sirach (Sirach 38, ibid., 294-95). In direct contrast with the way Avalos interprets the prophetic metaphors, see Brown, \textit{Israel’s Divine Healer}, 44-46. On the Chronicles text, Brown (ibid., 51), reading the text in context, interprets Asa’s problem differently. It was not that he sought a healer but that he did not repent from his numerous sins (described in the first half of chapter 16) for which he was punished. He also argues that Asa makes an oracular consultation from the healer (ibid, 51-52). For an argument for amending the text to “shades” making the sin one of necromancy see Smith, \textit{Early History of God}, 168-69.
In sum, biblical texts may allude to a development in healing rituals in which the sick originally travelled to shrines where rites took place. At some point, perhaps as early as the Iron IIB, the sick were excluded from temple space; and healing rituals must have taken place in the home. It is also possible that rituals related to illness always took place in the home. Obviously, if figurines were associated with these types of rituals, their location in domestic units would be explained.

Furthermore, if Avalos is correct to suggest that some postexilic authors considered healers problematic or associated them with non-Yahwistic practices, this may help explain the absence of figurines from Yehud in that period. Furthermore, if figurine rituals involved a class of learned specialists, then the Babylonian conquest would have interrupted their activities, explaining the cessation of figurine production at settlements in Judah.

10.5 Protection, healing, and divine intermediaries in the Hebrew Bible

Returning to Chapter 1, Tuttle suggests that apotropaism is only a useful category if the dangers from which people were threatened are identified. Assuming that the Hebrew Bible reflects some semblance of the fears and dangers experienced by people in Iron II Judah, from what does it suggest people needed protection?

Without delving into the extensive problem of theodicy in the Hebrew Bible, it is sufficient to say that most texts claim Yahweh doles out punishment, misfortune, and even sickness. So too in Mesopotamian literature, sickness was often attributed to the “hand of” a god or goddess who needed to be supplicated in order to save the sick (see
Chapter 3). However, just as Yahweh sometimes uses agents or implements to affect healing (e.g., Num 21), he also uses agents to inflict sickness and misfortune.\footnote{It is not necessary to argue whether Israelites originally attributed sickness and misfortune to independent divine figures that were subsequently co-opted by Yahweh, a point which seems clear. Rather, even in a more monotheistic guise, a number of texts show that Yahweh uses divine intermediaries to bring destruction and sickness.}

For example, the “messenger of the Lord”\footnote{Handy, Among the Host of Heaven, 153-54. Handy notes that many scholars believe the messenger of Yahweh was added to the text to replace other deities omitted in a late monotheistic worldview. For support for the interpretation that Yahweh’s messenger was once considered divine, see ibid., 157-59.} strikes the camp of the Assyrians (2 Kgs 19:35=Isa 37:36=2 Chr 32:21), a possible illusion to a plague. The messenger also brings a plague over Israel as punishment for David’s census (2 Sam 24:16-17=1 Chr 21:12, 15-16, 18, 30). Messengers are attributed with destruction against the Egyptians (Ps 78:49). Along the same lines, Yahweh may send an evil spirit to cause discontent between parties (Judg 9:23) or to afflict (1 Sam 16:14-16, 23; 18:10; 19:9); Yahweh may also send a deceiving spirit (1 Kgs 22:21-23=2 Chr 18:20-22).

Furthermore, some texts may refer to dangerous divine or semi-divine forces like “death,”\footnote{Day, Yahweh and the Gods and Goddesses of Canaan, 185-90.} “pestilence and plague,”\footnote{Ibid., 199-206.} and perhaps the dead (though this is less likely).\footnote{The Hebrew Bible does not seem to describe the dead causing pain or illness as do the etemmu of Mesopotamia (Tom Nash, “Devils, Demons, and Disease: Folklore in Ancient Near Eastern Rites of Atonement,” in The Bible in the Light of Cuneiform Literature: Scripture in Context 3 [ed. William Hallo, Bruce William Jones, and Gerald L. Mattingly. Lewiston, N. Y.: Edwin Mellen, 1990], 65, 78); though necromancy is known from both cultures. Alternatively, a great number of Psalms liken physical suffering and illness to a descent into Sheol. On this point see Phillip S. Johnston, Shades of Sheol: Death and Afterlife in the Old Testament (Downer's Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 2002), 95-97. While the language is certainly metaphorical, the strong connection between illness and the realm of the dead may betray connections in a de-mythologized form. At the same time the “shades” are usually characterized as weak}
Perhaps the longest list of these entities is found in Psalm 91, a prayer for protection from a host of evils, not entirely dissimilar from the lists of evils found in Mesopotamian figurine rituals. This particular psalm lists the “snare of the trapper,” “deadly pestilence” (v 3), “the terror by night,” “the arrow that flies by day,” (v 5), “the pestilence that stalks in darkness,” “the destruction that lays waste at noon” (v 6), “evil,” “plague,” (v 10), “lion,” and “cobra” (v 13). 

Of interest, although Yahweh is ultimately the protector, the psalm suggests that Yahweh may use messengers for protection as well (vv 11-12). Nor is this unique to Psalm 91. Elsewhere divine intermediaries are also charged with protection. These 

and powerless (ibid., 128) despite the tantalizing possibility that the root was related to the verb “to heal” (ibid., 130). Still, the biblical evidence suggests that Israelites may have considered demons to be more dangerous than the dead. In comparison Johannes C. de Moor (An Anthology of Religious Texts from Ugarit [Leiden: Brill, 1987], 175) notes that inhabitants at Ugarit often attributed illness and misfortune to demonic characters. See also Brian B. Schmidt, Israel’s Beneficent Dead: Ancestor Cult and Necromancy in Ancient Israelite Religion and Tradition (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, Paul Seibeck, 1994), 287. Ultimately, both demons and the dead may have been associated with the underworld; even in Mesopotamia the line between demons and those who suffered an unfortunate death is permeable.

103 Day (Yahweh and the Gods and Goddesses of Canaan, 206-7) cites a number of scholars who see this as an allusion to Reseph.

104 Mark S. Smith, “Primary and Secondary Religion in Psalms 91 and 139: A Response to Andreas Wagner,” in Primäre und sekundäre Religion als Kategorie der Religionsgeschichte des Alten Testaments (ed. Andreas Wagner; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2006) 102. Smith notes first, that this Psalm was incorporated into Qumran as 11Q11=11QPsAp in a group of exorcistic texts. Second, following Herbert. J. Levine (Sing Unto God a New Song: A Contemporary Readings of the Psalms [Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana Studies in Biblical Literature, 1995], 68-71), he connects the הָעַר of this Psalm with the ritual for the purification of the person with skin disease in Lev 14 (see Chapter 8), arguing that this psalm was meant to be recited over a person who had an illness (taking vv 14-16 as a response by Yahweh to the sick person and to the officiate). While the Leviticus ritual, in its present form, clearly takes place after the person is well, there is nothing in the psalm that suggests it was not used in the process of a healing ritual.

105 E.g., for messengers, see: Gen 16:7-13; 19; 21:17; Exod 23:20; Ps 34:8; for cherubim, see Gen 3:24; Exod 25:22; 1 Kgs 6; for seraphim, see Isa 6:2, 6. This is excluding later books like Zechariah and Daniel,
intermediaries also communicate messages between the Yahweh and humans, including those related to healing, like Yahweh granting children to barren women (Gen 18; Judg 13:3).

This is not to suggest that the pillar figurines necessarily depicted biblical angels, cherubim, or seraphim, but that even the authors of the Bible, writing in some cases long after the fact and with a careful skepticism of polytheism, recognized that other divine or semi-divine entities or intermediaries existed in ancient Israel. Some were associated with protection and some with destruction; and in the case of Psalm 91 they may even be pitted against each other.

10.6 Summary

10.6.1 Figurines as goddesses

Having established the four most prevalent interpretive positions in Chapter 2, these positions have been tested against various types of information bearing on figurine function. The first of these positions, that the figurines are major goddesses, is difficult to support in light of the evidence. Mesopotamian figurine rituals indicate that entities represented by figurines never include the main gods and goddesses who are actually the objects of supplication in the accompanying incantations. These texts also suggest that clay is rarely used to create the images of major deities.

where angelology is even further developed. On the *seraphim* as protective symbols see Handy, *Among the Host of Heaven*, 154-56; on *cherubim* see ibid., 156 n.22.
The archaeological context of figurines in Jerusalem and the hill country also suggest that figurines were not treated with the special regard due to important figures in the pantheon. They are found as trash deposited with other common debris and used secondarily as fill along with other discarded objects. They are not used in formal shrine space. Petrographic testing also suggests that the figurines’ construction does not suggest the figurines were elite cultic objects.

The portrayal of clay in biblical texts also argues that clay was not widely recognized as a material for the construction of idols, which are more commonly constructed from metal, stone, and/or wood. Clay items were not generally associated with temple or tabernacle, and clay is often referred to in metaphors that emphasize the cheapness and breakability of clay items. Nor are clay images ever directly prohibited in biblical texts.

Iconographic investigation suggests that none of the components of the JPF design are associated with a main goddess, whether in Mesopotamia, Syria, or the Levant. Where the naked female form is absorbed into Egyptian tradition, the manner of her depiction suggests the adoption of a foreign deity who was secondarily given attributes, epithets, and a place in the pantheon. Furthermore, the distinctive headdress associated with the molded heads is not associated with major goddesses but is found on seals, ivories, and metals usually placed upon semi-divine beings, divine beings, cultic officiates, or servants. The same is true for the turban or turban and sidelocks.
10.6.2 Figurines in popular religion

The second major interpretive position is that figurines belong to the realm of popular religion as practiced by lower levels of society. The figurine rituals are interpreted as antithetical to official orthodoxy and explained as endemic to neighboring groups whose traditions would be heterodox in Judah. As suggested in Chapter 2, this paradigm is theoretically problematic. Moreover, when compared with the various data the strict schematization is unsupported. Rather a more nuanced picture of religious ritual emerges.

Figurine rituals in Mesopotamia were performed by a class of priests that was associated with the temple but that was not restricted to practice within its walls. Nor was the temple the only location of specialized texts needed to perform the rituals. Thus, even in Mesopotamia, the ritual specialists had a complex relationship with the temple system, the local population, and the royal house.

The archaeological context of the Jerusalem figurines indicates that figurines on the southeastern hill were used in many types of neighborhoods, including those probably inhabited by temple and royal elites. The large number of figurine fragments recovered from domestic contexts suggests that the rituals must have been performed in or near the home. Figurines are not found in shrine spaces in Jerusalem or the hill country, implying they may have passed out of the realm of public religious ritual.

At the same time, the relative dates of the figurines and their stylistic changes do not suggest any correlation with reform movements. Both types of figurines arise prior to the supposed reforms of Hezekiah, remain popular through the end of the eighth century,
and continue to be produced through the supposed Josianic reform and until the
destruction of Jerusalem. Thus, they appear to have been totally unaffected by reforms
associated with Yahwistic orthodoxy, had such reforms taken place.

Petrographic analysis, ethnographic analogy, and ancient Near Eastern texts
indicate that figurines were produced by a number of ceramic producers in Jerusalem
rather than by a single manufacturer associated with the king or the temple. The
preference for certain clays is best explained as a result of local ritual expectations rather
than formal command or regulation. Further, the fact that an overwhelming number of
figurines were produced from local clays eliminates the possibility that figurines were
imported from foreigners or adopted from surrounding cultic traditions.

The biblical data also suggest that items made from clay were used in rituals
involving priest and populace and were often performed in the home, though occasionally
at shrines. Moreover, the Bible does not preserve any prohibitions of clay objects
including figurines. While this may be an argument from silence, other passages in the
Bible suggest that the material out of which an image was constructed was important for
the meaning and function of the image. Furthermore, where prohibitions use more all-
compassing terminology, they tend to be late and thus preserve postexilic traditions,
when figurines are unknown in Judah.

The iconographic materials also indicate that figurines partake in the long-
standing Levantine tradition of the naked female, which was associated with healing
already by the Late Bronze Age. While they do share common features with neighboring
iconographic traditions, their previous presence in Palestine would not have led the Iron
II figurines to be considered foreign intrusions. Further, their iconographic ambiguities indicate that the figurines would not have been in direct competition with major deities of the pantheon.

Figurine rituals cut across distinctions between shrine and household ritual. The rituals probably took place in the home (though other contexts, like graves, cannot be totally ruled out) but were not necessarily officiated by those living in the structures and probably involved some type of formal officiate. Figurine rituals were performed by a large percentage of the populace regardless of socio-economic status. The style and manufacture of the figurines also indicate that many different people were producing and procuring figurines for the rituals. Although the iconography shares some similarities with the figurines of neighboring areas, JPFs exhibit a distinctive local style, suggesting that they would not have been considered foreign objects by most of the people; nor is there evidence that figurines were prohibited or intentionally destroyed. Finally, figurine rituals from elsewhere suggest that even in Mesopotamia and Ugarit main deities were attributed with the power to inflict and cure sickness; and the figurines were primarily intermediaries whose power extended over other lower-level beings, like demons and ghosts. In this sense figurines would not have threatened the belief in Yahweh, whether Yahweh was considered the head deity above others or the only deity.

10.6.3 Figurines and socio-economic status

The third interpretive paradigm, which is a corollary to many popular religion interpretations, is that the quality of the figurines indicates they were used by the poor
and/or disenfranchised. In sharp contrast, Mesopotamian rituals suggest that figurine rituals could actually be quite expensive, involving a long list of ritual actions and materials, even for the purification of the clay itself. Unfortunately, the majority of these materials would not survive in the archaeological record.

Archaeological distribution and petrographic analysis also argue against any correlation between figurine make, style, deposition, and economic status. The figurines were found in both elite and non-elite areas. Furthermore, both molded and pinched heads were found in all areas, arguing against any association between molded heads and the elite. Nor do the areas generally correlate with the quality of the clay used to construct figurines or their iconographic styles. Figurines of certain clays or iconographic types were not found with a higher percentage of elite goods, like ivories. Further, clay type, ethnographic analogy, and ancient Near Eastern texts do not support the interpretation that poorly made figurines were produced by the lower classes on an ad hoc basis. Figurines appear to have been produced by full-time potters who made a range of clay items.

At the same time, biblical texts suggest that clay was a cheaper material than metal or wood. It is contrasted with items, like fine cloth, metals, and precious stones, that were used in the temple or tabernacle. Clay is also highlighted as being breakable and fragile, though its endurance is also evoked in certain texts. Moreover, the technical qualities of the figurines suggest that their appearance was only of moderate concern, with very badly damaged pieces consistently whitewashed and painted for use. Thus, the
figurines are certainly not elite objects; but nor do they suggest that those using or making the figurines were necessarily non-elite persons.

10.6.4 Figurines and females

Finally, the data do not seem to support a special connection between the figurines and female petitioners or concerns. None of the Mesopotamian figurine rituals list specific female concerns among the evils combated, though certainly female concerns could fall under the general rubrics cited in these texts. Furthermore, known rituals and incantations related to conception, pregnancy, birth, and infant mortality do not specify the use of figurines. Even in Egyptian spell literature, the figurines mentioned in the texts of these rituals are primarily those of animals or Bes. In both Mesopotamia and Egypt other types of rituals for reproductive problems are more common, such as those using herbs and amulets. In addition, rituals for healing and protection seem to involve the entire household or the head of the household rather than just one particular member. Moreover, the accompanying texts for rituals like Šep lemitti suggest that the appearance of the figurines was not meant to represent the gender of the users or their specific concerns but a set of recognizable symbols used for exorcistic and apotropaic purposes. Finally, more specific functions of the figurines in this corpus might be indicated by painted decorations, incantations, or accompanying items which would not survive in the archaeological record.

The archaeological data for the Jerusalem figurines do not support a connection between the figurines and women. Figurine fragments were found throughout domestic
spaces, without any special correlation with particular parts of the house. Nor were figurines found in significant correlation with implements associated with women’s tasks. Additionally, ethnographic analogy and Near Eastern texts suggest that while women may have been involved in pottery workshops (where figurines were produced) it is unlikely they owned or ran the workshops such that they exercised much control over the style and production of the figurines. Thus, there is no evidence that the figurines were made by women for specific female ritual needs. Biblical texts also suggest that clay items might be used in any number of rituals, including those associated with both males and females.

Iconographic investigation indicates that the naked female type was common from a number of different areas and time periods. In its Iron II manifestation, the naked female with hands on her breasts was found in multiple media, like horse trappings and state art, where the image could not have been used to supplicate for the health and well-being of women and children. It even appears on seals with accompanying inscriptions indicating the seal was owned by a male. It occurs on metal items mentioning male deities and dedicated to male rulers. In Israel and Philistia naked females holding their breasts also appear on model shrines and cult-stands as guardian figures in the early Iron II. These images are associated, not with domestic contexts, but with shrine spaces, suggesting a wider use than just by women and children in the household. Again, this does not preclude the possibility that women used the image to ask for health and wellbeing for themselves and their children; but it suggests that the iconography was not meant to represent female users and needs but a set of recognizable protective symbols.
This does not mean that the figurines are insignificant from a gender studies perspective. Rather their significance in this regard is related to three other implications. The first is the possible associations between female images used for healing and the existence of actual female healers. The second is the positive value associated with breasts, an association unique to females. Unfortunately, in neither case is there enough evidence to determine whether these possible connections might correlate with the treatment of women and their social status.

The third implication is the significance of the female form used in a ritualized behavior that cross-cuts social-economic boundaries as well as the gender of those using the figurines. From this perspective, the female body of the figurines becomes the locus where the ritual expectations of the larger social body are played out in the physical ritual body of sick individuals in their time of need. Were more known about the ritualized

106 On females involved in healing see also Joris F. Borghouts, “Divine Intervention in Ancient Egypt and Its Manifestation (b3w),” in *Gleanings from Deir El-Medina* (ed. Robert J. Demarée and Jacque J. Janssen; Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten, 1982), 24-27. Borghouts discusses a “wise woman” from the city who is sometimes referred to as a healer. See also Peter Machinist, “Kingship and Divinity in Imperial Assyria,” in *Text, Artifact, and Image: Revealing Ancient Religion* (ed. Gary M. Beckman and Theodore J. Lewis; Brown Judaic Studies 346; Providence, R.I.: Brown Judaic Studies, 2006), 170. Machinist suggests that the West Semitic queen Naqia, the wife of Sennacherib and the mother of Esarhaddon, had once been an “exorcist.” For more on her interactions with cultic officiates and temples as well as her participation in rituals for protection and healing see Melville, *Role of Naqia/Zakatu in Sargonid Politics*, 28-29, 44-47, 52-54, 58-59, 75, 82, 84. However, for the infrequency of females mentioned as healers in ancient Near Eastern texts, see Marsman, *Women in Ugarit and Israel*, 411. Marsman notes that women may have “acted in a healing capacity” in households, though not as professionals. She also suggests that women commonly functioned as midwives in Near Eastern texts (ibid., 411-12). She further comments that female healers are unknown in the Hebrew Bible, though women did act as midwives (ibid., 430).

107 Marsman (ibid., 431) notes that Yahweh is never depicted as a wet-nurse though sometimes is likened to a midwife. Rather, kings and nations are described as nursing mothers to Israel (Isa 49:23; 60:16). Jerusalem is also described as comforting and nursing Israel (Isa 66:10-13). Marsman notes that, though Yahweh is likened to a mother in verse 13, the text does not attribute Yahweh with nursing. Ultimately, the texts in question are exilic and postexilic so their bearing on Iron IIB-C concepts is somewhat curtailed.
activities that accompanied the use of figurines, this would provide a fruitful opportunity to analyze the way the participants embody and challenge the power structures inherent in the ritual, including power structures that bear upon gender hierarchy. For example, if the accompanying incantations emphasized the power of a male deity whose monolatry stood in opposition to the worship of female deities or deities traditionally associated with the family or local spheres, then any positive value associated with the female image used in healing might share a complex or even strained relationship with the values encoded in the ritual performance of accompanying incantations.

Furthermore, the underlying structures responsible for the female body’s association with healing may be problematic from a contemporary perspective. Bahrani has pointed out that the two-gender system is a contemporary construct; and, prior to the nineteenth century, even in the modern period women’s sexual organs were considered an inversion of male organs, creating a one-sex system.¹⁰⁸ Thus, in ancient Mesopotamia, “female” was not a fixed signifier referring solely to female sex and gender but could “stand in for other concepts” depending on the context of the image.¹⁰⁹ In this case of Judean figurines, “female” stands in for “healing” or “protection,” though the symbol’s ability to do so is partly enabled by a gender hierarchy that excludes woman as an “absence,” “inversion,” or “other.”

¹⁰⁸ Bahrani, Women in Babylon, 145.
¹⁰⁹ Ibid., 150.
10.6.5 Function of the figurines

As has been argued, the most widely supported function for the figurines is protection and healing. Thus, the conclusions in this study are not entirely dissimilar from those of earlier scholars, who associated naked female figures with apotropaism (see Chapter 1). That having been said, these positions differ in substantial ways. First, the methodology employed throughout the present work bases these conclusions on the archaeological contexts in which Iron II objects were recovered as well as the details of their technological style and form. Second, while earlier studies of apotropaic objects assumed that fertility and apotropaism were connected or even synonymous, this dissertation has shown that JPFs and the naked female form were used in contexts that had little to do with fertility concerns. Finally, far from being relegated to heterodoxy or base instinct, apotropaic figurine rituals were probably an important aspect of the Iron II ritual complex.

To summarize, in Mesopotamian texts figurines with a consistent set of attributes are used to exorcise evil, including sickness, and to guard the home. The connection with sickness and protection is reinforced by the fact that the rite takes place in the home itself. Archaeological deposition rules out other potential uses for the Jerusalem figurines, such as dedicated votives or main cult objects in household shrines. The fact that they regularly occur in domestic spaces, though without specialized deposition, could be explained by their association with semi-divine beings used in rituals of healing and protection, which must have taken place in the domestic unit.
Biblical texts suggest that clay items transmitted purity/impurity and for that reason were used in several rituals, including those associated with purifying the recently ill. Iconographic analogy also suggests that the naked female elsewhere in the Late Bronze Age and the Iron II was used as a symbol of healing and protection. Even in Israel and Judah the symbol appears as guardian figurines on model shrines. Further, the switch to the molded head suggests a connection with the masks and protomes of northern Israel and Philistia in the Late Bronze Age and Iron I, also believed to be apotropaic.

Finally, biblical and Mesopotamian texts mention traditions that require the ill to seek aid in the house rather than at public shrines, an explanation that might account for the figurines’ deposition. The fact that the Judean versions cast this object as a semi-divine being may also correlate with the biblical tradition of semi-divine intermediaries used to cause, relieve, and protect from evil and sickness.

10.6.6 Changing iconography

Finally, the particular iconographic adaptations of the Judean figurines might be best explained by practical matters. The adoption of the pillar style may have been motivated by the switch from plaque to three-dimensional figurines on shrines of the Iron II. At this time, due to the increased influence of Assyrian figurine ritual, figurines may have come to be used in rituals in the household rather than in shrines. This use would have necessitated free-standing figurines guarding the household space rather than attached figurines guarding shrine spaces.
The adoption of the molded head on the female body probably entered Jerusalem through influence from the Shephelah, perhaps motivated by increased centralization in the eighth century (under Assyrian demand) and population movement during preparations for Sennacherib’s impending siege. Various iconographic patterns may also be explained by the movement of people along trade routes, though figurines were not traded as such.

In contrast to the molded heads, the pinched heads may have been more common in Jerusalem for a number of reasons. The lack of an established molded figurine tradition in preceding centuries, the cessation of influence from areas where molded heads were more dominant like northern Israel and the Shephelah, and the simplicity of manufacture all represent practical explanations. Eventually the ideological style distinctions that separate Judah and Jerusalem from surrounding people groups may have become important as well.

On this last point, ritualization works regardless of whether the ritual agents can articulate to themselves what ritual does. While individuals participate in ritual activity they are also structured by it, often without their complete awareness of this process. Thus, the repeated use of a symbol portrayed with unique Judean stylistic features, in contrast with the features of figurines in surrounding nations, may have reproduced in the ritual agents a sense of social and political identity. It may also have confirmed the power structures of the political entity that reinforced that identity as well as the gender hierarchies encoded in that social and political organization. Furthermore, this distinctive image, when used in healing rites associated with liminal states between life and death,
may have reaffirmed the individual’s participation in a broader social nexus. Performed as a rite of transition, the ritual initiates the person healed not only into the community of the living, but into a particular social, political, and gendered version of that community. Furthermore, as implements in a rite of protection, the figurines serve to remind the ritual agents of the dangers of liminality and to reinforce positive regard for the forces responsible for physical, personal, and social order.

10.6.7 Methodology revisited

At the end of the day, the study of figurines in Judah will morph to some extent with every excavation, making all conclusions based on the existing data tentative in nature. At present, the data suggest the figurines in Jerusalem were used for healing and protection by many different people at multiple levels of society. Regardless of whether these conclusions will be modified or even overturned with future excavation, where other interpretive options are proffered they must move beyond the level of inference, taking into consideration all of the lines of inquiry, including text, archaeology, and iconography. Ultimately, only by combining an investigation of the figurines from the top down, i.e., iconography “head to toe,” with an archaeological analysis of figurines literally from the bottom up, can we approach an understanding of the figurines’ functions within an ancient ritual community that includes top, bottom, and everything in between.
## Appendix A

Table 1: Pinched heads from Kenyon's excavations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Holland</th>
<th>Kletter</th>
<th>Provenience as per Kletter</th>
<th>Tushingham (Vol I) or Steiner (Vol III) Reg. number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A.I.a.17</td>
<td>338.A+.1.A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A.I.a.20</td>
<td>341.A.1.A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>A.I.a.21</td>
<td>342.A.1.A</td>
<td>Fd.A. Sq.XXV1. L.957.7</td>
<td>Vo III 6809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>A.I.a.22</td>
<td>343.A.1.A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>A.I.a.23</td>
<td>344.A.1.A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>A.I.a.24</td>
<td>345.A.1.A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MISTYPED IN KL AS 713.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>A.I.a.26</td>
<td>347.A.1.A</td>
<td>Fd.A. Sq.XXVI. L.957.18</td>
<td>Vol III 6816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>A.I.a.27</td>
<td>348.A.1.A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>A.I.a.28</td>
<td>349.A.1.A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>A.I.a.30</td>
<td>351.A.1.A</td>
<td>Fd.L. Sq.XVIII. L.853.7</td>
<td>Vol I 6003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>A.I.a.31</td>
<td>352.A.1.A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>A.I.a.32</td>
<td>321.A.1.A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>A.I.a.33</td>
<td>320.A.1.A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>A.I.a.35</td>
<td>318.A.1.A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>A.I.a.36</td>
<td>323.A.1.A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>A.I.a.41</td>
<td>352.A.1.A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>A.I.a.43</td>
<td>354.A.1.A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>A.I.a.44</td>
<td>355.A.1.A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>A.I.a.45</td>
<td>356.A.1.A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>A.I.a.46</td>
<td>357.A.1.A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>A.I.a.47</td>
<td>358.A.1.A</td>
<td>Fd. L. Sq.IV. L.332.22</td>
<td>Vol I 7218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>A.I.a.48</td>
<td>328.A.1.A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>A.I.a.49</td>
<td>329.A.1.A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>A.I.a.50</td>
<td>330.A.1.A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>A.I.a.52</td>
<td>331.A.1.A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>A.I.b.2</td>
<td>362.A.2.A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>A.I.b.3</td>
<td>332.A.2.A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>A.I.b.4</td>
<td>363.A.2.A Fd L. Sq.XII. L.158.16 Vol I 3923</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>A.I.b.5</td>
<td>364.A.2.A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>A.I.b.6</td>
<td>365.A.2.A Fd.A. Sq.XXVI. L.953.13 (Kletter mistake: 3338)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>A.I.c.1</td>
<td>333.A.3.A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>A.I.c.2</td>
<td>334.A+.3.A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>A.I.c.3</td>
<td>335.A.3.A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>A.I.c.4</td>
<td>336.A.3.A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>A.I.d.3</td>
<td>369.A.4.A (may apply to 366) 379?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>A.I.d.4</td>
<td>366.A.4.A Fd.A. Sq.Trench I. L. 304.21 (Steiner, Vol III, Appendix I). Kletter says Fd.A. Sq?.301.12; in Kl Appendix 2, this is listed for 369, not 366 Vol III 1046</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>A.I.e.1</td>
<td>367.A.5.A Fd.A. Sq.XXVI. L.955.25 Vol III 622 (Kletter mistake:6222)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>A.I.e.2</td>
<td>368.A.5.A Fd.A ?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>A.I.g.2</td>
<td>360.C.1.D? (should be body fragment, as per Kletter)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>A.I.g.3</td>
<td>361.C.1.D (should be body fragment, as per Kletter)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>A.I.h.1</td>
<td>5.1.4.17 Fd.A. Sq.XXVIII. L.4.8 Vol III 7056</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>A.I.i.21</td>
<td>5.1.4.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>A.I.i.23</td>
<td>5.1.4.16 Fd.L. Sq.XVIII. L.857.10 Vol I 6718</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>A.I.j.5</td>
<td>5.1.4.18 Fd. A. Sq.XXIX. L.101.15 Vol III 7052</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2: Unidentified heads from Steiner Vol III, Appendix I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Square</th>
<th>Layer</th>
<th>Reg. Num.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 (= to Phase 5)</td>
<td>XXII</td>
<td>156.6</td>
<td>3336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>XXVI</td>
<td>956.3</td>
<td>6299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Street</td>
<td>XIV</td>
<td>821.3</td>
<td>333, 334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>821.4</td>
<td>381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XXV</td>
<td>1101.4</td>
<td>4361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1200.11</td>
<td>5106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1200.13</td>
<td>5287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XXVI</td>
<td>955.32</td>
<td>6720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Destruction</td>
<td>XV</td>
<td>807.2B</td>
<td>380, 382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3(=Phase 8)</td>
<td>XXIV</td>
<td>305.12</td>
<td>6485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3: Molded heads from Kenyon’s excavations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Holland</th>
<th>Kletter</th>
<th>Provenience as per Kletter</th>
<th>Holland 1995 or Steiner (Volume III) Reg. No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 A.II.a.3</td>
<td>370.B.3.A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 A.III.b.2</td>
<td>371.B.3.B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 A.III.b.3</td>
<td>372.B.3.B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 A.III.c.4</td>
<td>300.B.3.B</td>
<td>Fd.A.Sq.XXVI.L.Cave1.966.3Y</td>
<td>Holland C. 391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 A.III.d.6</td>
<td>373.B.4.B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 A.III.d.7</td>
<td>301.B.4.B.</td>
<td>Fd.A. Sq.AXXVI. L.965.25. Kletter says: Cave 1 but reg. no. indicates found outside cave proper; in Kletter App.II lists locus as A.966.3Y as in no.300 and calls it 'entrance' to cave</td>
<td>Holland, Vol III 7366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 A.IV.d.1</td>
<td>374.B.3.C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 A.IV.d.2</td>
<td>376.B.3?.C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 A.IV.d.3</td>
<td>375.B.3.C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 A.VI.a.2</td>
<td>377.B.1-2</td>
<td>Fd.A. Sq.840.L?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 A.VI.e.2</td>
<td>378B.5.E</td>
<td>Fd.A. Sq?.L.156a?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 A.VIII.b.1; typo in Holland plate text calls it A.VII.b instead</td>
<td>292.B.0?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 A.XII.g.1</td>
<td>5.I.4.6</td>
<td>Fd.A. Sq.XXVI. L.955.33</td>
<td>Vol III 6671 (Kletter unsure)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 A.XII.l.1</td>
<td>5.I.4.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 A.XII.r.2</td>
<td>5.I.4.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 A.XII.r.3</td>
<td>5.I.4.3</td>
<td>Fd.A. Sq?.L.107.6?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 A.XII.r.4</td>
<td>302.B</td>
<td>Fd.A. Sq.XXVI. L.Cave 1</td>
<td>Holland C. 790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 A.XIII.c.5</td>
<td>5.I.5.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 A.XIV.a.2</td>
<td>5.I.5.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4: Unidentified molded heads from Steiner Vol III, Appendix I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Square</th>
<th>Layer</th>
<th>Reg. Num.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>XXVI</td>
<td>963.27</td>
<td>7099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>XXV</td>
<td>1200.9</td>
<td>5107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XXVI</td>
<td>953.13</td>
<td>3338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>955.49</td>
<td>5889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>957.17</td>
<td>6811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>XIV</td>
<td>830.7</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total 6</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5: Body and pillar fragments from Kenyon's excavations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Holland</th>
<th>Kletter</th>
<th>Provenience as per Kletter</th>
<th>Tushingham (Vol I), Holland 1995, Steiner (Vol III), or Prag (Vol IV) Reg. No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A.X.a.4</td>
<td>380.C.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A.X.a.5</td>
<td>381.C.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>A.X.b.14</td>
<td>382.C.2</td>
<td>Fd.L. Sq.IX. L.912.30</td>
<td>Vol I 7217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A.X.b.15</td>
<td>383.C.2</td>
<td>Fs.L. Sq.IV. L.332.18a</td>
<td>Vol I 7264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>A.X.b.16</td>
<td>384.C.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>A.X.b.17</td>
<td>385.C.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>A.X.b.18</td>
<td>386.C.2</td>
<td>Fd.L.Sq.XV.L.457.23</td>
<td>Vol I 3973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>A.X.b.19</td>
<td>387.C.2</td>
<td>Fd.L Sq.VII-VIII. L.609.5</td>
<td>Vol I 3342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>A.X.b.20</td>
<td>388.C.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>A.X.b.21</td>
<td>389.C.1</td>
<td>Fd.A. Sq.XXVI. L.953.17</td>
<td>Vol III 3339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>A.X.b.22</td>
<td>390.C.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>A.X.b.23</td>
<td>379.C.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>792?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>A.X.b.24</td>
<td>391.C.1</td>
<td>Fd.A. Sq?. L.108.1?</td>
<td>797?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>A.X.b.25</td>
<td>392.C.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>A.X.b.26</td>
<td>393.C.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>A.X.b.27</td>
<td>394.C.2</td>
<td>Fd.L. Sq.VII-VIII. L.608.18</td>
<td>Vol I 4169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>A.X.b.28</td>
<td>395.C.2</td>
<td>Fd.L. Sq.XIV. L.369.13</td>
<td>Vol I 5432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>A.X.b.29</td>
<td>396.C.1</td>
<td>Fd.L. Sq.XIV. L.371.2</td>
<td>Vol I 5463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>A.X.b.30</td>
<td>397.C.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>A.X.b.31</td>
<td>398.C.1</td>
<td>Fd.L. Sq.XII. L.159.32</td>
<td>Vol I 4373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>A.X.b.32</td>
<td>399.C.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2033?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>A.X.b.33</td>
<td>401.C.2</td>
<td>Fd.L. Sq.VII-III. L.711.2</td>
<td>Vol I 5108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>A.X.b.34</td>
<td>402.C.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>A.X.b.35</td>
<td>400.C.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>A.X.b.36</td>
<td>403.C.2?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>A.X.b.37</td>
<td>404.C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>A.X.b.38</td>
<td>405.C.?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A.X.b.39</td>
<td>406.C.?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A.X.b.40</td>
<td>407.C.?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A.X.b.41</td>
<td>304.C.1</td>
<td>Fd.A. Sq.XXVI. L.Cave1</td>
<td>Holland C. 777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A.X.b.42</td>
<td>408.C.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A.X.b.43</td>
<td>305.C.2</td>
<td>Fd.A. Sq.XXVI. L.Cave1</td>
<td>Holland C. 774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A.X.c.3</td>
<td>409.C.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A.X.c.4</td>
<td>410.C.2</td>
<td>Fd.A. Sq? L.669.2/6?</td>
<td>3509?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A.X.c.5</td>
<td>411.C.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A.X.c.6</td>
<td>412.C.2</td>
<td>Fd.A. Sq.XXV. L.845.7 Kletter mistypes field as R</td>
<td>Vol III 4444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A.X.c.7</td>
<td>413.C.2</td>
<td>Fd.A. Sq.XXVI. L.955.18</td>
<td>Vol III 5890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A.X.c.8</td>
<td>414.C.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A.X.i.2</td>
<td>303.C.1.E</td>
<td>Fd.A. Sq.XXVI. L.Cave1</td>
<td>Holland C. 365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A.XI.16</td>
<td>5.I.5.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A.XI.17</td>
<td>415.C.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>A.XI.18</td>
<td>5.I.5.5 Misstypes as XI.8 but references to fig. make clear it is 18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>A.XI.19</td>
<td>416.C.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>A.XI.20</td>
<td>417.C.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>A.XI.21</td>
<td>418.C.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>A.XI.22</td>
<td>419.C.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>A.XI.23</td>
<td>420.C.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>A.XI.24</td>
<td>421.C.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>A.XI.25</td>
<td>422.C.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>A.XI.26</td>
<td>423.C.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>A.XI.27</td>
<td>424.C.2</td>
<td>Fd.C. 6.19?</td>
<td>1329?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>A.XI.28</td>
<td>425.C.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>A.XI.29</td>
<td>426.C.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>A.XI.30</td>
<td>427.C.3</td>
<td>Fd.A Sq.AA.</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.101.22?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>A.XI.31</td>
<td>428.C.3</td>
<td>Fd.C. 6.8-18?</td>
<td>1133?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>A.XI.32</td>
<td>429.C.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>A.XI.33</td>
<td>430.C.?</td>
<td>L.Cave 1?</td>
<td>1106?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>A.XI.34</td>
<td>431.C.?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>A.XI.35</td>
<td>314.C.?</td>
<td>Fd.A. Sq.XXVI. L.Cave wash</td>
<td>Holland C. 792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>A.XI.36</td>
<td>313.C.?</td>
<td>Fd.A. Sq.XXVI. L.Cave1</td>
<td>Holland C. 779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>A.XI.37</td>
<td>312.C.?</td>
<td>Fd.A. Sq.XXVI. L.Cave1</td>
<td>Holland C. 770; Typo in Kletter As 777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>A.XI.38</td>
<td>306.C.1</td>
<td>Fd.A. Sq.XXVI. L.Cave1</td>
<td>Holland C. 335-6? Kletter writes 335f or 366 but according to Vol 4 it is 335+366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>A.XI.39</td>
<td>315.C.3</td>
<td>Fd.A. Sq.XXVI. L.Cave1</td>
<td>Holland 7460; In his chart, Kletter notes no. 2480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>A.XI.40</td>
<td>317.C.3</td>
<td>Fd.A. Sq.XXVI. L.Cave1</td>
<td>Holland C. 796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>A.XI.41</td>
<td>316.C.3</td>
<td>Fd.A. Sq.XXVI. L.Cave1</td>
<td>Holland C. 793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>A.XI.44</td>
<td>432.C.?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>B.VII.10</td>
<td>5.I.2.5</td>
<td>Fd.A. Sq.XXVI. L.Cave1</td>
<td>Holland C. 258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>B.VII.7</td>
<td>5.I.2.2</td>
<td>Fd.A. SqXXV. L840.14a</td>
<td>Vol III 3341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>B.VII.8</td>
<td>5.I.2.3</td>
<td>Fd.A.Sq.XXVI. L.Cave 1</td>
<td>Holland C. 775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>B.VII.9</td>
<td>5.I.2.4</td>
<td>Fd.A. Sq.XXVI. L.Cave1</td>
<td>Holland C. 322</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6: Unidentified body fragments from Steiner Vol III, Appendix I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Square</th>
<th>Layer</th>
<th>Reg. Num.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>XXIX</td>
<td>105.14</td>
<td>6812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>107.14</td>
<td>7260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XIV</td>
<td>831.3a</td>
<td>1946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>XXV</td>
<td>845.23a</td>
<td>4446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(female pedestal figurine)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>XXVIII</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>5772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>XXVI</td>
<td>963.27</td>
<td>7262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>XIV</td>
<td>820.4</td>
<td>346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>821.4D</td>
<td>384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XXVI</td>
<td>953.13</td>
<td>3340, 3343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>955.18</td>
<td>5888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>955.25</td>
<td>6623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>955.29</td>
<td>6724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>955.49</td>
<td>5887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>957.10</td>
<td>6806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>957.14</td>
<td>6817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>957.16</td>
<td>6838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XXIX</td>
<td>101.22</td>
<td>6839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>XIV</td>
<td>821.4B</td>
<td>342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>822.2</td>
<td>385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XXVI</td>
<td>955.2</td>
<td>5978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T4 (=Phase 8)</td>
<td>Trench I</td>
<td>611.8</td>
<td>1066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T5 (=Phase 8)</td>
<td>Trench I</td>
<td>305.16</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Highest floor</td>
<td>1001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total: 24**
Table 7: Total figurine deposition per square in Kenyon Phases 8 and 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sq XXIX</th>
<th>Sq XV</th>
<th>Sq XIV</th>
<th>Sq XXV</th>
<th>Sq XXVI</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase 8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: Distribution of figurine types in Kenyon Phases 4, 8, and 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pinched</th>
<th>Molded</th>
<th>Torso</th>
<th>Animal¹</th>
<th>Horse/Rider</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase 4²</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2³</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CII</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1⁴</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5⁵</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI/J</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1⁶</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 8</td>
<td>12⁸</td>
<td>5⁹</td>
<td>15¹⁰</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>86¹¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27¹²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB: Northern Building, CII: Cave II, SB: Southern Building, CI/J: Cave I/Room J

1. This number excludes horses with rider fragments preserved but includes all other zoomorphic fragments.
2. Phase 4 includes the Northern Building, Cave II, the Southern Building, Cave III, and Cave I.
3. Both are mentioned in Steiner, “Stratigraphical Analysis, Architecture and Objects of the Phases,” 13 (Reg. 6302), and 20 Figure 2-15 (Reg. 2448), as well as Steiner, Volume III, 123 (Appendix I).
5. Four are listed in both Steiner (“Stratigraphical Analysis, Architecture and Objects of the Phases,” 37 Figure 2-27 (Reg. 7365, Reg. 7518), 42 (Reg. 7569, 7570) and in Volume III, 123 (Appendix I). One more is listed only in Steiner (“Stratigraphical Analysis, Architecture and Objects of the Phases,” 32 [no reg.]).
7. In this category, 7 are bird fragments, 39 are what Holland refers to as “Miscellaneous Animals,” and 12 are moved here from Holland’s “Horse and Rider” category because they show no sign of a rider (“A Study of Palestinian Iron Age Baked Clay Figurines,” 179-80).
8. Includes 1 head labeled “male” in Steiner, Volume III, Appendix I (Reg. 7052).
11. These numbers are based on Steiner, Volume III, Appendix I. The brief mention in Steiner, “Stratigraphical Analysis, Architecture and Objects of the Phases,” 56 lists only 5 pinched heads, 5 “human heads” (meaning molded), 11 torsos, 17 animals, and 2 horse and rider fragments. She does not list reference numbers, so the figures cannot be easily compared with the Appendix I in Volume III.
12. Includes 1 extra unidentifiable “front of head” from Steiner, Volume III, Appendix I.
Table 9: Pinched heads from Shiloh's excavations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gilbert-Peretz Type</th>
<th>Reg No</th>
<th>Kletter</th>
<th>Area and Locus</th>
<th>Stratum (Qedem 35, Qedem 40, and de Groot Locus List)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A.I.a</td>
<td>D1/12666</td>
<td>FdD1. L.419</td>
<td>IRON: 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>A.I.a</td>
<td>D2/14083</td>
<td>633.A.1.A</td>
<td>Fd.D2.L.1834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A.I.a</td>
<td>D2/20242</td>
<td>842.A.1.A</td>
<td>Fd..D2.L.2323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>A.I.a</td>
<td>D2/20243</td>
<td>635.A.1.A</td>
<td>Fd.D2.L.2323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>A.I.a</td>
<td>D2/20283</td>
<td>636.A.1.A</td>
<td>Fd.D2.L.2323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>A.I.a</td>
<td>D2/20333/2</td>
<td>MAY BE 843.A.1.A WHICH HE CALLS D2/20339/2</td>
<td>Fd. D2.L.2319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>A.I.a</td>
<td>E1/3436</td>
<td>Fd.E1.L.621A</td>
<td>IRON: 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>A.I.a</td>
<td>E1/3646</td>
<td>B; NO NUMBER</td>
<td>Fd.E1.L.619(B ADDED IN NEW REPORT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>A.I.a</td>
<td>E1/4118</td>
<td>C; NO NUMBER</td>
<td>Fd.E1.L.1324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>A.I.a</td>
<td>E1/8475</td>
<td>Fd.E1.L.1303</td>
<td>IRON: 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>A.I.a</td>
<td>E1/8494</td>
<td>5.II.3.4</td>
<td>Fd.E1.L.1283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>A.I.a</td>
<td>E1/9927</td>
<td>Fd.E1.L.1394</td>
<td>IRON: 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>A.I.a</td>
<td>E1/10257</td>
<td>Fd.E1.L.1627</td>
<td>IRON: 12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

604
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>EITHER 1867 OR 1862; NOTES UPPER PART IS MISSING?</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>A.I.a</td>
<td>E3/13109</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fd.E3.L.1902, NOT DISCUSSED IN TEXT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>A.I.a</td>
<td>G/5751</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fd.G.L.872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>A.I.a</td>
<td>G/11481</td>
<td>627.A.1.A</td>
<td>Fd.G.L.903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>A.I.a?</td>
<td>D2/20274</td>
<td>D; NO NUMBER</td>
<td>Fd.D2.L.2323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>A.I.a?</td>
<td>G/2092</td>
<td>A; NO NUMBER</td>
<td>Fd.G.L.710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>A.I.b</td>
<td>E2/7352</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fd.E2.L.1447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>A.I.b</td>
<td>G/11769</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fd.G.L.972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>A.I.c</td>
<td>G/11147</td>
<td>846.A.2?MISTYPED AS G1147</td>
<td>Fd.G.L.903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>A.I.c</td>
<td>E1/10127</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fd.E1.L.1606(A ADDED BY NEW REPORT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>A.I.d</td>
<td>E1/5948</td>
<td>848.A.3; TYPO HAS ONLY NO. AND OMITTED THE FIELD</td>
<td>Fd.E1.L.698</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The unpublished locus list only lists loci in Areas E1-3. Thus, the other locus designations have not been updated from their initial publication and may contain mistakes. To be clear, this column adds chronological designations with the loci that have been double-checked against the new list.

Table 10: Molded heads from Shiloh’s excavations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Gilbert-Peretz Type</th>
<th>Reg. No.</th>
<th>Kletter</th>
<th>Area and Locus</th>
<th>Stratum (Qedem 25, Qedem 40, de Groot List)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A.II.a</td>
<td>E1/10143</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fd.E1.L.1604</td>
<td>IRON 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A.II.a.1</td>
<td>G/5723</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fd.G.L.862</td>
<td>10C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A.II.a.1</td>
<td>D1/12507</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fd.D1.L.383</td>
<td>LATE: 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>A.II.a.1</td>
<td>E1/9329</td>
<td>621.B.3</td>
<td>Fd.E1.L.1310(A; ADDED IN NEW REPORT)</td>
<td>IRON: 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>A.II.a.3</td>
<td>G/11437</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fd.G.L.950</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>A.II.b.1</td>
<td>D2/13590</td>
<td>616.B.3-4; MISTYPED AS D1</td>
<td>Fd.D2L.1870</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>A.II.b.1</td>
<td>D2/20264</td>
<td>?836.B.3; MISTYPED AS 180269?</td>
<td>Fd.D2L.2323</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>A.II.b.1</td>
<td>E1/8456</td>
<td>840.B.3; MISTYPED AS 18456</td>
<td>Fd.E1.L.1303</td>
<td>IRON: 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>A.II.b.2</td>
<td>D2/20256</td>
<td>837.B.1-2</td>
<td>Fd.D2L.2325</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>A.II.b.3</td>
<td>E1/3416</td>
<td>838.B.5; NOTES FIVE ROWS OF CURLS</td>
<td>Fd.E1.L.618</td>
<td>IRON: 11-12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1The unpublished locus list only lists loci in Areas E1-3. Thus, the other locus designations have not been updated from their initial publication and may contain mistakes. To be clear, this column adds chronological designations with the loci that have been double-checked against the new list.
The unpublished locus list only lists loci in Areas E1-3. Thus, the other locus designations have not been updated from their initial publication and may contain mistakes. To be clear, this column adds chronological designations with the loci that have been double-checked against the new list.

Table 11: Pillar bodies from Shiloh’s excavations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gilbert - Peretz Type</th>
<th>Reg. No.</th>
<th>Kletter</th>
<th>Area and Locus</th>
<th>Stratum (Qedem 40, de Groot)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.III.a.2</td>
<td>D1/6665</td>
<td>673.C.2</td>
<td>Fd.D1.L.365</td>
<td>LATE: 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.III.a.2</td>
<td>D2/13658</td>
<td>852.C.2?</td>
<td>Fd.D2.L.1882</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.III.a.2</td>
<td>E3/12886</td>
<td>?657.C.2; MISTYPED 12586</td>
<td>Fd.E3.L.1565</td>
<td>0; NEW LIST CANCELS LOCUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.III.a.2</td>
<td>G/11076</td>
<td>?687.C.2; MISTYPED E1/10760</td>
<td>Fd.G.L.908</td>
<td>10C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.III.a.2</td>
<td>G/11953</td>
<td>661.C.2</td>
<td>Fd.G.L.999</td>
<td>10C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>A.III.a.2</td>
<td>G/2068</td>
<td>?683.C.2; MISTYPED 2868</td>
<td>Fd.G.L.710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>A.III.a.2</td>
<td>G/11439</td>
<td>659.C.2</td>
<td>Fd.G.L.950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>A.III.a.2</td>
<td>G/8228</td>
<td>5.I.5.21</td>
<td>Fd.G.L.903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>A.III.b</td>
<td>E2/2992</td>
<td>666.C.2</td>
<td>Fd.E2.L.1467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>A.III.b</td>
<td>G/2277</td>
<td>?681.C.2; MISTYPED 2777 AND ASSIGNED TO E2</td>
<td>Fd.G.L.727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>A.III.b</td>
<td>E2/3026</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fd.E2.L.1476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>A.III.b</td>
<td>E2/12015</td>
<td>675.C.1</td>
<td>Fd.E2.L.1467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>A.III.b</td>
<td>G/4931</td>
<td>?672.C.2; MISTYPED 4331</td>
<td>Fd.G.L.824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>A.III.c</td>
<td>E2/12182</td>
<td>?678.C.2; MISTYPED 12812</td>
<td>Fd.E2.L.1705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>A.III.c</td>
<td>D2/20189</td>
<td>665.C.2</td>
<td>Fd.D2.L.2321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>A.III.c</td>
<td>E1/3481</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fd.E1.L.621B(C CHANGED TO A IN NEW REPORT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>A.III.c</td>
<td>E1/7500</td>
<td>670.C.2; MISTYPED AS 17500</td>
<td>Fd.E1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>A.III.c</td>
<td>E1/8520</td>
<td>668.C.2</td>
<td>Fd.E1.L.1312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>A.III.c</td>
<td>E2/1895</td>
<td>682.C.2</td>
<td>Fd.E2.L.534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>A.III.c</td>
<td>G/11067</td>
<td>?677.C.2; MISTYPED AS 12015 WHICH IS</td>
<td>Fd.G.W.329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ALREADY CORRECTLY ASSIGNED to 675</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>A.III.c</td>
<td>D2/21064</td>
<td>679.C.2</td>
<td>Fd.D2.L.2766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>A.III.c</td>
<td>E1/4128</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fd.E1.L.661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>A.III.c</td>
<td>E1/16759</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fd.E1.L.2079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>A.III.c</td>
<td>G/5797</td>
<td>674.C.2</td>
<td>Fd.G.L.922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>A.III.d.1</td>
<td>E1/10126</td>
<td>S.I.2.8</td>
<td>Fd.E1.L.1623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>A.III.e</td>
<td>E1/15547</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fd.E1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>A.III.e</td>
<td>G/11059</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fd.G.L.903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>A.III.e</td>
<td>E1/9284</td>
<td>676.C.1</td>
<td>Fd.E1.L.1367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>A.III.e</td>
<td>E1/15634</td>
<td>653.C.2</td>
<td>Fd.E3.L.1927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>A.III.f</td>
<td>D1/12762</td>
<td>S.I.5.20</td>
<td>Fd.D1.L.433</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The unpublished locus list only lists loci in Areas E1-3. Thus, the other locus designations have not been updated from their initial publication and may contain mistakes. To be clear, this column adds chronological designations with the loci that have been double-checked against the new list.
Table 12: Pillar bases from Shiloh's excavations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Gilbert-Peretz Type</th>
<th>Reg. No.</th>
<th>Kletter</th>
<th>Area and Locus</th>
<th>Stratum (Qedem 35, de Groot List)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A.V.a.1</td>
<td>E1/3359/2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fd.E1.L.617</td>
<td>IRON: 11?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A.V.a.1</td>
<td>E1/5987/1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fd.E1.</td>
<td>SURFACE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A.V.a.1</td>
<td>E1/8644</td>
<td>M; TOO FRAG FOR NO.</td>
<td>Fd.E1.L.1293 (B ADDED IN TEXT)</td>
<td>IRON: 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>A.V.a.1</td>
<td>E1/9558</td>
<td>746.C.3</td>
<td>Fd.E1.L.1381</td>
<td>IRON: 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>A.V.a.1</td>
<td>E1/1105</td>
<td>734.C.3</td>
<td>Fd.E1.</td>
<td>SURFACE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>A.V.a.1</td>
<td>E1/20526</td>
<td>775.C.3</td>
<td>Fd.E1.</td>
<td>SURFACE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>A.V.a.1?</td>
<td>G/2476/1</td>
<td>783.C.3</td>
<td>Fd.G.L.742</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>A.V.a.2</td>
<td>D1/12436</td>
<td>772.C.3</td>
<td>Fd.D1.L.421</td>
<td>LATE: 7B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>A.V.a.2</td>
<td>D1/12621</td>
<td>736.C.3</td>
<td>Fd.D1.L.422</td>
<td>LATE: 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>A.V.a.2</td>
<td>D2/13660</td>
<td>691.C.3</td>
<td>Fd.D2.L.1882</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>A.V.a.2</td>
<td>D2/20352</td>
<td>721.C.3</td>
<td>Fd.D2.L.2337</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>A.V.a.2</td>
<td>D2/20573</td>
<td>774.C.3</td>
<td>Fd.D2.L.2701</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>A.V.a.2</td>
<td>D2/21019</td>
<td>773.C.3</td>
<td>Fd.D2.L.2765</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>A.V.a.2</td>
<td>E1/1608/1</td>
<td>758.C.3</td>
<td>Fd.E1.L.525</td>
<td>LATE: 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>A.V.a.2</td>
<td>E1/2636</td>
<td>755.C.3</td>
<td>Fd.E1.L.565; MISSING FROM NEW LOCUS LIST BUT IS IN VOL 4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>A.V.a.2</td>
<td>E1/3412</td>
<td>777.C.3</td>
<td>Fd.E1.L.618</td>
<td>IRON: 11-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>A.V.a.2</td>
<td>E1/3508</td>
<td>786.C.3</td>
<td>Fd.E1.L.565; MISSING FROM NEW LOCUS LIST BUT IS IN VOL 4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>A.V.a.2</td>
<td>E1/3645</td>
<td>?752.C.3; MISTYPED</td>
<td>Fd.E1.L.631</td>
<td>IRON: 12A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Locality</td>
<td>Locus</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>A.V.a.2</td>
<td>E1/4127</td>
<td>760.C.3</td>
<td>Fd.E1.L.1324, IRON: 12A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>A.V.a.2</td>
<td>E1/5933</td>
<td>??751.C.3; MISTYPED AS 593</td>
<td>Fd.E1.L.1324, IRON: 12A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>A.V.a.2</td>
<td>E1/6075</td>
<td>737.C.3</td>
<td>Fd.E1.L.1214, LATE: 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>A.V.a.2</td>
<td>E1/9071</td>
<td>730.C.3</td>
<td>Fd.E1.L.675, IRON: 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>A.V.a.2</td>
<td>E1/9882</td>
<td>733.C.3</td>
<td>Fd.E1.L.1392, LATE: 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>A.V.a.2</td>
<td>E1/10044</td>
<td>739.C.3</td>
<td>Fd.E1.L.1604, IRON: 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>A.V.a.2</td>
<td>E1/19843</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fd.E1.L.2182, EB: 19-20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>A.V.a.2</td>
<td>E2/1716</td>
<td>748.C.3</td>
<td>Fd.E2.L.537, LATE: 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>A.V.a.2</td>
<td>E2/1844</td>
<td>785.C.3</td>
<td>Fd.E2.L.536, LATE: 7-6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>A.V.a.2</td>
<td>E2/1925</td>
<td>757.C.3 OR 784.C.3; HE NOTES FOR 784 THAT THE NUMBER COULD BE EITHER 1925 OR 1425; 1425 DOESN'T EXIST AND 1925 IS ALREADY CALLED 757</td>
<td>Fd.E2.L.537, LATE: 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>A.V.a.2</td>
<td>E2/2604</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fd.E2.L.544, IRON: 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>A.V.a.2</td>
<td>E2/2613</td>
<td>??761.C.3; MISTYPED AS 7613</td>
<td>Fd.E2.L.544, IRON: 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>A.V.a.2</td>
<td>E2/3334</td>
<td>756.C.3</td>
<td>Fd.E2.L.601, IRON: 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>A.V.a.2</td>
<td>E2/12031</td>
<td>735.C.3; REPEATED AS KLETTER 750</td>
<td>Fd.E2.L.1485 (SAYS = TO 1483 IN LOCUS LIST), LATE: 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>A.V.a.2</td>
<td>E2/12067/8</td>
<td>??767.C.3; MISTYPED AS 18067.8</td>
<td>Fd.E2.L.1492, IRON: 12A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>A.V.a.2</td>
<td>E2/12098</td>
<td>771.C.3</td>
<td>Fd.E2.L.1478, LATE: 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>A.V.a.2</td>
<td>E2/12133</td>
<td>740.C.3</td>
<td>Fd.E2.L.1703, 7B;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LATE: 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NOT ON NEW LOCUS LIST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IRON: 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LATE: 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LATE: 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IRON: 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IRON: 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G/2089/2</td>
<td>782.C.3</td>
<td>Fd.G. L.710</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G/2254</td>
<td>780.C.3</td>
<td>Fd.G.L.736</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G/2281/1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fd.G.L.727</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G/2428/1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fd.G.L.737</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G/4574</td>
<td>779.C.3</td>
<td>Fd.G.L.804</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10C-B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G/4630</td>
<td>763.C.3</td>
<td>Fd.G.L.793</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10C-B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G/5791</td>
<td>743.C.3</td>
<td>Fd. G.L.872</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G/8216</td>
<td>770.C.3</td>
<td>Fd.G.L.906</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G/1061</td>
<td>?725.C.3; MISTYPED G11065</td>
<td>Fd.G.L.903</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G/11115</td>
<td>729.C.3</td>
<td>Fd. G.L.903</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G/11173</td>
<td>726.C.3</td>
<td>Fd.G.L.903</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G/11249</td>
<td>738.C.3</td>
<td>Fd.G.L.927</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G/15444</td>
<td>697.C.3</td>
<td>Fd.G.L.1114</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14?-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G/17504</td>
<td>699.C.3</td>
<td>Fd.G.L1114</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14?-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H/5240</td>
<td>I; TOO FRAG FOR NO.</td>
<td>Fd.H.L.1006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G/2409</td>
<td>764.C.3</td>
<td>Fd.G.L.742</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E1/3320</td>
<td>753.C.3</td>
<td>Fd.E1.L.595</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LATE: 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E1/4042</td>
<td>I; TOO FRAG FOR NO.</td>
<td>Fd.E1.L.661</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IRON: 11?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E1/9355</td>
<td>769.C.3</td>
<td>Fd.E1.L.1365</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LATE: 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E1/17323</td>
<td>724.C.3</td>
<td>Fd.E1.L.2035</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IRON: 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E3/15591</td>
<td>693.C.3; MISTYPED AS 1559</td>
<td>Fd.E3.L.1923</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IRON: 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IRON: 12-13?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G/4578</td>
<td>?762.C.3; MISTYPED AS 14578</td>
<td>Fd.G.L.790</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10C-B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D2/13620</td>
<td>696.C.3</td>
<td>Fd.D2.L.1868</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D2/20219</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fd.D2.L.2321</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E1/2780</td>
<td>?759.C.3; MISTYPED AS G2781/1</td>
<td>Fd.E1.L.562</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MB: 18-17?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Area</td>
<td>Locality</td>
<td>Locus</td>
<td>Surface Group</td>
<td>Locus Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>A.V.b</td>
<td>E1/3525</td>
<td>754.C.3 OR K WHERE HE SAYS ITS TOO FRAG</td>
<td>*10 NEW REPORT SAYS POTTERY IS IRON BUT LOCUS DATE UNCLEAR</td>
<td>Fd.E1.L.565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>A.V.b</td>
<td>E1/4084</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fd.E1.L.1324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>A.V.b</td>
<td>E1/9103</td>
<td>745.C.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fd.E1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>A.V.b</td>
<td>E1/16058</td>
<td>F; TOO FRAG FOR NO.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fd.E1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>A.V.b</td>
<td>E1/16564</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fd.E1.L.2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>A.V.b</td>
<td>E1/16979</td>
<td>700.C.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fd.E1.L.2063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>A.V.b</td>
<td>E2/1817</td>
<td>L ; TOO FRAG FOR NO.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fd.E2.L.1489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>A.V.b</td>
<td>E2/7268</td>
<td>744.C.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fd.E2.L.1430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>A.V.b</td>
<td>G/325</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fd.G.L.710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>A.V.b</td>
<td>G/4524</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fd.G.L.787A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>A.V.b</td>
<td>G/5625</td>
<td>768.C.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fd.G.L.975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>A.V.b?</td>
<td>G/2191/1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fd.G.L.727</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1The unpublished locus list only lists loci in Areas E1-3. Thus, the other locus designations have not been updated from their initial publication and may contain mistakes. To be clear, this column adds chronological designations with the loci that have been double-checked against the new list.
Table 13: Figurines from Iron II loci in Shiloh's excavations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>% of Total Iron Figurines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>140</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14: Number of figurines from the Iron II in Area E of Shiloh's excavations as listed in unpublished list and as listed in Qedem 35

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>de Groot list</th>
<th>Qedem 35</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E1</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Table 15: Figurines in Iron Age strata from Area G of Shiloh's excavations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stratum</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>12B</th>
<th>10B</th>
<th>10B-C</th>
<th>10C</th>
<th>14-10B</th>
<th>14?-10</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 16: Figurines in Area G Stratum 10C of Shiloh's excavations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locus</th>
<th>Pinched</th>
<th>Molded</th>
<th>Body</th>
<th>Base</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Other objects in Locus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>903</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3 bed figurines, 5 zoo. fig., 9 anth. fig., 1 triangular unidentified object, many botanical remains, one weight, many fish bones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>906</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3 zoo. fig., 2 anth. fig., botanical remains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>862</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 zoo. fig., 1 anth. fig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>908</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4 zoo. fig., 1 anth.fig., botanical remains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>999</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 zoo. fig., 1 anth. fig., 1 fish bone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>824</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9 zoo. fig., 1 anth. fig., 1 weight, botanical remains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>922</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 zoo. fig., 1 rider fragment, 1 anth. fig., 1 unidentified pillar frag., 1 unidentified body frag., botanical remains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>927</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 zoo. fig., 1 anth. fig., botanical remains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>975</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 zoo. fig., 1 anth. fig., 1 broken relief from vessel or figurine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 17: Objects from Stratum 12 fills in E West of Shiloh’s excavations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locus</th>
<th>Objects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fill 1627</td>
<td>1 pinched head (E1/10257), 1 female body fragment (E1/10244), pottery, fish bone, 1 incised handle, and 1 ground stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fill 1303</td>
<td>1 pinched head and body (E1/8475), 1 molded head (E1/8456), pottery, botanical remains, 1 loom weight, 1 mollusk shell, 1 stone object, 7 weights, 7 zoomorphic fragments, and 1 rectangular fragment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fill 1381</td>
<td>1 base, much pottery, 1 bone/ivory fragment, 3 zoomorphic fragments, 3 incised handles, and 1 loom weight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL ANTHROPOMORPHIC</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 18: Objects from Stratum 10 loci, south of the Ashlar House in Shiloh’s excavations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locus</th>
<th>Objects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fill 1394</td>
<td>1 simple pinched head with arms and pillar (E1/9927), 1 metal fragment, 2 ground stones, 2 loom weights, much pottery, 1 incised handle, 3 incised sherds, 3 zoomorphic fragments, botanical remains, fish bones, and 4 fragments of bone/ivory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tabun 675 (in cave SW of Ashlar House)</td>
<td>1 figurine base and 1 mollusk shell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor 1367 (at the mouth of the cave)</td>
<td>1 pinched head (E1/5839), 1 body fragment (E1/9284), pottery, and 2 zoomorphic fragments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL ANTHROPOMORPHIC</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 19: Objects from the Terrace House in Shiloh's excavations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stratum</th>
<th>Locus</th>
<th>Objects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stratum 12a</td>
<td>Plaster Floor 631</td>
<td>1 pillar base fragment, 1 bead, 1 fragment of bone/ivory, 1 zoomorphic fragment, 5 incised handles, 1 inscribed fragment of a storage jar, 1 mollusk shell, 1 metal fragment, 3 ground stones (including 1 mortar), and much pottery, including bowl fragments, 5 cooking pots, and 1 jug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Floor 619B</td>
<td>1 simple pinched head (E1/3646), pottery, and 2 zoomorphic fragments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL ANTHROPOMORPHIC</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratum 11</td>
<td>Pit 663B</td>
<td>1 base fragment and pottery, 1 piece of which was incised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fill 698</td>
<td>1 pinched head with turban (E1/5948), 1 female body fragment (E1/5902), 1 unidentified fragment, and pottery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fill 661</td>
<td>1 female body fragment (E1/4128), 1 pillar base, and minimal pottery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Floor 699</td>
<td>1 broken molded head (E1/5954), pottery, botanical remains, and 2 incised handles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL ANTHROPOMORPHIC</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 20: Objects from Northern Structure 1380 in Shiloh's excavations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stratum</th>
<th>Locus</th>
<th>Objects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stratum 12b</td>
<td>Floor 665 = Floor 1380</td>
<td>1 pillar base and minimal pottery, minimal pottery, 1 zoomorphic fragment, and 1 rider fragment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL ANTHROPOMORPHIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratum 12a</td>
<td>Floor 1324</td>
<td>3 pillar/base fragments, 1 fragmentary simple pinched head (E1/4118), 6 zoomorphic fragments, 1 ground stone, and pottery, including 1 incised handle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL ANTHROPOMORPHIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratum 11</td>
<td>Floor 1310A</td>
<td>1 molded head (E1/9329), 1 fragment of bone/ivory, 1 ground stone, 1 zoomorphic fragment, and 1 unidentified fragment, along with pottery that included 1 complete bowl and fragments of bowls, cooking pots, jugs, and juglets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fill 617</td>
<td>1 pillar base, 1 unidentified fragment, 2 zoomorphic fragments, 1 inscription, 1 ground stone, pottery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL ANTHROPOMORPHIC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 21: Objects in Lane 1324 in Shiloh’s excavations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stratum</th>
<th>Locus</th>
<th>Objects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stratum 12a</td>
<td>Floor 621A</td>
<td>1 pinched head figurine E1/3436, 1 female body fragment (E1/3481), and a small quantity of pottery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL ANTHROPOMORPHIC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratum 11</td>
<td>Surface/floor 615</td>
<td>1 female body fragment (E1/6143) and minimal pottery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL ANTHROPOMORPHIC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratum 10</td>
<td>Fill 601</td>
<td>1 base, 1 female body fragment (E2/3301), pottery, including 1 incised handle and 1 inscribed piece, 1 bead, and 5 zoomorphic fragments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fill 1312</td>
<td>1 female body fragment (E1/8520), 1 zoomorphic fragment, pottery, 1 scarab/seal, and 1 weight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL ANTHROPOMORPHIC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 22: Objects in the House of the Monoliths in Shiloh's excavations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stratum</th>
<th>Locus</th>
<th>Objects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stratum 12A</td>
<td>White Lime Floor 1492</td>
<td>1 pillar base fragment, some pottery, 2 fragments with incised handles and 1 ceramic object with “wave-shaped” sides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL ANTHROPOMORPHIC</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratum 11</td>
<td>White Lime Floor 1489</td>
<td>1 female body fragment (E1/3526), 1 base fragment, minimal pottery, and 7 zoomorphic fragments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratum 11/10</td>
<td>Pit Fill 565</td>
<td>3 pillar base fragments, minimal pottery, and 1 stone object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL ANTHROPOMORPHIC</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 23: Objects in the Pavement Structure in Shiloh's excavations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stratum</th>
<th>Locus</th>
<th>Objects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stratum 12</td>
<td>Corridor Fill 1604</td>
<td>2 pillar base fragments, and 2 molded heads (E1/10143 and E1/10527), abundant pottery, 1 bone/ivory fragment, 1 concentric circle handle, 14 incised handles, 1 inscription, 1 piece of inscribed pottery, 4 weights, and 55 zoomorphic fragments, 3 couch/bed/chair fragments, 1 fragmentary cylindrical object, 1 relief fragment of a hand, and 2 unidentifiable fragments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paved Floor 2035</td>
<td>1 figurine base, much pottery, 1 fish bone, 10 zoomorphic fragments, and 1 stone object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL ANTHROPOMORPHIC</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratum 11</td>
<td>Beaten Floor 2009</td>
<td>1 figurine base, 2 zoomorphic fragments, and minimal pottery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plaster and Beaten Earth Floor 2079</td>
<td>1 human shoulder fragment (E1/16759), minimal pottery, 1 bead, 1 zoomorphic fragment, and 1 glass fragment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fill 2028</td>
<td>2 female body fragments (E1/16284; E1/16360), much pottery, 19 zoomorphic fragments, 2 mollusk shells, and 2 metal fragments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL ANTHROPOMORPHIC</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 24: Objects from Stratum 12 of Northern Structure 1927 in Shiloh's excavations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locus</th>
<th>Objects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beaten Earth Floor 1927</td>
<td>much pottery, including decanters, amphorae, and oil lamps, 3 base fragments, 2 simple pinched heads (E3/15705, E3/15706), and 1 malformed body fragment (E3/15634), 1 bone/ivory fragment, fish bones, 10 zoomorphic fragments, 3 incised handles, 1 piece of inscribed pottery, and 1 metal fragment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tabun 1951 (on floor 1927)</td>
<td>1 base fragment, 2 pieces of pottery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Limey” Floor 1935</td>
<td>2 base fragments, some pottery, 6 zoomorphic fragments, and 1 couch/bed fragment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflagration Layer 1923</td>
<td>2 simple pinched heads (E3/15643 and E3/15736), 1 female body fragment (E3/15592), minimal pottery, 2 bone/ivory fragments, 6 zoomorphic fragments, and 1 incised handle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pit Fill or Floor 1901(possibly unrelated to Structure 1927)</td>
<td>1 molded head badly broken (E3/12999), much pottery, including oil lamps, bowls, and juglets, 3 zoomorphic fragments, 6 ground stones, and 1 weight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL ANTHROPOMORPHIC FIGURINES</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 25: Objects in Stratum 10 walls and surfaces of E North in Shiloh's excavations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locus</th>
<th>Objects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stone Floor 1355</td>
<td>1 simple pinched head (E1/9524), some pottery, and 2 weights.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface 1606A</td>
<td>1 pinched head, possibly male (E1/10127), as well as minimal pottery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fill 1297</td>
<td>1 simple pinched head (E1/7930), 1 mollusk shell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL ANTHROPOMORPHIC</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 26: Pinched heads by stratum and area in Shiloh's excavations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stratum</th>
<th>Area and # of Figurines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D1  D2  E1  E2  E3  G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St 12</td>
<td>2    7   6   2   4   1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St 10</td>
<td>0    0   5   0   0   5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 27: Molded heads by stratum and area in Shiloh's excavations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stratum</th>
<th>Area and # of Figurines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D1  D2  E1  E2  E3  G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St 12</td>
<td>0    3   3   0   1   0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St 10</td>
<td>0    0   0   0   0   3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 28: Pinched and molded heads by stratum in Shiloh's excavations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stratum</th>
<th>Pinched</th>
<th>Molded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St 13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14?-10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 29: Pinched head variety by stratum in Shiloh's excavations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stratum</th>
<th>A.1.a</th>
<th>A.1.b</th>
<th>A.1.c</th>
<th>A.1.d</th>
<th>A.1.e</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-11/11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A.1.a: simple pinched head, A.1.b: pinched head with turban, A.1.c: pinched head with turban and sidelocks, A.1.d: pinched head with applied conical hat, A.1.e: pinched head with applied conical hat and sidelocks

Table 30: Bone and ivory objects in Areas E, D1, D2, and G in Strata 12-10 in Shiloh's excavations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fills, Pits, Installations, Dumps, Walls, Stone Collapse</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Area E</th>
<th>Area D1</th>
<th>Area D2</th>
<th>Area G</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ivory Inlay</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bone Spatula</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fan Handles</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pendants</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bead</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rods (Pin)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astragalii</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Non-Floor</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Floors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Area E</th>
<th>Area D1</th>
<th>Area D2</th>
<th>Area G</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ivory Inlay</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bone Spatula</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fan Handles</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pendants</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bead</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rods (Pin)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astragalii</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Floor</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total All Loci</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 31: Locus types in E West, South, and North in Strata 12-10 in Shiloh's excavations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locus Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St 12 EW fills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fill 1627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fill 1303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fill 1381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashlar House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation trench 2157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St 10 fills south of Ashlar House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fill 1394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tabun 675 (in cave SW of Ashlar House)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor 1367 (at the mouth of the cave)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrace House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaster Floor 631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor 619B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pit 663B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fill 698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fill 661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor 699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fill for Drainage Channel 618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Structure 1380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor 665=Floor 1380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor 1324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor 1310A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fill 617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane 1324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor 621A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface/floor 615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fill 601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fill 1312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House of the Monoliths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Lime Floor 1492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Lime Floor 1489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pit Fill 565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc. ES Loci</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fill 544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fill 572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavement Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corridor Fill 1604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paved Floor 2035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaten Floor 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaster and Beaten Earth Floor 2079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locus Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation Trench</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tabun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor/Surface</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pit fill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflagration layer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 33: Objects in fill loci containing anthropomorphic figurines in Areas E West, South, and North from Strata 12-10 in Shiloh's excavations

**PH:** pinched head, **MH:** molded head, **Bo:** bodies, **Ba:** bases, **Zo:** zoomorphic figurines, **C/B:** couch/bed fragments, **W:** weights, **B/I:** bone/ivory, **IH:** inscribed handles, **MS:** mollusks, **F:** faience, **MT:** metal, **GS:** ground stones, **Pt:** pottery (S: some, m: minimal, M: much), **B/G:** beads/gems, **LW:** loom weights, **BR:** botanical remains, **FB:** fish bones, **IP/I:** inscribed pottery/inscriptions, **HR:** human remains, **UF/O:** unidentified fragments/other fragments, **GL:** glass, **S/SC:** imported stamp handles/scarabs and seals, **CCH:** concentric circle handles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structures</th>
<th>Objects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EW St 12 fills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fill 1627</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fill 1303</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fill 1381</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S of Ashlar House</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fill 1394</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrace House</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fill 698</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fill 661</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drain Fill 618</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locus: Northern Structure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1380</td>
<td>Fill 617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane 1324</td>
<td>Fill 601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fill 1312</td>
<td>Fill 544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES Misc. loci</td>
<td>Fill 572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavement Structure</td>
<td>Fill 1604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fill 2028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratum 10 floors not assoc. with structures</td>
<td>Fill 1297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc. EN loci</td>
<td>Fill 1650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fill 1955</td>
<td>Fill 1562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIG TOTAL</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIG TOTAL</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 34: Frequency of objects appearing in fill loci containing anthropomorphic figurines in Areas E West, South, and North in Strata 12-10 in Shiloh's excavations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Number of Loci with Objects</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pottery</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoomorphic</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bodies</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bases</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incised Handles</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinched Heads</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mollusk Shells</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loom Weights</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified Frags/Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weights</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground Stones/ Stone Obj</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molded Heads</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bone/Ivory</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botanical Remains</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish Bones</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inscribed Pottery/Inscriptions</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couch/Bed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beads/Gems</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horse and Rider</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faience</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scarab/Seal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concentric Circle Handle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 35: Objects in floor loci containing anthropomorphic figurines in Areas E West, South, and North in Strata 12-10 in Shiloh’s excavations


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structures</th>
<th>Objects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S. of Ashlar House, in cave</td>
<td>P   M   B   Ba   Zo   C/B   W/I   I   M   M/S   G   S   P   B/G   L   W   B   F   P   H   U   F   G   L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor 1367 (at the mouth of the cave)</td>
<td>1     1   a   2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrace House</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaster Floor 631</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor 619B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor 699</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locus: Northern Structure 1380</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor 665=Floor 1380</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor 1324</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor 1310A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane 1324</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor 621A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface/floor 615</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House of the Monoliths</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Lime Floor 1492</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Lime Floor 1489</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavement Structure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paved Floor 2035</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaten Floor 2009</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaster and Beaten Earth Floor 2079</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Structure 1927</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaten Earth Floor 1927</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Limey” Floor 1935</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratum 10 floors not assoc. with struc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone Floor 1355</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface 1606A</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc. EN loci</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor 1910</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor (?) 1902</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIG TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIG TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 36: Frequency of objects appearing in floor loci containing anthropomorphic figurines in Areas E West, South, and North in Strata 12-10 in Shiloh’s excavations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Number of Loci with Objects</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pottery</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoomorphic</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bases</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinched Heads</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bodies</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incised Handles</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground Stones/ Stone Obj</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bone/Ivory</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molded Heads</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beads/Gems</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish Bones</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inscribed Pottery/Inscriptions</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified Frags/Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couch/Bed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weights</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mollusk Shells</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botanical Remains</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loom Weights</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horse and Rider</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass/Faience</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 37: Petrographic samples organized by sample number

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample No.</th>
<th>Reg. No.</th>
<th>Area/Locus</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COD EM 1</td>
<td>20046</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>pinched head</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td></td>
<td>1a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD EM 2</td>
<td>21088</td>
<td>2036</td>
<td>pillar body</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td></td>
<td>1a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD EM 3</td>
<td>21735</td>
<td>2061</td>
<td>molded head</td>
<td>motza/rendzina</td>
<td></td>
<td>1b?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD EM 4</td>
<td>21630</td>
<td>2044</td>
<td>pillar body</td>
<td>motza/rendzina</td>
<td></td>
<td>1b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD EM 5</td>
<td>20435</td>
<td>2031</td>
<td>pillar body</td>
<td>motza marl</td>
<td>elongated voids</td>
<td>2a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD EM 6</td>
<td>22168</td>
<td>2082</td>
<td>pinched head</td>
<td>terra rossa?</td>
<td>small slide</td>
<td>3?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD EM 7</td>
<td>21425</td>
<td>2046</td>
<td>figurine body</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td></td>
<td>1c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD EM 8</td>
<td>21480</td>
<td></td>
<td>molded head</td>
<td>terra rossa</td>
<td></td>
<td>3a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD EM 9</td>
<td>21148</td>
<td>2039</td>
<td>molded head</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td></td>
<td>1a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD EM 10</td>
<td>29635</td>
<td>2043</td>
<td>pillar base</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td>HF, decomposed calcite</td>
<td>1d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD EM 11</td>
<td>21215</td>
<td>2039</td>
<td>pillar base</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td></td>
<td>1c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD EM 12</td>
<td>29391</td>
<td>2039</td>
<td>pillar base</td>
<td>terra rossa</td>
<td></td>
<td>3b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD EM 13</td>
<td>20934</td>
<td>2031</td>
<td>pillar base</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td>1c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD EM 14</td>
<td>21325</td>
<td>2045</td>
<td>pillar body</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td>1e</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD EM 15</td>
<td>21921</td>
<td>2071</td>
<td>pillar base</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td>1e</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD EM 16</td>
<td>29685</td>
<td>2040</td>
<td>pillar body</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td>HF, decomposed calcite</td>
<td>1d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD EM 17</td>
<td>21557</td>
<td>2045</td>
<td>horse body</td>
<td>terra rossa</td>
<td>3b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD EM 18</td>
<td>21518</td>
<td>2048</td>
<td>zoomorphic body</td>
<td>terra rossa?</td>
<td>3b?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD EM 19</td>
<td>21562</td>
<td>2050</td>
<td>horse body</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td>1b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD EM 20</td>
<td>20953</td>
<td>2036</td>
<td>horse&amp;rider</td>
<td>terra rossa?</td>
<td>3b?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD EM 21</td>
<td>21259</td>
<td>2041</td>
<td>horse&amp;rider</td>
<td>marl/loess</td>
<td>4/5b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD EM 22</td>
<td>29256</td>
<td>2036</td>
<td>horse head/body</td>
<td>terra rossa</td>
<td>3b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD EM 23</td>
<td>20437</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>small horse body</td>
<td>loess?</td>
<td>elongated voids</td>
<td>5?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD EM 24</td>
<td>23472</td>
<td>2084</td>
<td>horse head</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td>1a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD EM 25</td>
<td>21295</td>
<td>2041</td>
<td>horse front</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td>1a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD EM 26</td>
<td>21711</td>
<td>2053</td>
<td>horse&amp;rider head</td>
<td>terra rossa?</td>
<td>3b?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>21596</td>
<td>2045</td>
<td>horse body</td>
<td>motza marl</td>
<td>2a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>21301</td>
<td>2041</td>
<td>horse head</td>
<td>motza marl</td>
<td>2a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>21070</td>
<td>2036</td>
<td>horse head</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td>1c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>21792</td>
<td>2053</td>
<td>horse body</td>
<td>rendzina?</td>
<td>1b?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>21901</td>
<td>2066</td>
<td>zoomorphic body</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td>1a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>23459</td>
<td>2081</td>
<td>horse body</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td>1e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>21207</td>
<td>2039</td>
<td>ibex/ram head</td>
<td>terra rossa?</td>
<td>3b?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>22292</td>
<td>2096</td>
<td>horse body</td>
<td>motza marl?</td>
<td>2b?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>21203</td>
<td>2039</td>
<td>horse body</td>
<td>terra rossa</td>
<td>3a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>21166</td>
<td>2036</td>
<td>zoomorphic body</td>
<td>motza marl</td>
<td>worn dolomite?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>21251</td>
<td>2041</td>
<td>horse body</td>
<td>terra rossa?</td>
<td>3a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>21902</td>
<td>2054</td>
<td>zoomorphic body</td>
<td>terra rossa?</td>
<td>3a?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>21610</td>
<td>2052</td>
<td>horse body</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td>1a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>29865</td>
<td>2051</td>
<td>horse body</td>
<td>terra rossa</td>
<td>3a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>21888</td>
<td>2066</td>
<td>horse head</td>
<td>rendzina?</td>
<td>1b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>22309</td>
<td>2087</td>
<td>lion head cup?</td>
<td>brown?</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>21123/9</td>
<td>2039</td>
<td>Krater</td>
<td>terra rossa</td>
<td>3b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>21081/11</td>
<td>2036</td>
<td>Krater</td>
<td>terra rossa</td>
<td>3b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>21083/14</td>
<td>2036</td>
<td>Decanter</td>
<td>motza marl</td>
<td>2a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD</td>
<td>YS</td>
<td>G 8227</td>
<td>903</td>
<td>pinched head</td>
<td>loess/rendzina</td>
<td>5a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD</td>
<td>YS</td>
<td>G 11953</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>pillar torso</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td>1a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD</td>
<td>YS</td>
<td>G 11059</td>
<td>903</td>
<td>pillar torso</td>
<td>terra rossa?</td>
<td>3c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD</td>
<td>YS</td>
<td>G 2320</td>
<td>727</td>
<td>molded head</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td>HF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD</td>
<td>YS</td>
<td>G 11026</td>
<td>906</td>
<td>pinched head</td>
<td>terra rossa?</td>
<td>3a/c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD</td>
<td>YS</td>
<td>G 11152</td>
<td>903</td>
<td>pillar torso</td>
<td>terra rossa?</td>
<td>3b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD</td>
<td>YS</td>
<td>G 4471</td>
<td>782</td>
<td>molded head</td>
<td>loess?</td>
<td>5a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD</td>
<td>YS</td>
<td>G 5618</td>
<td>858</td>
<td>molded head</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td>1c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD</td>
<td>YS</td>
<td>G 2330</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>horse head</td>
<td>terra rossa</td>
<td>3a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD YS</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>G4264</td>
<td>727</td>
<td>horse body</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td>1b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>D2 20242</td>
<td>2323</td>
<td>pinched head</td>
<td>motza marl</td>
<td>2a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>D2 20339</td>
<td>2323</td>
<td>zoomorphic head</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td>1c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>E3 15634</td>
<td>1927</td>
<td>pillar torso</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td>1a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>E1 16286</td>
<td>2028</td>
<td>zoomorphic leg</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td>1a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>E1 10527</td>
<td>1604</td>
<td>molded head</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td>1d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>E3 15924</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>pillar torso</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td>1d/1e</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>E3 15592</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>pillar torso</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td>1a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>E1 10126</td>
<td>1623</td>
<td>pillar torso?</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td>1b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>E1 10422</td>
<td>1604</td>
<td>zoomorphic figurine</td>
<td>terra rossa</td>
<td>3a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>E1 3418</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>horse head</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td>1a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>E1 3436</td>
<td>621A</td>
<td>pinched head</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td>1e</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>E1 8456</td>
<td>1303</td>
<td>molded head</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td>1a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>E1 5948</td>
<td>698</td>
<td>pinched head</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td>1c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD YS 24</td>
<td>E1 3663</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>zoomorphic head</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td>1a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD YS 25</td>
<td>E1 10520</td>
<td>1604</td>
<td>horse head</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td>1a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD YS 26</td>
<td>G 11076</td>
<td>908</td>
<td>pillar torso</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td>1a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD YS 27</td>
<td>G 2068</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>pillar torso</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td>1a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD YS 28</td>
<td>G 2277</td>
<td>727</td>
<td>pillar torso</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td>1a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD YS 29</td>
<td>G 11481</td>
<td>903</td>
<td>pinched head</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td>1a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD YS 30</td>
<td>G 2287</td>
<td>727</td>
<td>zoomorphic torso</td>
<td>loess</td>
<td>coastal sand</td>
<td>5b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD YS 31</td>
<td>G2054</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>rider torso</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td>1a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD YS 32</td>
<td>E1 9329</td>
<td>1310</td>
<td>molded head</td>
<td>rendzina/motza</td>
<td>1b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD YS 33</td>
<td>E1 8520</td>
<td>1312</td>
<td>pillar torso</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td>1e</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD YS 34</td>
<td>G 2092</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>pinched head</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td>1e</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD YS 35</td>
<td>G 5751</td>
<td>872</td>
<td>pinched head</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td>1e</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD YS 36</td>
<td>E1 10257</td>
<td>1627</td>
<td>pinched head</td>
<td>terra rossa?</td>
<td>3a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD YS 37</td>
<td>E1 16360</td>
<td>2028</td>
<td>pillar torso</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td>1b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD YS 38</td>
<td>E1 3646</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>pinched head?</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td>1e</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD YS 39</td>
<td>E1 3481</td>
<td>621A</td>
<td>pillar torso</td>
<td>terra rossa?</td>
<td>3b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD YS 40</td>
<td>E1 3526</td>
<td>1489</td>
<td>pillar torso</td>
<td>motza marl</td>
<td>2b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD YS 41</td>
<td>E1 3664</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>molded head</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td>1e</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD YS 42</td>
<td>E1 6143</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>pillar torso</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td>1a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD YS 43</td>
<td>E1 5954</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>molded head</td>
<td>terra rossa?</td>
<td>3b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD YS 44</td>
<td>E3 15736</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>pinched head</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td>1b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD YS 45</td>
<td>E3 15706</td>
<td>1927</td>
<td>pinched head</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td>1c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD YS 46</td>
<td>E1 4118</td>
<td>1324</td>
<td>pinched head?</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td>1e</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD YS 47</td>
<td>E3 15705</td>
<td>1927</td>
<td>pinched head</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td>1b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD YS 48</td>
<td>E3 15643</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>pinched head</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td>1a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD YS 49</td>
<td>G4806</td>
<td>824</td>
<td>horse hind</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td>1e</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD YS 50</td>
<td>G 8225</td>
<td>903</td>
<td>horse body</td>
<td>rendzina?</td>
<td>1a?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD YS 51</td>
<td>E1 16727</td>
<td>2028</td>
<td>horse body</td>
<td>rendzina?</td>
<td>1b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD YS 52</td>
<td>E1 3475</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>horse body</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td>1c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD YS 53</td>
<td>E1 10485</td>
<td>1604</td>
<td>horse body</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td>1b/1c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD YS 54</td>
<td>E1 10384</td>
<td>1604</td>
<td>bed model?</td>
<td>rendzina/motza</td>
<td>1b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD YS 55</td>
<td>E3 15699</td>
<td>1927</td>
<td>zoomorphic body</td>
<td>rendzina/motza</td>
<td>1c?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD YS 56</td>
<td>E1 16085</td>
<td>1604</td>
<td>horse body</td>
<td>rendzina/motza</td>
<td>1b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD YS 57</td>
<td>E1 10464</td>
<td>1604</td>
<td>horse hind</td>
<td>loess</td>
<td>5?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD YS 58</td>
<td>D1 13363</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>pinched head?</td>
<td>motza marl</td>
<td>2b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD YS 59</td>
<td>D2 20243</td>
<td>2323</td>
<td>pinched head</td>
<td>terra ossa?</td>
<td>3b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD YS 60</td>
<td>D2 20302</td>
<td>2323</td>
<td>horse body</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td>1a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD YS 61</td>
<td>D6713</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>cooking pot</td>
<td>Hamra?</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD YS 62</td>
<td>D12761</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>cooking pot</td>
<td>Hamra?</td>
<td>HF, elongated voids</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD YS 63</td>
<td>D886</td>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>loess</td>
<td>5b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD YS 64</td>
<td>D917</td>
<td>Krater</td>
<td>motza marl</td>
<td>2c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD YS 65</td>
<td>D935/1</td>
<td>holemouth jar</td>
<td>motza marl</td>
<td>2b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD YS 66</td>
<td>MV1</td>
<td>MV2</td>
<td>MV3</td>
<td>MV4</td>
<td>MV5</td>
<td>MV6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1018/4</td>
<td>G 1367</td>
<td>G 1456</td>
<td>G 1457</td>
<td>1444</td>
<td>70-914</td>
<td>70-914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jug</td>
<td>pillar figurine</td>
<td>pillar figurine</td>
<td>standing figurine</td>
<td>175 c</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamra?</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td>Basin</td>
<td>Basin</td>
<td>Basin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1a</td>
<td>1a</td>
<td>1a</td>
<td>terra rossa?</td>
<td>terra rossa?</td>
<td>terra rossa?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COD YS**: City of David, Yigal Shiloh; **COD EM**: City of David, Eilat Mazar, **MV**: Mevesseret
Table 38: Petrographic samples from Area G in Shiloh's excavations and Mazar's excavations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COD YS 1</td>
<td>G 8227</td>
<td>903</td>
<td>Pit</td>
<td>10c</td>
<td>pinched head</td>
<td>loess/rendzina</td>
<td>5a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD YS 3</td>
<td>G 11059</td>
<td>903</td>
<td>10c</td>
<td>pillar torso</td>
<td>terra rossa?</td>
<td>3c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD YS 6</td>
<td>G 11152</td>
<td>903</td>
<td>10c</td>
<td>pillar torso</td>
<td>terra rossa?</td>
<td>3b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD YS 29</td>
<td>G 11481</td>
<td>903</td>
<td>10c</td>
<td>pinched head</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td>1a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD YS 50</td>
<td>G 8225</td>
<td>903</td>
<td>10c</td>
<td>horse body</td>
<td>rendzina?</td>
<td>1a?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD YS 2</td>
<td>G 11953</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>10c</td>
<td>pillar torso</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td>1a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD YS 5</td>
<td>G 11026</td>
<td>906</td>
<td>Ahiel</td>
<td>10c</td>
<td>pinched head</td>
<td>terra rossa?</td>
<td>3a/c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD YS 8</td>
<td>G 5618</td>
<td>858</td>
<td>Stone collapse</td>
<td>10b</td>
<td>molded head</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td>1c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD YS 7</td>
<td>G 4471</td>
<td>782</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>10c-b</td>
<td>molded head</td>
<td>loess?</td>
<td>5a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD YS 26</td>
<td>G 11076</td>
<td>908</td>
<td>fill</td>
<td>10c</td>
<td>pillar torso</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td>1a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD YS 35</td>
<td>G 5751</td>
<td>872</td>
<td>floor</td>
<td>10b</td>
<td>pinched head</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td>1e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD YS 49</td>
<td>G4806</td>
<td>824</td>
<td>floor</td>
<td>10c</td>
<td>horse hind</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td>1e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD YS 4</td>
<td>G 2320</td>
<td>727</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>molded head</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td>1d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD YS 28</td>
<td>G 2277</td>
<td>727</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>pillar torso</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td>1a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD YS 10</td>
<td>G4264</td>
<td>727</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>horse body</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td>1b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD YS 30</td>
<td>G 2287</td>
<td>727</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>zoomorphic torso</td>
<td>loess</td>
<td>5b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD YS 9</td>
<td>G 2330</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>horse head</td>
<td>terra rossa</td>
<td>3a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD YS 27</td>
<td>G 2068</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>pillar torso</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td>1a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD YS 31</td>
<td>G2054</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>rider torso</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td>1a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD YS 34</td>
<td>G 2092</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>pinched head</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td>1e</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD EM 1</td>
<td>20046</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td></td>
<td>pinched head</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td>1a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD EM 2</td>
<td>21088</td>
<td>2036</td>
<td></td>
<td>pillar body</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td>1a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD EM 20</td>
<td>20953</td>
<td>2036</td>
<td></td>
<td>horse&amp;rider</td>
<td>terra rossa?</td>
<td>3b?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD EM 22</td>
<td>29256</td>
<td>2036</td>
<td></td>
<td>horse head/body</td>
<td>terra rossa</td>
<td>3b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD EM 29</td>
<td>21070</td>
<td>2036</td>
<td></td>
<td>horse head</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td>1c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD EM 36</td>
<td>21166</td>
<td>2036</td>
<td></td>
<td>zoomorphic body</td>
<td>motza marl</td>
<td>2a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD EM 3</td>
<td>21735</td>
<td>2061</td>
<td></td>
<td>molded head</td>
<td>motza/rendzina</td>
<td>1b?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD EM 4</td>
<td>21630</td>
<td>2044</td>
<td></td>
<td>pillar body</td>
<td>motza/rendzina</td>
<td>1b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD EM 5</td>
<td>20435</td>
<td>2031</td>
<td></td>
<td>pillar body</td>
<td>motza marl</td>
<td>2a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD EM 13</td>
<td>20934</td>
<td>2031</td>
<td></td>
<td>pillar base</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td>1c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD EM 6</td>
<td>22168</td>
<td>2082</td>
<td></td>
<td>pinched head</td>
<td>terra rossa?</td>
<td>3?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD EM 7</td>
<td>21425</td>
<td>2046</td>
<td></td>
<td>figurine body</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td>1c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD EM 8</td>
<td>21480</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>molded head</td>
<td>terra rossa</td>
<td>3a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD EM 9</td>
<td>21148</td>
<td>2039</td>
<td></td>
<td>molded head</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td>1a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD EM 11</td>
<td>21215</td>
<td>2039</td>
<td></td>
<td>pillar base</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td>1c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD EM 12</td>
<td>29391</td>
<td>2039</td>
<td>pillar base</td>
<td>terra rossa</td>
<td>3b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD EM 33</td>
<td>21207</td>
<td>2039</td>
<td>ibex/ram head</td>
<td>terra rossa?</td>
<td>3b?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD EM 35</td>
<td>21203</td>
<td>2039</td>
<td>horse body</td>
<td>terra rossa</td>
<td>3a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD EM 10</td>
<td>29635</td>
<td>2043</td>
<td>pillar base</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td>1d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD EM 14</td>
<td>21325</td>
<td>2045</td>
<td>pillar body</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td>1e</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD EM 17</td>
<td>21557</td>
<td>2045</td>
<td>horse body</td>
<td>terra rossa</td>
<td>3b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD EM 27</td>
<td>21596</td>
<td>2045</td>
<td>horse body</td>
<td>motza marl</td>
<td>2a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD EM 15</td>
<td>21921</td>
<td>2071</td>
<td>pillar base</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td>1e</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD EM 16</td>
<td>29685</td>
<td>2040</td>
<td>pillar body</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td>1d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD EM 18</td>
<td>21518</td>
<td>2048</td>
<td>zoomorphic body</td>
<td>terra rossa?</td>
<td>3b?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD EM 19</td>
<td>21562</td>
<td>2050</td>
<td>horse body</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td>1b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD EM 21</td>
<td>21259</td>
<td>2041</td>
<td>horse&amp;rider</td>
<td>marl/loess</td>
<td>4/5b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD EM 25</td>
<td>21295</td>
<td>2041</td>
<td>horse front</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td>1a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD EM 28</td>
<td>21301</td>
<td>2041</td>
<td>horse head</td>
<td>motza marl</td>
<td>2a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD EM 37</td>
<td>21251</td>
<td>2041</td>
<td>horse body</td>
<td>terra rossa?</td>
<td>3a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD EM 23</td>
<td>20437</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>small horse body</td>
<td>loess?</td>
<td>5?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD EM 24</td>
<td>23472</td>
<td>2084</td>
<td>horse head</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td>1a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD EM 26</td>
<td>21711</td>
<td>2053</td>
<td>horse&amp;rider head</td>
<td>terra rossa?</td>
<td>3b?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD EM 30</td>
<td>21792</td>
<td>2053</td>
<td>horse body</td>
<td>rendzina?</td>
<td>1b?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD EM 31</td>
<td>21901</td>
<td>2066</td>
<td>zoomorphic body</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td>1a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD EM 41</td>
<td>21888</td>
<td>2066</td>
<td>horse head</td>
<td>rendzina?</td>
<td>1b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD EM 32</td>
<td>23459</td>
<td>2081</td>
<td>horse body</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td>1e</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD EM 34</td>
<td>22292</td>
<td>2096</td>
<td>horse body</td>
<td>motza marl?</td>
<td>2b?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD EM 38</td>
<td>21902</td>
<td>2054</td>
<td>zoomorphic body</td>
<td>terra rossa?</td>
<td>3a?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD EM 39</td>
<td>21610</td>
<td>2052</td>
<td>horse body</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td>1a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD EM 40</td>
<td>29865</td>
<td>2051</td>
<td>horse body</td>
<td>terra rossa</td>
<td>3a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 39: Petrographic samples from Areas D1 and D2 in Shiloh's excavations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COD YS 11</td>
<td>D2 20242</td>
<td>2323</td>
<td>floor</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>pinched head</td>
<td>motza marl</td>
<td>2a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD YS 12</td>
<td>D2 20339</td>
<td>2323</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>zoomorphic head</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td>1c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD YS 59</td>
<td>D2 20243</td>
<td>2323</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>pinched head</td>
<td>terra ossa?</td>
<td>3b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD YS 60</td>
<td>D2 20302</td>
<td>2323</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>horse body</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td>1a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD YS 58</td>
<td>D1 13363</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>Floor/ash layer</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>pinched head?</td>
<td>motza marl</td>
<td>2b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COD YS: City of David, Yigal Shiloh; COD EM: City of David, Eilat Mazar, MV: Mevesseret
Table 40: Petrographic samples from Area E1 in Shiloh's excavations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample No.</th>
<th>Reg. No.</th>
<th>Locus</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Strata</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Grp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COD YS 14</td>
<td>E1 16286</td>
<td>2028</td>
<td>Reuse of pavement structure; fill</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>zoomorphic leg</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td>1a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD YS 37</td>
<td>E1 16360</td>
<td>2028</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>pillar torso</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td>1b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD YS 51</td>
<td>E1 16727</td>
<td>2028</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>horse body</td>
<td>rendzina?</td>
<td>1b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD YS 15</td>
<td>E1 10527</td>
<td>1604</td>
<td>Long corridor in pavement structure/deep fill</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>molded head</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td>1d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD YS 19</td>
<td>E1 10422</td>
<td>1604</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>zoomorphic figurine</td>
<td>terra rossa</td>
<td>3a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD YS 25</td>
<td>E1 10520</td>
<td>1604</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>horse head</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td>1a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD YS 53</td>
<td>E1 10485</td>
<td>1604</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>horse body</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td>1b/1c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD YS 54</td>
<td>E1 10384</td>
<td>1604</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>bed model?</td>
<td>rendzina/ motza</td>
<td>1b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD YS 56</td>
<td>E1 16085</td>
<td>1604</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>horse body</td>
<td>rendzina/ motza</td>
<td>1b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD YS 57</td>
<td>E1 10464</td>
<td>1604</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>horse hind</td>
<td>loess</td>
<td>5?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD YS 18</td>
<td>E1 10126</td>
<td>1623</td>
<td>Fill, could be contaminated</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>pillar torso?</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td>1b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD YS</td>
<td>E1 3418</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>Floor in Terrace</td>
<td>12a</td>
<td>horse head</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td>1a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>COD YS 38</td>
<td>E1 3646</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>12a</td>
<td>pinched head?</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td>1e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD YS 22</td>
<td>E1 8456</td>
<td>1303</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>molded head</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td>1a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD YS 23</td>
<td>E1 5948</td>
<td>698</td>
<td>Terrace House fill</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>pinched head</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td>1c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD YS 24</td>
<td>E1 3663</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>Drainage channel, N of Terrace House</td>
<td>11-12</td>
<td>zoomorphic head</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td>1a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD YS 41</td>
<td>E1 3664</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>11-12</td>
<td>molded head</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td>1e</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD YS 52</td>
<td>E1 3475</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>11-12</td>
<td>horse body</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td>1c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD YS 32</td>
<td>E1 9329</td>
<td>1310</td>
<td>Northern Structure</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>molded head</td>
<td>rendzina/motza</td>
<td>1b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD YS 33</td>
<td>E1 8520</td>
<td>1312</td>
<td>Fill covering lane</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>pillar torso</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td>1e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD YS 36</td>
<td>E1 10257</td>
<td>1627</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>pinched head</td>
<td>terra rossa?</td>
<td>3a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD YS 39</td>
<td>E1 3481</td>
<td>621A</td>
<td>Lane</td>
<td>12a</td>
<td>pillar torso</td>
<td>terra rossa?</td>
<td>3b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD YS 21</td>
<td>E1 3436</td>
<td>621A</td>
<td>12a</td>
<td>pinched head</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td>1e</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD YS 40</td>
<td>E1 3526</td>
<td>1489</td>
<td>House of the Monoliths</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>pillar torso</td>
<td>motza marl</td>
<td>2b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD YS 647</td>
<td>E1 6143</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>lane</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>pillar torso</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td>1a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 41: Petrographic samples from Area E3 in Shiloh’s excavations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample No.</th>
<th>Reg. No.</th>
<th>Locus</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Strata</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COD YS 16</td>
<td>E3 15924</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>14-15</td>
<td>pillar torso</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td>1d/1e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD YS 13</td>
<td>E3 15634</td>
<td>1927</td>
<td>Structure 1927 floor</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>pillar torso</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td>1a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD YS 45</td>
<td>E3 15706</td>
<td>1927</td>
<td>Structure 1927 floor</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>pinched head</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td>1c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD YS 47</td>
<td>E3 15705</td>
<td>1927</td>
<td>Structure 1927 floor</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>pinched head</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td>1b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD YS 55</td>
<td>E3 15699</td>
<td>1927</td>
<td>Structure 1927 floor</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>zoomorphic body</td>
<td>rendzina/motza</td>
<td>1c?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD YS 17</td>
<td>E3 15592</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>Structure 1927 conflagration layer</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>pillar torso</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td>1a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD YS 44</td>
<td>E3 15736</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>pinched head</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td>1b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD YS</td>
<td>E3</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>pinched head</td>
<td>rendzina</td>
<td>1a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>15643</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COD YS**: City of David, Yigal Shiloh; **COD EM**: City of David, Eilat Mazar, **MV**: Mevasseret

**Table 42: Rendzina soil samples by area**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>1a</th>
<th>1a?</th>
<th>1b</th>
<th>1b/c</th>
<th>1c</th>
<th>1c?</th>
<th>1d/1e</th>
<th>1d</th>
<th>1e</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% of area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area G</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area D2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area E1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area E3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 43: Moza marl samples by area**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>2a</th>
<th>2b</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% of Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area G</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area D2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area E1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area E3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 44: Terra Rossa samples by area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>3a</th>
<th>3a/c</th>
<th>3b</th>
<th>3c</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% of Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area G</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area D2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area E1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area E3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 45: Loess samples by area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>5?</th>
<th>5a</th>
<th>5b</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% of Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area G</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area D2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area E1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area E3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Table 46: Non-figure tested**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Soil Type</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COD YS 61</td>
<td>cooking pot</td>
<td>Hamra?</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD YS 62</td>
<td>cooking pot</td>
<td>Hamra?</td>
<td>HF, elongated voids</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD YS 63</td>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>loess</td>
<td></td>
<td>5b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD YS 64</td>
<td>Krater</td>
<td>motza marl</td>
<td></td>
<td>2c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD YS 65</td>
<td>holemouth jar</td>
<td>motza marl</td>
<td></td>
<td>2b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD YS 66</td>
<td>Jug</td>
<td>Hamra?</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD EM 42</td>
<td>lion head cup?</td>
<td>brown?</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD EM 43</td>
<td>Krater</td>
<td>terra rossa</td>
<td></td>
<td>3b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD EM 44</td>
<td>Krater</td>
<td>terra rossa</td>
<td></td>
<td>3b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD EM 45</td>
<td>Decanter</td>
<td>motza marl</td>
<td></td>
<td>2a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MV4</td>
<td>Basin</td>
<td>terra rossa?</td>
<td></td>
<td>3a-c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MV5</td>
<td>Basin</td>
<td>terra rossa?</td>
<td>small slide</td>
<td>3a?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MV6</td>
<td>Basin</td>
<td>terra rossa?</td>
<td></td>
<td>3a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MV7</td>
<td>Basin</td>
<td>terra rossa?</td>
<td></td>
<td>3a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MV8</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>terra rossa</td>
<td>elongated voids</td>
<td>3a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MV9</td>
<td>Slag</td>
<td>terra rossa?</td>
<td></td>
<td>3a?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COD YS:** City of David, Yigal Shiloh; **COD EM:** City of David, Eilat Mazar, **MV:** Mevesseret

**Table 47: Petrographic groups by figurine type from Shiloh's excavations and Mazar's excavations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figurine Design</th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Group 3</th>
<th>Group 4/5</th>
<th>Group 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pinched Head</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molded Head</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoomorphic</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rider</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couch/Bed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 48: Petrographic groups and subgroups by figurine type from Shiloh's excavations and Mazar's excavations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figurine Design</th>
<th>Petrographic Subgroup</th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Group 3</th>
<th>Group 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pinched Head</td>
<td>3 2 2 5 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molded Head</td>
<td>2 1 1 1 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body</td>
<td>8 3 1 1 1 2 1 1 2 1 1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td>2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoomorphic</td>
<td>1 9 5 3 1 2 3 1 1 1 1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rider</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couch/bed</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 49: Petrographic groups by strata from Shiloh's excavations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strata</th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Group 3</th>
<th>Group 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14-15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 50 Petrographic groups and subgroups by strata from Shiloh's excavations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Petrographic Subgroup</th>
<th>Stratum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 51: Petrographic groups by figurine type, area, and strata from Shiloh's excavations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figurine Design</th>
<th>Area D1 and D2</th>
<th>Area E 12</th>
<th>Area E 11-12</th>
<th>Area E 11</th>
<th>Area E 10</th>
<th>Area G 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Molded Head Subgroups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grp 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grp 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grp 3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grp 5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinched Head Subgroups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grp 1</td>
<td>2a, 2b, 3b</td>
<td>1a, 1b, 1b, 1c, 1c, 1e, 1e, 1e, 3a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molded Head Subgroups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grp 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1c, 5a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

653
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bodies Subgroups</th>
<th>1a, 1a, 3b</th>
<th>1a, 1b, 2b</th>
<th>1e</th>
<th>1a, 1a, 3b, 3c</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grp 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grp 2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grp 3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grp 5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total anthro</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grp 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grp 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grp 3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grp 5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoo Subgroups</td>
<td>1c, 1a</td>
<td>1a, 1a, 1b, 1b/c, 1c?, 5?</td>
<td>1a, 1c</td>
<td>1a, 1b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grp 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grp 2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grp 3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grp 5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Figs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grp 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grp 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grp 3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grp 5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 52: Petrographic subgroups by structure in Shiloh Area E

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Petrographic Subgroups</th>
<th>1a</th>
<th>1b</th>
<th>1b/1c</th>
<th>1c</th>
<th>1c?</th>
<th>1d</th>
<th>1d/1e</th>
<th>1e</th>
<th>2b</th>
<th>3a</th>
<th>3b</th>
<th>5?</th>
<th>Total tested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-St. 12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E West Fills</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. 10 fills S. of Ashlar House</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monoliths</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane 1324</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrace</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drain 618</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Structure 1380</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavement Structure</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure 1927</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 53: Figurines from Mazar's excavations by petrographic groups and subgroups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroups</th>
<th>Pinched Head</th>
<th>Molded Head</th>
<th>Body/Base</th>
<th>Zoomorphic</th>
<th>Horse and Rider</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1a, 3?</td>
<td>1b?, 3a, 1a</td>
<td>1a, 1b, 1c, 1c, 1c, 1d, 1d, 1e, 1e, 2a, 3b</td>
<td>1a, 1a, 1a, 1a, 1b, 1b, 1b?, 1c, 1e, 2a, 2a, 2a 2b?, 3a, 3a, 3a, 3a?, 3b, 3b, 3b?, 3b?, 3b?, 5?</td>
<td>3b?, 3b?, 4/5b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Mazar Total | 1 | 2 | 9 | 9 | 0 |
| Grp 1       | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 |
| Grp 2       | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 2 |
| Grp 3       | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Grp 4/5     | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Grp 5       | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |

Table 54: Petrographic group totals for Area G from Shiloh's excavations and Mazar's excavations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 55: Pinched head variety in Shiloh areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>A.1.a</th>
<th>A.1.b</th>
<th>A.1.c</th>
<th>A.1.d</th>
<th>A.1.e</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 56: Pinched head variation in Shiloh Areas E and G of Stratum 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kletter Pinched Head Type</th>
<th>Area E Stratum 10</th>
<th>Area G Stratum 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.1.a</td>
<td>Reg. No. 5839, 7930, 9524, 9927</td>
<td>80% Reg. No. 5751, 11481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.1.c</td>
<td>Reg. No. 10127</td>
<td>20% Reg. No. 11147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.1.e</td>
<td>Reg. No. 8227, 11026</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A.1.a: simple pinched head, A.1.b: pinched head with turban A.1.c: pinched head with turban and sidelocks, A.1.d: pinched head with cap, A.1.e: pinched head with applied conical hat and sidelocks
Table 57: Area A domestic structures from Kenyon’s excavations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locus</th>
<th>Object</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building 6, Area 26, Floor 2</td>
<td>1 couch/table fragment, 1 zoomorphic fragment, 1 quern, 1 jar, 2 lamps, 1 jug, 1 bottle, 2 bowls, 1 plate, 1 loom weight, and 1 mortar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building 6, Area 26, Floor 3</td>
<td>1 pinched head with cap, 2 zoomorphic fragments, 1 unidentified fragment, 3 bowls, 1 pottery rattle, 1 juglet, a bone spatula, 1 iron strap fragment, 1 rubbing stone, and 2 loom weights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building 6, Area 26, Floor 4</td>
<td>1 female torso, 1 female bust, 2 zoomorphic fragments, 1 quern, 2 bowls, 1 juglet, 3 fragments of a cooking pot, 1 loom weight, 1 platter, 2 lamps, 2 bone spatulas, 1 scarab, 1 rubbing stone, 1 nail, and 1 bone fragment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Room” in City Wall (prob. contaminated)</td>
<td>1 female torso, 1 zoomorphic fragment, Iron II pottery, 1 chert nodule, 1 bead, 1 seal with inscription, Roman/Byzantine and Middle Bronze II sherds, and 1 modern knife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building 7, Area 28, Floor</td>
<td>1 pinched head, 1 stamped rosette jar handle, 1 bronze spit pin, 1 iron object, 1 incised cooking pot sherd, 1 bowl fragment, 2 foot baths, 1 holemouth jar, 1 incised handle fragment with a single circle, 1 stone weight, 1 stone seat (probably secondary), and ca. 32 loom weights, 133 sherds.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 58: Head types from Iron II loci in Kenyon's excavations and Shiloh's excavations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kenyon</th>
<th>Shiloh</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase</td>
<td>Pinched</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 5 and 6 collapse over caves and buildings</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 8 Street</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 26, 28</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 9 Destruction</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 59: Head types from Iron II loci (excluding the Kenyon street deposit) in Kenyon's excavations and Shiloh's excavations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Kenyon</th>
<th>Shiloh</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pinched</td>
<td>Molded</td>
<td>Pinched</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eighth Century</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seventh Century</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of Seventh-586</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destruction</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 60: Total head types from Iron II loci in Kenyon's excavations and Shiloh's excavations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excavation</th>
<th>Pinched</th>
<th>Molded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kenyon</td>
<td>19 (66%)</td>
<td>10 (34%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shiloh</td>
<td>36 (71%)</td>
<td>15 (29%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>55 (69%)</td>
<td>25 (31%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 61: Known figurines from other excavations at the City of David and on the Ophel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excavation</th>
<th>Publication</th>
<th>Holland Type</th>
<th>Reg. or Plate</th>
<th>Kletter Type</th>
<th>Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bliss and Dickey: Mount Zion and the City of David</td>
<td>Bliss and Dickey</td>
<td>A.I.a.51</td>
<td>287Ac.1.AP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Holland Type</td>
<td>Reg. or Plate</td>
<td>Kletter Type</td>
<td>Context</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A.X.b.44</td>
<td>288.C.2</td>
<td>Ophel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Holland Type</td>
<td>Reg. or Plate</td>
<td>Kletter Type</td>
<td>Context</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A.III.d.8; Listed</td>
<td>291.B.4.B</td>
<td>Iron? But in Macalister's section on post-exilic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Macalister and Duncan</td>
<td>A.IV.e.2</td>
<td>5.I.4.7</td>
<td>Kletter: under floor of Byz building; In Macalister is in section on post-exilic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A.XI.42</td>
<td>9B(22A)?</td>
<td>In cat. called C.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>290.C.1; In cat. called C.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kletter: Iron?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duncan</td>
<td>9B2777?</td>
<td>286.C.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vincent</td>
<td>A.VI.b.1</td>
<td>279.B.2?E</td>
<td>Kletter: &quot;ophel hill&quot; Jerusalem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A.VI.d.1</td>
<td>278.B.4.E?</td>
<td>Kletter: &quot;ophel hill&quot; Jerusalem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B.VII.11</td>
<td>5.I.2.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mazar: Temple Mount</td>
<td>Benjamin Mazar</td>
<td>1469</td>
<td>438.A.? In cat. says A.1?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>194</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not in Kletter; a solid pinched male head with conical helmet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 diff. figs. are listed under this number: this figurine, horse head, and animal torso</td>
<td></td>
<td>mid8-mid7; Locus 6015 pottery deposit in unfinished tomb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E/F 15/16</td>
<td>440.B.1?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>269k</td>
<td>441.B.?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben-Dov</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin Mazar</td>
<td>746/10</td>
<td>439.C.2</td>
<td>mid8-mid7; Locus 6015 pottery deposit in unfinished tomb</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 62: Figurines from the Jewish Quarter on the southwestern hill

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jewish Quarter Catalogue #</th>
<th>Reg. No.</th>
<th>Kletter</th>
<th>Descrip.</th>
<th>Stratum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F241</td>
<td>34494</td>
<td></td>
<td>pinched head</td>
<td>ST 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F18</td>
<td>3342/1</td>
<td></td>
<td>pinched head</td>
<td>ST 9-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F39</td>
<td>3926/1</td>
<td></td>
<td>pinched head</td>
<td>ST 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F163</td>
<td>3962</td>
<td></td>
<td>complete female pinched head fig</td>
<td>NONE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F57</td>
<td>8433/5</td>
<td>308.Bc.2.A</td>
<td>complete fig with molded head</td>
<td>ST 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F3</td>
<td>2675/1</td>
<td></td>
<td>molded head</td>
<td>ST 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F211</td>
<td>615/1</td>
<td></td>
<td>molded head</td>
<td>ST 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F25</td>
<td>3400/1</td>
<td></td>
<td>molded head</td>
<td>ST 9-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F17</td>
<td>3299/1</td>
<td></td>
<td>molded head</td>
<td>ST 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F53</td>
<td>3913/1</td>
<td></td>
<td>molded head</td>
<td>ST 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F55</td>
<td>8431/1</td>
<td></td>
<td>molded head</td>
<td>ST 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F238</td>
<td>34312</td>
<td></td>
<td>molded head</td>
<td>ST 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F61</td>
<td>8442/1</td>
<td></td>
<td>molded head</td>
<td>ST 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1</td>
<td>2385/1</td>
<td></td>
<td>complete pillar with female torso</td>
<td>ST 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F34</td>
<td>3763/1</td>
<td></td>
<td>torso</td>
<td>ST 8-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F143</td>
<td>8902/1</td>
<td>torso</td>
<td>ST 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F234</td>
<td>34305/1</td>
<td>upper part of female pillar figurine</td>
<td>ST 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F235</td>
<td>34305/2</td>
<td>female torso</td>
<td>ST 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F4</td>
<td>2725/2</td>
<td>pillar with concave base</td>
<td>ST 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F29</td>
<td>3853/1</td>
<td>pillar</td>
<td>ST 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F30</td>
<td>3853/2</td>
<td>pillar</td>
<td>ST 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F33</td>
<td>3786/1</td>
<td>pillar with concave base</td>
<td>ST 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F63</td>
<td>8436/1</td>
<td>pillar with flat base</td>
<td>ST 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F105</td>
<td>8620/1</td>
<td>pillar with remains of human hand</td>
<td>ST 8-7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F137</td>
<td>8846</td>
<td>pillar</td>
<td>ST 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F138</td>
<td>8850</td>
<td>pillar with concave base</td>
<td>ST 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F209</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>pillar with flat base</td>
<td>ST 7-6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F226</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>pillar</td>
<td>ST 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F236</td>
<td>34308/1</td>
<td>pillar with concave base</td>
<td>ST 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F9</td>
<td>3361/1</td>
<td>307.B.3.A hollow molded head</td>
<td>ST 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F58</td>
<td>8435/1</td>
<td>wheel</td>
<td>ST 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Eighth Century (St 9)</td>
<td>Late Eighth-Seventh Century</td>
<td>Seventh Century</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinched</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molded</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bodies/bases</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 63: Chronological breakdown of figurines from Iron II loci in Areas A, W, and X-2 of the Jewish Quarter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Pinched Head</th>
<th>Molded Head</th>
<th>Bodies/Bases</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X-2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 64: Spatial breakdown of figurines in Iron II loci from Areas A, X-2, and W of the Jewish Quarter
Table 65: Figurines from Iron II loci in Area X-2 of Jewish Quarter on the southwestern hill

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F241</td>
<td>34494</td>
<td></td>
<td>pinched head</td>
<td>AREA X-2:5469</td>
<td>IRON: ST 9; 8th-7th</td>
<td>earth fill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F238</td>
<td>34312</td>
<td></td>
<td>molded head</td>
<td>AREA X-2:5443</td>
<td>ST 9; 8th-7th</td>
<td>bedding of floor 5440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F234</td>
<td>34305/1</td>
<td></td>
<td>upper part of female pillar figurine</td>
<td>AREA X-2:5441</td>
<td>ST 9; 8th-7th</td>
<td>bedding of floor 5440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F235</td>
<td>34305/2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Female torso</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 236</td>
<td>34308/1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pillar with concave base</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 66: Figurines from Iron II loci in Area W of the Jewish Quarter on the southwestern hill

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F211</td>
<td>615/1</td>
<td></td>
<td>molded head</td>
<td>AREA W: 3071</td>
<td>ST 7A; 8th</td>
<td>bedding of floor 3024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F209</td>
<td>600</td>
<td></td>
<td>pillar with flat base</td>
<td>AREA W: 3070</td>
<td>ST 7-6; 7th</td>
<td>Earth fill covering bedrock and remains of quarries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F226</td>
<td>970</td>
<td></td>
<td>pillar</td>
<td>AREA W: 3117</td>
<td>ST 6 7th</td>
<td>Included in 3135; foundation trench of W 4030 (part of Israelite tower 4006-4030).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 67: Figurines from Iron II loci in Area A of the Jewish Quarter on the southwestern hill

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jewish Quarter Catalogue *</th>
<th>Reg. No.</th>
<th>Kletter</th>
<th>Descrip.</th>
<th>Area and locus</th>
<th>Stratum and Date</th>
<th>Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F18</td>
<td>3342/1</td>
<td></td>
<td>pinched head</td>
<td>AREA A:SQ F10: 122</td>
<td>IRON: St 9-7; 8th-6th</td>
<td>Floor of crushed beaten limestone or earth fill beneath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F39</td>
<td>3926/1</td>
<td></td>
<td>pinched head</td>
<td>AREA A: SQ F-G14:161</td>
<td>IRON: St 9; 8th</td>
<td>One layer of fill 163; waste material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F53</td>
<td>3913/1</td>
<td>molded head</td>
<td>AREA A: SQ F-G14:166</td>
<td>St 9; 8th</td>
<td>One layer of fill 163; waste material dumped on hillside</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F63</td>
<td>8436/1</td>
<td>pillar with flat base</td>
<td>AREA A: SQ D-E12:176</td>
<td>St 9; 8th</td>
<td>Roofed cell from structure 363 in its earlier phase (363b)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F57</td>
<td>8433/5</td>
<td>complete fig with molded head</td>
<td>AREA A: SQ D-E12: 172</td>
<td>St 9; 8th</td>
<td>fill of earth mixed with gravel N of W593; part of later phase of structure 363 (363a)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F55</td>
<td>8431/1</td>
<td>molded head</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F58</td>
<td>8435/1</td>
<td>wheel made concave pillar base</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F59</td>
<td>8435/5</td>
<td>female pillar figurine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F25</td>
<td>3400/1</td>
<td>molded head</td>
<td>AREA A: SQ F10:125</td>
<td>St 9-7; 8th-6th</td>
<td>Earth fill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F61</td>
<td>8442/1</td>
<td>molded head</td>
<td>AREA A: SQ F11: 174</td>
<td>St 9; 8th</td>
<td>Floor of crushed and beaten limestone or fill beneath</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F34</td>
<td>3763/1</td>
<td>torso</td>
<td>AREA A: SQ F-G14: 159</td>
<td>St 8-7; Late 8th-7th</td>
<td>Floor layers of earth mixed with crushed, beaten limestone.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F143</td>
<td>8902/1</td>
<td>torso</td>
<td>AREA A SQ D-E10:369</td>
<td>St 9; 8th</td>
<td>Upper floor of beaten earth, or lower floor or terra rossa fill beneath lower floor.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F29</td>
<td>3853/1</td>
<td>pillar</td>
<td>AREA A: SQH14: 154b</td>
<td>ST7; 7th- beginning of 6th</td>
<td>Earth fills found in robbers trench of Broad Wall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F30</td>
<td>3853/2</td>
<td>pillar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F105</td>
<td>8620/1</td>
<td>pillar with remains of human hand</td>
<td>AREA A: SQ G-H15-16: 179</td>
<td>St 8-7; End of 8th-7th</td>
<td>179a is 2 m thick earth fill, above 179b, a thin organic accumulation, above floor 179c, which may be possible road or ramp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F70</td>
<td>8474/1</td>
<td>wheel made pillar with concave base</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 68: Figurines from older Jerusalem excavations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publication</th>
<th>Holland</th>
<th>Reg.</th>
<th>Kletter</th>
<th>Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crowfoot and Fitzgerald: Tyropoeon Valley</td>
<td>A.I.i.22</td>
<td>5.I.4.14</td>
<td>Kletter says mixed Iron Age/Hellenistic; room</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A.II.h.4</td>
<td>296.B.4.A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A.III.d.9</td>
<td>295.B.4.B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A.VII.c.1</td>
<td>294.B.2.G</td>
<td>Kletter says mixed Iron Age/Hellenistic; room</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not in Holland</td>
<td>Not in Kletter; molded head</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A.X.b.45</td>
<td>298.C.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A.X.c.9</td>
<td>297.C.1.C</td>
<td>Kletter says: Room 41 of lowest level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A.XI.43</td>
<td>299.C.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not in Holland</td>
<td>Not in Kletter; female body</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clermont-</td>
<td></td>
<td>835.C.2;</td>
<td>Kletter says:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ganneau: Muslim Quarter</th>
<th>MISTYPED B.2</th>
<th>Found on bedrock in Muslim Quarter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amiran and Eitan: Citadel</td>
<td>A.I.a53</td>
<td>436A.1.A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Iron IIc floors and ash pit above bedrock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ketef Hinnom Tombs</td>
<td>974/1</td>
<td>792.A.2; MISTYPED AS C.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3195</td>
<td>790.B.2-4?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3314</td>
<td>791.B.3-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1752</td>
<td>793.C.3 Kletter says: L144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1537</td>
<td>794.C.3 Kletter says: L134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3716</td>
<td>795.C.3 Kletter says: Fills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2858</td>
<td>796.C.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mamilla Tombs</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>473.B.2-3.A?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5-105/1</td>
<td>467.C.1 8th - 7th century; tomb repos.; From floor of central collection area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 84</td>
<td>468.C.1 8th - 7th century; tomb repos.; From floor of central collection area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19; Not listed on</td>
<td>469.C.1 Kletter says: 8th - 7th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Chart but in cat.</td>
<td>Century; tomb excav in 1927 excav by Amiran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. Zion tombs</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>590.C.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>138</td>
<td>591.C.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lux: Muristan</td>
<td>A.I.a.53a</td>
<td>434.A.1; cat. says: A.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fill ranging from 7\textsuperscript{th} – 1\textsuperscript{st} centuries BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A.I.b.6a</td>
<td>433.A.2.A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fill ranging from 7\textsuperscript{th} – 1\textsuperscript{st} centuries BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A.I.c.4a</td>
<td>435.A.3.A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fill ranging from 7\textsuperscript{th} – 1\textsuperscript{st} centuries BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broshi and Barkay: St. Vartan Chapel, The Holy Sepulchre</td>
<td>Not in Holland</td>
<td>Not in Kletter; pinched head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prob. From Iron II remains above quarry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broshi: West Wall</td>
<td></td>
<td>804.A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>805.A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>806.A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>800.B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>801.B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>802.B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>803.B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>807.C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>808.C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>809.C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>810.C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>811.C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>812.C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>813.C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>814.C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>815.C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 69: Figurines from Moza

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reg. No.</th>
<th>Descrip.</th>
<th>Locus</th>
<th>Locus Descrip.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Other obj</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B10496</td>
<td>Pinched Head and Bust</td>
<td>Area A, L 231</td>
<td>Fill. Combined</td>
<td>Stratum IV?; 7(^{th})</td>
<td>None listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>with 230, 232, 233,</td>
<td>beginning of 6(^{th})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>234, 237, 244, 245</td>
<td>century</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B10090</td>
<td>Molded Head</td>
<td>Area A L 163</td>
<td>Topsoil</td>
<td>Stratum I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B60019</td>
<td>Molded Head</td>
<td>Area E L 6003</td>
<td>Fill down to bedrock</td>
<td>Tractor Probe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B32979</td>
<td>Handmade Body</td>
<td>Area B, Southern Secondary Area, Pit 2079</td>
<td>Pit</td>
<td>Stratum IV; 7(^{th}) beginning of 6(^{th}) century</td>
<td>Incised Handle 32983, Bone/Ivory Fragment 33055, Flint 33057, 33141, 33236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2014/A</td>
<td>Handmade Body</td>
<td>Area B, Pit 304</td>
<td>Pit</td>
<td>Stratum I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kletter 474.C.2</td>
<td>Handmade Body</td>
<td>Surface Find</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113A.1.A</td>
<td>Reg. 724</td>
<td>Pinched Head</td>
<td>L 120</td>
<td>Cistern; also contained hammerstone, and figurine fragments 729, 728, 727, 725, which are probably animals.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112.B.3.A</td>
<td>Reg. 912</td>
<td>Molded Head</td>
<td>L 179</td>
<td>Accumulation on top of a surface/living space, ca. 40 cm. Also contained minimal ceramics.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114.C.2</td>
<td>Reg. 136</td>
<td>Body</td>
<td>Field B</td>
<td>Unable to locate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>463.C.2</td>
<td>Reg. 2963</td>
<td>Body</td>
<td>Field C1</td>
<td>Unable to locate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>578.C.2</td>
<td>Reg. 23710</td>
<td>Body</td>
<td>No field listed</td>
<td>Unable to locate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>577.C.2?</td>
<td>Reg. 2969</td>
<td>Body</td>
<td>L 1152</td>
<td>Domestic area; Part of the same building as L2195; fill; no remains of floors in this area; pottery also found</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115.C.3</td>
<td>Reg. 943</td>
<td>Base</td>
<td>L 196</td>
<td>Domestic area; cistern also containing much pottery and bones; a fragmentary building was adj. to the cistern but function unclear</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132.C.3</td>
<td>Reg. 13748</td>
<td>Base</td>
<td>L 1116</td>
<td>Just west of the winery. Large area with late accumulation,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
partly covering one of the wine cisterns. Difficult to interpret. Also contained bones.

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>310.C.3</td>
<td>Reg. 1941</td>
<td>Base</td>
<td>L 2195</td>
<td>Domestic area, best preserved building, courtyard space; near a cistern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311.C.3</td>
<td>Reg. 13763</td>
<td>Base</td>
<td>L 2195</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>464.C.3</td>
<td>Reg. 2737</td>
<td>Base</td>
<td>L 131</td>
<td>Possible floor? from very eroded building; also pottery on the floor as well as two figurines (763, 766), one grinding stone, one stone weight. Close to Cistern 120.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309.C.3</td>
<td>Reg. 766</td>
<td>Base</td>
<td>L 131</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 71: Figurines from Ramat Rachel published in Kletter and Holland

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Holland</th>
<th>Plate</th>
<th>Kletter</th>
<th>Locus</th>
<th>Locus Descrip.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.I.b.9</td>
<td>RRI 24:2; Basket 162/21</td>
<td>117.A.2.A</td>
<td>329 or 340?</td>
<td>Storeroom or nearby courtyard in Northern Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.I.g.5</td>
<td>RRI Pl. 5</td>
<td>118.A+.1.Ap</td>
<td>SQ Z15/16: L286</td>
<td>Secret passage through casemate wall near Northern Building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.I.j.12</td>
<td>RRI 24:3-4; Basket 1232/1; Kl. chart says 1232/2</td>
<td>119.Ac.1.C</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>Storeroom in Northern Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.II.f.3</td>
<td>RII 35:1; Basket 7321/1 but on fig. says 5921/1</td>
<td>120.B.3.A</td>
<td>Prob. 477</td>
<td>Storeroom in Northern Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.X.b.70</td>
<td>RII 36:2</td>
<td>123.C.2</td>
<td>Prob. 477</td>
<td>Storeroom in Northern Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.X.b.71</td>
<td>RII 36:1; Basket 5982/1 (?)</td>
<td>122.C.1</td>
<td>Prob. 477</td>
<td>Storeroom in Northern Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
<td>587.C.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
<td>588.C.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.I.c.2</td>
<td>RII 35:3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Prob. 477</td>
<td>Storeroom in Northern Building</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 72: Published and unpublished anthropomorphic and zoomorphic figurines from Ramat Rachel (courtesy of the Ramat Rahel Archaeological Project)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locus</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Photo</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Aharoni</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1132</td>
<td>Figurine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260c</td>
<td>Animal figurine</td>
<td></td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>Iron Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>285</td>
<td>Animal figurine</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>Late Iron Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297</td>
<td>Figurine</td>
<td></td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Late Iron Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297</td>
<td>Figurine</td>
<td></td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Late Iron Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297</td>
<td>Figurine</td>
<td></td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Iron Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297</td>
<td>Figurine</td>
<td></td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Iron Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297</td>
<td>Figurine</td>
<td></td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Iron Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297</td>
<td>Figurine</td>
<td></td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Iron Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297</td>
<td>Animal figurine</td>
<td></td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Iron Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>322</td>
<td>Figurine</td>
<td></td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Iron Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>322</td>
<td>Figurine</td>
<td></td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Iron Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>329</td>
<td>Figurine</td>
<td></td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Iron Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>329</td>
<td>Figurine</td>
<td></td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Iron Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>329</td>
<td>Figurine</td>
<td></td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Iron Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>329</td>
<td>Figurine</td>
<td></td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Iron Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>329</td>
<td>Figurine</td>
<td></td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Iron Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>337</td>
<td>Figurine</td>
<td></td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Iron Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>338</td>
<td>Figurine</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Iron Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>340</td>
<td>Animal figurine</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>Late Iron Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>340</td>
<td>Figurine</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>Late Iron Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>340</td>
<td>Figurine</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>Late Iron Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>340a</td>
<td>Figurine</td>
<td></td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Iron Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>340b</td>
<td>Figurine</td>
<td></td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Iron Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>340b</td>
<td>Animal figurine</td>
<td></td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Iron Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>340b</td>
<td>Animal figurine</td>
<td></td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Iron Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>340b</td>
<td>Animal figurine</td>
<td></td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Iron Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>340b</td>
<td>Figurine</td>
<td></td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Iron Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>346</td>
<td>Figurine</td>
<td></td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Iron Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>370</td>
<td>Animal figurine</td>
<td></td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Iron Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>383</td>
<td>Figurine</td>
<td></td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Iron Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>390</td>
<td>Animal figurine</td>
<td></td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Iron Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>390</td>
<td>Animal figurine</td>
<td></td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Iron Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410</td>
<td>Figurine</td>
<td></td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>Late Iron Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Period</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410E</td>
<td>Animal figurine</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>Late Iron Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410E</td>
<td>Figurine</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>Late Iron Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>439</td>
<td>Animal figurine</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>Iron Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>439</td>
<td>Animal figurine</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>Iron Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>444</td>
<td>Animal figurine</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>Late Iron Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>477</td>
<td>Figurine</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>Late Iron Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>477</td>
<td>Figurine</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>Late Iron Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>477</td>
<td>Figurine</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>Late Iron Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>477</td>
<td>Figurine</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>Late Iron Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>477</td>
<td>Figurine</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>Late Iron Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>477</td>
<td>Figurine</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>Late Iron Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>477</td>
<td>Figurine</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>Late Iron Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>477</td>
<td>Figurine</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>Late Iron Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>477</td>
<td>Figurine</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>Late Iron Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>477</td>
<td>Figurine</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>Late Iron Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>477</td>
<td>Figurine</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>Late Iron Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>477</td>
<td>Figurine</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>Late Iron Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>477</td>
<td>Figurine</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>Late Iron Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>477</td>
<td>Figurine</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>Late Iron Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>477</td>
<td>Figurine</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>Late Iron Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>477</td>
<td>Figurine</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>Late Iron Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>477</td>
<td>Figurine</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>Late Iron Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>477</td>
<td>Figurine</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>Late Iron Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>477</td>
<td>Figurine</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>Late Iron Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>477</td>
<td>Figurine</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>Late Iron Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>477</td>
<td>Figurine</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>Late Iron Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>477</td>
<td>Figurine</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>Late Iron Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>485</td>
<td>Animal figurine</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>Late Iron Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>491</td>
<td>Figurine</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>Late Iron Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>719</td>
<td>Animal figurine</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>Late Iron Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>724</td>
<td>Animal figurine</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>Late Iron Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>749</td>
<td>Figurine</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>Late Iron Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>752</td>
<td>Figurine</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>Late Iron Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>761</td>
<td>Animal figurine</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>Late Iron Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>764</td>
<td>Animal figurine</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>Late Iron Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>764</td>
<td>Figurine</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>Late Iron Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>774</td>
<td>Figurine</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>Late Iron Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>783</td>
<td>Figurine</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>Late Iron Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>802</td>
<td>Animal figurine</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>Late Iron Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>803</td>
<td>Figurine</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>Late Iron Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>803</td>
<td>Figurine</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>Late Iron Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>803</td>
<td>Figurine</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>Late Iron Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>803</td>
<td>Figurine</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>Late Iron Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>806</td>
<td>Animal figurine</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>Late Iron Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>820</td>
<td>Figurine</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>Late Iron Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>825</td>
<td>Figurine</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>Late Iron Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>934</td>
<td>Figurine</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>Byzantine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>935</td>
<td>Figurine</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>Late Iron Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Table 73: Figurines from the Gibeon pool**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Holland</th>
<th>Plate</th>
<th>Kletter</th>
<th>Descrip.</th>
<th>Elev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.I.a.9</td>
<td>41:290</td>
<td>44.A.1.Ap</td>
<td>Pinched Head</td>
<td>4.45-4.60m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.I.a.10</td>
<td>41:557</td>
<td>45.A+.1.A</td>
<td>Pinched Head with disc?</td>
<td>10.70-11.80m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.I.a.11</td>
<td>41:503</td>
<td>46.A.1.Ap</td>
<td>Pinched Head</td>
<td>7.80-8.30m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.I.a.12</td>
<td>41:382</td>
<td>47.A.1.Ap</td>
<td>Pinched Head</td>
<td>5.80-6.50m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.I.a.14</td>
<td>41:462</td>
<td>49.A.1.Ap</td>
<td>Pinched Head</td>
<td>7.30-7.60m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.I.a.15</td>
<td>41:441</td>
<td>50.A.1.Ap</td>
<td>Pinched Head</td>
<td>6.60-7.30m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.I.a.16</td>
<td>39:420</td>
<td>42.A+.1.Ap</td>
<td>Pinched Head</td>
<td>6.50-6.60m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.I.d.1</td>
<td>41:312</td>
<td>51.A.4.A</td>
<td>Pinched Head with cap</td>
<td>4.60-5.00m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.I.d.2</td>
<td>41:86</td>
<td>52.A.4.A</td>
<td>Pinched Head with cap</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.I.f.1</td>
<td>41:438</td>
<td>53.A.6.A</td>
<td>Pinched Head with elongated face and &quot;bun: at the back</td>
<td>6.60-7.30m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only mentioned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pinched Head</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only mentioned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pinched Head</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only mentioned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pinched Head</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.II.a.2</td>
<td>40:381</td>
<td>54.B.3.A</td>
<td>Molded Head</td>
<td>5.80-6.50m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.II.c.4</td>
<td>40:527; Missing from Kletter chart</td>
<td>55.B.1-2.A</td>
<td>Molded Head</td>
<td>9.00-9.80m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.II.c.5</td>
<td>40:548</td>
<td>56.B.1-2.A</td>
<td>Molded Head</td>
<td>10.30-10.70m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Catalogue</td>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.II.e.5</td>
<td>40:87</td>
<td>57.B</td>
<td>Molded Head</td>
<td>6.50-6.60m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.II.f.2</td>
<td>40:422</td>
<td>58.B.3.A</td>
<td>Molded Head</td>
<td>6.50-6.60m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.II.h.3</td>
<td>40:421</td>
<td>59.B.4.A</td>
<td>Molded Head</td>
<td>6.50-6.60m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Only mentioned</td>
<td>Molded Head</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.X.a.3</td>
<td>39:437</td>
<td>63.C.1</td>
<td>Body</td>
<td>6.60-7.30m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.X.b.8</td>
<td>39:379</td>
<td>62.C.1</td>
<td>Body</td>
<td>5.80-6.50m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.X.b.9</td>
<td>39:434</td>
<td>67.C.2</td>
<td>Body</td>
<td>6.60-7.30m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.X.b.10</td>
<td>39:330</td>
<td>64.C.2</td>
<td>Body</td>
<td>5.00-5.30m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.X.b.11</td>
<td>39:511</td>
<td>65.C.2</td>
<td>Body</td>
<td>8.30-8.80m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.X.b.12</td>
<td>39:419</td>
<td>66.C.2</td>
<td>Body</td>
<td>6.50-6.60m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.X.b.13</td>
<td>39:432+435</td>
<td>61.C.1</td>
<td>Body</td>
<td>6.60-7.30m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Only mentioned</td>
<td>Body</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Only mentioned</td>
<td>Body</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Only mentioned</td>
<td>Body</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Only mentioned</td>
<td>Body</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Only mentioned</td>
<td>Body</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Only mentioned</td>
<td>Body</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Only mentioned</td>
<td>Body</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Only mentioned</td>
<td>Body</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Only mentioned</td>
<td>Body</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Only mentioned</td>
<td>Body</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only mentioned</td>
<td>Body</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only mentioned</td>
<td>Body</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only mentioned</td>
<td>Body</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only mentioned</td>
<td>Body</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only mentioned</td>
<td>Body</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only mentioned</td>
<td>Body</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only mentioned</td>
<td>Body</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only mentioned</td>
<td>Body</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only mentioned</td>
<td>Body</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only mentioned</td>
<td>Body</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only mentioned</td>
<td>Body</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only mentioned</td>
<td>Body</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only mentioned</td>
<td>Body</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only mentioned</td>
<td>Body</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A.XII.r.1 40:568 60.B Molded Head

B.VII.2 39:285 579.C.2 Body; Holland says hollow but Pritchard does not describe body as hollow
Table 74: Figurines from Tell en Nasbeh published in Kletter, Holland, or McCowan with dates and plans from Zorn

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Holland</th>
<th>Reg. No.</th>
<th>Kletter</th>
<th>Locus</th>
<th>Date given in Zorn with page no.</th>
<th>Zorn Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kletter mistype X13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.I.a.59</td>
<td>X.26</td>
<td>130A.1.A</td>
<td>Kletter: SQ.AD-17, Room 586</td>
<td>Zorn 730: Iron IIa through IIc (or maybe Bab/Per)</td>
<td>Plan 159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.I.a.60; Kletter notes same fig in A.I.c.6</td>
<td>M1608</td>
<td>126Ac.1.A</td>
<td>Kletter: SQ.RS-22, Room 369; Zorn says: S22</td>
<td>Zorn 165,503: Iron IIc or Bab/Per</td>
<td>Plan 93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>495.A.1.A</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kletter:SQ.AC-15, Room 534</td>
<td>Zorn 1571,648: Iron IIa through IIc (Maybe Bab/Per)</td>
<td>Plan 141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>496.A.1.A</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kletter:SQ.AB-16, Room 616</td>
<td>Zorn 1589: mixed locus; Zorn 656: Iron IIa through IIc</td>
<td>Plan 142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>497.A.1.A</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kletter:SQ.AB-16, Room 616;</td>
<td>Zorn 1589: mixed locus; Zorn 656: Iron IIa through IIc</td>
<td>Plan 142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Kletter:</td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>498.A.1.A</td>
<td>SQ.AB-17, Room 625A</td>
<td>142</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>499.A.1.A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500.A.1.A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501.A.1.A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>502.A.1.A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>503.A.1.A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>504.A.1.A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>505.A.1.A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>506.A.1.A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.I.b.7</td>
<td>Kletter: SQ. AC-14, Room 566</td>
<td>141</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.I.b.8</td>
<td>SQ. P-17, Cistern 216</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.I.c.5</td>
<td>Kletter: SQ. P-17, Cistern 216</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.I.c.6</td>
<td>Kletter: SQ. AB-25, Room 221</td>
<td>145</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.I.c.7</td>
<td>SQ. AA-14, Room 393</td>
<td>141</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.I.c.8</td>
<td>SQ. Q-14, Room 239</td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Architecture at Site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.I.c.9</td>
<td>M 2480</td>
<td>128.A.3.A</td>
<td>Kletter: SQ.AG-19, Cistern 368; mistypes in Kletter chart as 386; Acc. to Kletter, museum card at Rock. says 329A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Zorn 828: Iron IIa through IIc Plan 177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.I.c.9a</td>
<td>1512; not published in McCowan</td>
<td>138.A.3.A</td>
<td>SQ AB-25; Room 224; Acc. to Kletter head reads “4.4.1932, Level II East 224”; Acc. to Holland and museum card, head is from Level I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Zorn 165: Bab/Per; Zorn 713, could have extended into Stratum 1 though unlikely Plan 145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.I.d.5</td>
<td>X 35</td>
<td>137.A.2.A</td>
<td>Kletter: SQ.AA-18,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.I.d.6</td>
<td>M 2814</td>
<td>140.A.4.A</td>
<td>Kletter: SQ.AB-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.I.g.4</td>
<td>M 464</td>
<td>179.C.2.D</td>
<td>Kletter: SQ.AJ-20, Cistern 159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.I.j.8</td>
<td>M 988; Kletter Cat. mistypes 998</td>
<td>139.A.4.Cp</td>
<td>Kletter: SQ. P-17, Cistern 216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.II.a.8</td>
<td>M 666</td>
<td>141.B.3.A</td>
<td>Kletter: SQ.P-15, Room 132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Zorn 166: Maybe Bab/Per.; Zorn 416-17: Maybe Iron IIb through IIc; Zorn 1480: Iron IIb? Through Bab/Per? Plan 73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

488.A.2-3

489.A.2-3
<p>| A.II.a.12 | M 120 | 159.B.2.A | Kletter: Surface near Pit 2 but Rock. card says surface near Pit 32 | | |
| A.II.a.13 | M 1195 | 146.B.3.A | Kletter: SQ.P-14, Building Level II from an open area near the bastion in the N of the city | | |
| A.II.c.10 | M 690 | 149.B.1-2.A | SQ.R-17?, Room161, | | |
| A.II.d.2 | M 2815 | 151.B.2-3.A | Kletter: SQ.AB-16, exact locus unknown | | |
| A.II.d.4 | M 2350 | 152.B.2-3.A | Kletter: SQ.Z-14, Room 398 | Zorn 165, 560: Bab/Per | Plan 124 |
| A.III.d.1 | M 2419 | 154.B.4.B | Kletter: SQ.AF-17, dump | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9</th>
<th>Room 633 through IIc</th>
<th>126</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.IV.b.4</td>
<td>M 221</td>
<td>160.B.2.C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 142</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.IV.b.5</td>
<td>M 2808</td>
<td>162.B.3.C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.IV.e.5</td>
<td>1072; Kletter cat. mistypes 1702</td>
<td>161.B.2.C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.IV.e.6</td>
<td>M 1550</td>
<td>164.B.2.B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.IV.e.7</td>
<td>M 2535</td>
<td>163.B.3.B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 159</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.IX.a.1</td>
<td>M 1033</td>
<td>168.B.sr?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.IX.a.2</td>
<td>M 1698</td>
<td>165.B.srt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.IX.d.1</td>
<td>M 2868</td>
<td>166.B.5.A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cistern 156</td>
<td>Zorn 840: Building Iron IIA through IIC/ cistern Iron IIA through Bab/Per</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>508.C.1; OMIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>509.C.1; OMIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>510.C.1; OMIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>511.C.1; OMIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>512.C.1; OMIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>513.C.1; OMIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>514.C.1; OMIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>515.C.1; OMIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>516.C.1; OMIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>517.C.1; OMIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>518.C.1; OMIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>519.C.1; OMIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>520.C.1; OMIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>521.C.1; OMIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>522.C.1; OMIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>523.C.1; OMIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>524.C.1; OMIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>525.C.1; OMIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>526.C.1; OMIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>527.C.1; OMIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>528.C.1; OMIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>529.C.1; OMIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>530.C.1; OMIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>531.C.1; OMIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>532.C.1; OMIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>533.C.1; OMIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>534.C.1; OMIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>535.C.1; OMIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>536.C.1; OMIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>537.C.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>538.C.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>539.C.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>540.C.2</td>
<td>Kletter: SQ.AD-17, Cistern 359</td>
<td>Zorn 653: Iron IIa-c or Bab/Per</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>541.C.2</td>
<td>Kletter: SQ.AJ-20, Room 64</td>
<td>Zorn 1466: mixed Iron through Bab/Per; Zorn 845: Iron Ila through IIc (maybe Bab/Per)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>542.C.2</td>
<td>Kletter: SQ.Y-24, Room104</td>
<td>Zorn: 1474: Bab/Per; Zorn 609: Post Iron Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>543.C.2</td>
<td>Kletter: SQ.R-17, Silo 249</td>
<td>Zorn 488: Iron I probably through Iron II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>544.C.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>545.C.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>546.C.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>547.C.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>548.C.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>549.C.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>550.C.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>551.C.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.X.a.10</td>
<td>M 870</td>
<td>178.C.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.X.b.64</td>
<td>M 416</td>
<td>171.C.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.X.b.65</td>
<td>X.48</td>
<td>176.C.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.X.b.66</td>
<td>X35</td>
<td>177.C.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.X.b.67</td>
<td>X 12</td>
<td>172.C.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.X.b.68</td>
<td>M 775</td>
<td>174.C.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.X.c.10</td>
<td>M 333</td>
<td>175.C.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.X.c.11</td>
<td>M 175</td>
<td>173.C.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.XI.54</td>
<td>M 459</td>
<td>180.C.?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.XI.55</td>
<td>M 463</td>
<td>170.C.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X5</td>
<td>563.C.3</td>
<td>Kletter: SQ.P-22, Surface</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X22</td>
<td>564.C.3</td>
<td>Kletter: SQ.X-22, Surface</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X62</td>
<td>565.C.3</td>
<td>Kletter: SQ.Z-13, Surface</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X85</td>
<td>566.C.3</td>
<td>Kletter: SQ.Z-13, Surface</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X90</td>
<td>567.C.3</td>
<td>Kletter: SQ.Z-13, Surface</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X12</td>
<td>568.C.3</td>
<td>Kletter: SQ.AG-17, Surface; Kletter chart: dump</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X7</td>
<td>569.C.3</td>
<td>Kletter: SQ.AJ-20, Room 64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>570.C.3</td>
<td>Kletter: SQ.Q-17, Room 136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>571.C.3</td>
<td>Kletter: SQ.Q-16, Room 137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>572.C.3</td>
<td>Kletter: SQ.Q-17, Room 138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>573.C.3</td>
<td>Kletter: SQ.Q-16, Room 146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X5</td>
<td>574.C.3</td>
<td>Kletter: SQ.X-13, Room 346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X55</td>
<td>575.C.3</td>
<td>Kletter: SQ.AB-24; Mistyped in cat. Kletter chart: AB 14, Room 390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X12A</td>
<td>576.C.3</td>
<td>Kletter: AG-19, Room 438; Zorn: AG-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.C.3</td>
<td>577.C.3</td>
<td>Kletter: AG-19, Room 438; Zorn: AG-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.C.3</td>
<td>578.C.3</td>
<td>Kletter: AG-19, Room 443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.C.3</td>
<td>579.C.3</td>
<td>Kletter: SQ.AF-20, Room 445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.C.3</td>
<td>580.C.3</td>
<td>Kletter: SQ.AE-18, Room 513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.C.3</td>
<td>581.C.3</td>
<td>Kletter: SQ.AB-16, Room 622</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 75: Published and unpublished figurines from Tell en Nasbeh (courtesy of the Badè Museum of Biblical Archaeology at the Pacific School of Religion)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drawer 117F</th>
<th>Measurements</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>View</th>
<th>KL Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R610 I x16</td>
<td>6.2 cm wide, 4.6 cm high, 3.9 cm deep</td>
<td>92.1 g</td>
<td>upper torso and part of left arm</td>
<td>C.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TJ3 706-12.0 in. (?) x84</td>
<td>6.0 cm wide, 5.2 cm high, 3.8 cm deep</td>
<td>87.8 g</td>
<td>upper torso and part of right arm</td>
<td>C.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>651</td>
<td>5.2 cm wide, 4.9 cm high, 2.5 cm deep</td>
<td>47.6 g</td>
<td>upper torso and arms</td>
<td>C.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R441 I x45</td>
<td>4.3 cm wide, 4.8 cm high, 3.0 cm deep</td>
<td>49.2 g</td>
<td>upper torso</td>
<td>C.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>689</td>
<td>3.3 cm wide, 6.2 cm high, 3.4 cm deep</td>
<td>70.3 g</td>
<td>Base</td>
<td>C.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>884</td>
<td>4.9 cm wide, 5.0 cm high, 5.0 cm deep</td>
<td>66.1 g</td>
<td>Base</td>
<td>C.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>437</td>
<td>3.8 cm wide, 5.6 cm high, 5.2 cm deep</td>
<td>83.7 g</td>
<td>Base</td>
<td>C.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>719</td>
<td>5.7 cm wide, 6.4 cm high, 5.0 cm deep</td>
<td>84.6 g</td>
<td>Base</td>
<td>C.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>889</td>
<td>5.6 cm wide, 2.3 cm high</td>
<td>54.1 g</td>
<td>bottom of base</td>
<td>C.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Width</td>
<td>Height</td>
<td>Depth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>691</td>
<td>5.4 cm deep</td>
<td>3.9 cm</td>
<td>7.1 cm</td>
<td>5.5 cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ci351</td>
<td>6.5 cm wide, 6.6 cm high, 6.5 cm deep</td>
<td>3.9 cm</td>
<td>6.5 cm</td>
<td>6.5 cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>759</td>
<td>3.8 cm wide, 8.9 cm high, 5.0 cm deep</td>
<td>4.2 cm</td>
<td>7.4 cm</td>
<td>2.5 cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>906</td>
<td>5.1 cm wide, 6.6 cm high, 3.8 cm deep</td>
<td>4.2 cm</td>
<td>7.4 cm</td>
<td>2.5 cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R453</td>
<td>5.0 cm wide, 3.6 cm high, 3.3 cm deep</td>
<td>5.0 cm</td>
<td>6.6 cm</td>
<td>3.3 cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z13</td>
<td>6.5 cm wide, 8.0 cm high, 3.3 cm deep</td>
<td>6.5 cm</td>
<td>8.0 cm</td>
<td>3.3 cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R561</td>
<td>6.5 cm wide, 7.5 cm high, 2.5 cm deep</td>
<td>6.5 cm</td>
<td>7.5 cm</td>
<td>2.5 cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R513</td>
<td>6.4 cm wide, 5.5 cm high, 3.7 cm deep</td>
<td>5.0 cm</td>
<td>6.6 cm</td>
<td>3.7 cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R432</td>
<td>6.5 cm wide, 5.6 cm high, 2.9 cm deep</td>
<td>5.0 cm</td>
<td>6.6 cm</td>
<td>2.9 cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R271</td>
<td>2.1 cm wide, 3.5 cm high, 3.8 cm deep</td>
<td>2.1 cm</td>
<td>3.5 cm</td>
<td>3.8 cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE20X</td>
<td>7.4 cm wide, 4.1 cm high, 3.5 cm deep</td>
<td>7.4 cm</td>
<td>4.1 cm</td>
<td>3.5 cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214</td>
<td>4.0 cm wide, 4.0 cm high, 3.0 cm deep</td>
<td>4.0 cm</td>
<td>4.0 cm</td>
<td>3.0 cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R445</td>
<td>4.8 cm wide, 3.7 cm high, 3.7 cm deep</td>
<td>4.8 cm</td>
<td>3.7 cm</td>
<td>3.7 cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>707</td>
<td>4.8 cm wide, 6.6 cm high, 4.5 cm deep</td>
<td>4.8 cm</td>
<td>6.6 cm</td>
<td>4.5 cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ci331</td>
<td>2.5 cm wide, 5.4 cm high, 2.4 cm deep</td>
<td>2.5 cm</td>
<td>5.4 cm</td>
<td>2.4 cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># unreadable</td>
<td>6.3 cm wide, 7.2 cm high, 4.1 cm deep</td>
<td>6.3 cm</td>
<td>7.2 cm</td>
<td>4.1 cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Width</td>
<td>Height</td>
<td>Depth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4114</td>
<td>5.8 cm wide, 6.5 cm high, 2.4 cm deep</td>
<td>78.0 g</td>
<td>upper torso, right arm, and part of left arm</td>
<td>C.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dump AB13-14</td>
<td>6.0 cm wide, 5.0 cm high, 3.8 cm deep</td>
<td>80.9 g</td>
<td>upper torso, left arm, and part of right arm</td>
<td>C.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ci153 C x2</td>
<td>4.1 cm wide, 5.1 cm high, 3.6 cm deep</td>
<td>50.2 g</td>
<td>base</td>
<td>C.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R439 I x40</td>
<td>4.6 cm wide, 6.7 cm high, 4.6 cm deep</td>
<td>101.3 g</td>
<td>base</td>
<td>C.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>2.4 cm wide, 3.5 cm high, 2.4 cm deep</td>
<td>16.0 g</td>
<td>pinched head</td>
<td>A.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R402 I x24</td>
<td>6.0 cm wide, 6.1 cm high, 3.2 cm deep</td>
<td>87.2 g</td>
<td>upper torso, left arm, and neck</td>
<td>C.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>887</td>
<td>3.0 cm wide, 5.0 cm high, 3.8 cm deep</td>
<td>44.3 g</td>
<td>pinched head</td>
<td>A.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dump S24</td>
<td>1.8 cm wide, 3.9 cm high, 2.8 cm deep</td>
<td>16.9 g</td>
<td>pinched head</td>
<td>A.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ci304 I x69</td>
<td>2.5 cm wide, 4.9 cm high, 3.4 cm deep</td>
<td>35.1 g</td>
<td>pinched head</td>
<td>A.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ci 15x</td>
<td>6.5 cm wide, 6.4 cm high, 4.4 cm deep</td>
<td>92.0 g</td>
<td>upper torso and right arm</td>
<td>C.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dump (# unreadable)</td>
<td>1.9 cm wide, 3.9 cm high, 2.3 cm deep</td>
<td>15.8 g</td>
<td>pinched head</td>
<td>A.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R349 I x9</td>
<td>5.9 cm wide, 6.5 cm high, 4.7 cm deep</td>
<td>99.7 g</td>
<td>ambiguous</td>
<td>C.3?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>663</td>
<td>3.9 cm wide, 4.5 cm high, 3.9 cm deep</td>
<td>41.9 g</td>
<td>ambiguous</td>
<td>C.2?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>247</td>
<td>3.9 cm wide, 4.9 cm high, 3.2 cm deep</td>
<td>52.8 g</td>
<td>ambiguous</td>
<td>Unid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243</td>
<td>4.5 cm wide, 5.5 cm high, 3.4 cm deep</td>
<td>58.0 g</td>
<td>ambiguous</td>
<td>Unid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R435 I x31</td>
<td>4.2 cm wide, 4.7 cm high, 4.1 cm deep</td>
<td>39.5 g</td>
<td>base</td>
<td>C.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ci370 I x259</td>
<td>5.3 cm wide, 5.8 cm high, 4.8 cm deep</td>
<td>100.5 g</td>
<td>base</td>
<td>C.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ci370 I x261</td>
<td>6.1 cm wide, 8.8 cm high, 5.7 cm deep</td>
<td>182.0 g</td>
<td>base (?)</td>
<td>Unid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R366 I x29</td>
<td>5.7 cm wide, 6.4 cm high, 4.8 cm deep</td>
<td>84.5 g</td>
<td>base</td>
<td>C.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R608 Sub I x13</td>
<td>4.1 cm wide, 3.8 cm high, 1.6 cm deep</td>
<td>29.4 g</td>
<td>arm (?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no number</td>
<td>6.0 cm wide, 8.9 cm high, 4.3 cm deep</td>
<td>119.6 g</td>
<td>torso and part of right arm</td>
<td>C.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locus or Area</td>
<td>Descrip.</td>
<td>Figurine Frag. From Kletter (KL) or Badè Museum</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building 73.02</td>
<td>3 Room Building, prob. domestic</td>
<td>KL135.A.3.A</td>
<td>Iron II through Bab/Per?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building 74.02</td>
<td>Domestic Building</td>
<td>KL571.C.3</td>
<td>Iron IIA through IIc or Bab/Per</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building 74.03</td>
<td>Building, too fragmentary for function</td>
<td>KL570.C.3</td>
<td>Iron IIA through IIc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building unclear, maybe assoc. with 74.03</td>
<td>Room 138</td>
<td>KL572.C.3</td>
<td>Iron II or Iron IIA through IIc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building 74.06</td>
<td>Grape Press?; Cistern 176</td>
<td>KL168.B.sr?</td>
<td>Iron IIB through IIc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building 90.04</td>
<td>3 Room Building, prob. domestic with</td>
<td>KL164.B.2.B</td>
<td>Iron IIA through IIc or Bab/Per</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 76: Structures that contained figurines at Tell en Nasbeh
<p>| Building 93.02 | Outer Gate | KL165.B.srt | Iron IIb through Bab/Per |
| Building 93.03 | 4 Room Building, central courtyard, domestic; Room 369 | KL126.Ac.1.A | Iron IIc or Bab/Per |
|               | Room 366 | Bade R366 I x 29 (C.3) | |
| Building 109.01 | Problematic Structure with single chamber and basin (Rm 77), suggests assoc. with wine industry | KL171.C.1 | Hell-Rom |
| Building 124.01 | 4 Room Building, prob. domestic; Room 670 | KL148.B.2.A | Prob. Bab/Per |
|               | Room 398 | KL152.B.2-3.A | |
| Building 124.02? | Domestic building, though plan unclear; Rm. 346: maybe courtyard | KL574.C.3 | Iron IIa through IIc or Bab/Per |
|               | Room 349 | Bade R349 I x 9 (C.3??) | |
| Building 125.03 | 2-3 Room Building, back room eroded, prob. domestic | KLF.C.3 | Iron IIa through IIc or Bab/Per |
| Building 125.04 | 2-3 Room Building with back room in rubble heap, domestic and industrial; Rm 662: maybe courtyard | KLG.C.3 | Iron IIa through IIc |
| Building 125.05 | 4 Room Building, func. unclear | KL166.B.5.A | Iron IIa through IIc |
| Building 126.01 | 3 Room Building, domestic; Room 633 (maybe courtyard) | KL156.B.4.B | Iron IIa through IIc |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room/Building</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Room 639</td>
<td></td>
<td>KL177.C.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building 127.05?</td>
<td>Unclear building, Rm 104 only partially excavated</td>
<td>KL542.C.2</td>
<td>Bab-Pers/Post-Iron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building 141.01</td>
<td>4 Room Building, prob. domestic</td>
<td>KL134.A.3.A</td>
<td>Iron Ila through IIC, maybe Bab/Per</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building 141.03</td>
<td>“Elaborate” 3 Room Building with dwelling and industrial function; Room 390: maybe courtyard, contained 4 rock cut installations</td>
<td>KL575.C.3</td>
<td>Iron Ila through IIC or Bab/Per</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cistern 320</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bade Ci320 II x 1 (C.2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building 141.04 or 141.05</td>
<td>141.04: 4 Room Building, prob. domestic; 141.05: 3 Room Building, prob. domestic.</td>
<td>KL131.A.2.Ap</td>
<td>Either building: Iron Ila through IIC or Bab/Per</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building 142.01</td>
<td>Largest Iron II building, prob. domestic</td>
<td>KL495.A.1.A</td>
<td>Iron Ila through IIC (maybe Bab/Per.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building 142.03</td>
<td>3 Room Building with some industrial space Cistern 359 in Rm 588: open courtyard maybe associated with olive processing</td>
<td>KL540.C.2</td>
<td>Iron Ila through IIC or Bab/Per</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room 608</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bade R608 Sub I x 13 (arm?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room 610</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bade R610 I x 16 (C.2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building 142.04</td>
<td>3 Room Building, “unusual” objects in Room 616 suggest “cultic” function</td>
<td>KL496.A.1.A, KL497.A.1.A</td>
<td>Iron IIa through IIc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building 142.06</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>KL498.A.1.A</td>
<td>Iron IIa through IIc (maybe Bab/Per)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building 142.09</td>
<td>3 Room Building, either dwelling or industrial; Room 642 (may be courtyard)</td>
<td>KL158.B.1.C</td>
<td>Iron IIa through IIc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space between 145.02 and the S. wall of inner gate building 145.01</td>
<td>Prob. Small plaza in front of inner gate</td>
<td>KL136.A.3.A</td>
<td>Iron IIb through Bab/Per</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building 145.02</td>
<td>4 Room Building</td>
<td>KL138.A.3.A</td>
<td>Bab/Per</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building 159.02</td>
<td>3 Room Building</td>
<td>KL130.A.1.A</td>
<td>Iron IIa through IIc (maybe Bab/Per)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building 159.06</td>
<td>3 Room Building; unusual plan; prob. domestic; Room 513</td>
<td>KLD.C.3, Bade R513 I x 72 (C.2)</td>
<td>Iron IIa through IIc or Bab/Per</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building 159.08?</td>
<td>Unusual Building with unclear and disturbed plan, maybe associated with upperclass; Room 435</td>
<td>KL163.B.3.B, Bade R435 I x 31 (C.3)</td>
<td>Iron IIc or Bab/Per; Iron IIc-?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room 561</td>
<td>Bade R561 I x 11 (C.2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building 160.03</td>
<td>3 or 4 Room Building, prob. domestic with “industrial” area</td>
<td>KL144.B.2.A</td>
<td>Iron IIa through IIc (maybe Bab/Per)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building 160.04</td>
<td>Industrial Building, Cistern 370</td>
<td>KL494.A.1.A, KL169.B.1, Bade Ci370 I x 259 (C.3), Bade Ci3170 I x 261 (unid.)</td>
<td>Iron IIa through IIc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building 177.01</td>
<td>4 Room Building, prob. domestic; Cistern 368</td>
<td>KL128.A.3.A</td>
<td>Iron IIa through IIc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room 441</td>
<td>Bade R441 I x 45(C.2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room 443</td>
<td>KLB.C.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building 177.04</td>
<td>3 Room Building Cistern 156 in Rm 60: courtyard with specialized function, agricultural processing</td>
<td>KL507.C.1</td>
<td>Building: Iron IIa through IIc; cistern: Iron IIa through Bab/Per</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building 177.05 or 177.04</td>
<td>Building, uncertain and function uncertain; Cistern 159 (largest at site)</td>
<td>KL179.C.2.D, KL142.B.3.A, KL180.C.?, KL170.C.3</td>
<td>Iron IIa through IIc (maybe Bab/Per)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building 177.05</td>
<td>Building uncertain; function unclear; Rm 64: prob. courtyard</td>
<td>KL541.C.2, KL569.C.3</td>
<td>Iron IIa through IIc (maybe Bab/Per)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building 194.01</td>
<td>Building perhaps related to agricultural processing; Rm 23 part of central court</td>
<td>KL172.C.1</td>
<td>Bab/Per</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclear Building</td>
<td>Room 132</td>
<td>KL141.B.3.A</td>
<td>Iron IIb?-Bab/Per?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Number(s)</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remains</td>
<td>Room Group 160, 161, 163, 165 or road</td>
<td>KL149.B.1-2.A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Room 146, maybe road but very unclear</td>
<td>KL573.C.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Room 551, feature dug or built into fill poured into intramural area in inset-offset wall</td>
<td>KL5.I.4.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silo/Cisterns</td>
<td>Cistern 78</td>
<td>KL125Ac.1.A</td>
<td>Cut in Iron I, possib. used through Iron II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cistern 152</td>
<td>KL491.A.1.A</td>
<td>Iron I through Bab/Per</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cistern 153</td>
<td>Bade Ci153 C x 2 (C.3)</td>
<td>Iron I through Bab/Per</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cistern 128</td>
<td>KL490.A.1.A</td>
<td>Iron II-?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Silo/Cistern 92</td>
<td>KL160.B.2.C</td>
<td>Prob. cut in Iron I and used through II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Silo 249 (cut into Rm 219)</td>
<td>KL543.C.2</td>
<td>Iron I prob through Iron II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Silo 145</td>
<td>KL175.C.2</td>
<td>Iron I through Bab/Per</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cave 193</td>
<td>In slope outside city</td>
<td>KL167.B.1.B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In front of cave</td>
<td>KL143.B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cave Tomb 5/6</td>
<td>Prob. from Silo 3 which cut the roof of the tomb in the Iron II</td>
<td>No number, in TN p. 5; molded head; maybe Bade 214 or Bade 640</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Square W-13</td>
<td>Pits and domestic</td>
<td>KL129.A.1.A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Square</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA-18</td>
<td>Domestic buildings and debris piles in center</td>
<td>KL137.A.2.A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB-16</td>
<td>In west part of city</td>
<td>KL140.A.4.A, KL151.B.2-3.A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AH-20</td>
<td>Open area in south of town with many pits and cisterns</td>
<td>KL173.C.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AH-23</td>
<td>Dump</td>
<td>KL145.B.3.A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AF-17</td>
<td>Dump</td>
<td>KL154.B.4.B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AF-19</td>
<td>Area of small houses</td>
<td>KL157.B.4.B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AF-26</td>
<td>Near city wall, area of silos and buildings</td>
<td>KL178.C.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC-17</td>
<td>Area of small houses</td>
<td>KL162.B.3.C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z-24</td>
<td>Area of drain canal</td>
<td>KL176.C.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TJ 706</td>
<td>Bade TJ706 (? x 84 (C.2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z-13</td>
<td>Bade Z13 106 x 85 (C.3); Z13 106 x 2 (C.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB-13-14</td>
<td>Dump</td>
<td>Bade AB13-14 4(C.2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE-20</td>
<td>Bade AE20X 52 (C.2 hollow)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-24</td>
<td>Dump</td>
<td>Bade S-24 6 (A.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unreadable</td>
<td>Dump</td>
<td>Bade # unreadable (A.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V-28</td>
<td>Bade V-28 28 (A.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AK-21</td>
<td>Not in Kletter or Holland, maybe Bade 214 or Bade 640</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 77: Figurine count from Jerusalem excavations (excluding Kenyon, Shiloh, and recent excavations)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excavation</th>
<th>Pinched</th>
<th>Molded</th>
<th>Body/Base</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bliss (City of David/Mt. Zion)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duncan/Macalister (Ophel/City of David)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vincent (Ophel)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mazar (and Ben-Dov) (Ophel)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crowfoot and Fitzgerald (Tyropeon Valley)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Quarter</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim Quarter (Clermont Ganneau)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citadel (Amiran and Eitun)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ketef Hinnom</td>
<td>1 (turban)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6 (bases)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mamilla</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. Zion Tombs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muristan (Lux)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapel of St. Vartan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Wall (Broshi)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Hill</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td><strong>70</strong></td>
<td><strong>121</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 78: Figurines from all known Jerusalem and hill country excavations (excluding Weksler-Bdolah)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excavation</th>
<th>Pinched</th>
<th>Molded</th>
<th>Bodies/Bases</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kenyon</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shiloh</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>152</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Jerusalem</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Excavations (Eilat Mazar)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerusalem Total</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mevesseret</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moza</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramot</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibeon</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramat Rachel</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tell en Nasbeh</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kletter figurines not included above</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total outside Jerusalem</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>765</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B

Late Iron Age Figurines from Jerusalem: Thin Section Petrographic Analysis (TSPA) by David Ben-Shlomo

The sample includes a total of 120 items (66 from Y. Shiloh excavations, 45 from E. Mazar excavations and 9 from Mevasseret excavations): 57 Pillar Figurines with molded or pinched heads or other body fragments of pillar figurines; three other type human figurines, 33 horse figurines (of them at least 4 horse and rider), 12 other zoomorphic figurines and 15 pottery vessels or other items.

Preliminary petrographic analysis of the samples indicates that the majority of the figurines are made of a similar calcareous fabric, fossil-rich, which may be derived from local rendzina soils (Group 1 with 67-68 figurine samples). None of the pottery vessels sampled are made of this group. This group however can be sub-divided into at least five sub groups (Groups 1a-1e) according to the texture and quantities of different inclusions populations. It should be noted that generally even between these subgroups there is not much homogeneity in relation to firing temperature, levigation, porosity (voids) and frequencies of inclusions in comparison to most Petrographic groups reflecting common pottery vessels of this period. For example the size and frequency of calcareous inclusions, as well as the frequency of silty angular quartz inclusions, in the most common fabric- Group 1a is quite variable.
Second in frequency is a less calcareous, more reddish clay possibly derived from local terra rossa soils (Group 3, total of 21 figurines samples); this is the most common fabric used for pottery vessels sampled. Only 8 of the figurines are made of dolomitic motza marl clay (Group 2). Only several figurines seem to come from outside the region of Jerusalem of the central hills; these include five figurines made of loess type clay originating in the coastal plains of Shephela (Group 5).

**Characteristics of petrographic groups**

**ABBREVIATIONS**: FR=foraminifers; QZ=quartz; LS=limestone; CC=calcareous concentrations; OP=opaque minerals

**Group 1**: This is a Rendzina/calcareous clay type, a silty soil with many fossils (foraminifers - FR), and chalk fragments, reaching up to 25-30% of the slide area. Silty quartz is also quite common with up to 10-15% silty angular quartz (QZ), though few slides have quite less. The firing temperature is usually not high (probably lower than 900-850 degrees) due to the relatively good preservation of the calcareous inclusions.

The source of this clay could be in the vicinity of the city of David, the Kidron River or other places in the area of Jerusalem and to the east; they soil could be derived from Meleke limestone of the Bina formation (see Ariel and de Groot 1996: 8) which has 30% fossil contents, occurring for examples along the Kidron Valley, also within the city of David, or the western slope of Mount Zion.

This petrographic group has several subgroups according to the type and frequency of inclusions. These sub-groups may represent the variability in clay
procedures used in the same workshop by the same or different potters, but, generally, the
clay is assumed to come from similar sources.

- Group 1a- the most common Group 1 type with 10-25% calcareous inclusions and
  10-20% QZ, few dolomite silty sized and clay balls/pieces of terra rossa; also few
  micas;
- Group 1b: similar to group 1a but with substantial dolomitic sand (rhombic
  inclusions)
- Group 1c: similar soil but with a finer porous matrix and many small Agrillaceous
  Inclusions (‘clay balls’) and/or ferruginous opaque minerals (OP)
- Group 1d: probably also similar soil but higher fired rendzina; also relatively high
  QZ frequency.
- Group 1e: similar to Group 1a but with higher FR of 30%+ (most of these are
  human figurines).

**Group 2**: This group represents Motza marl clay, characterized by a very
calcareous matrix, usually densely packed with dolomite; this formation with is common
in the Judean hills is actually quite rare in the assemblage (it is more popular for vessels).

Three sub-groups were defined:

- Group 2a: A compact matrix with many FR and chalk inclusions (15-30%), some
  silty QZ and various quantities of fine sand and silty dolomite.
- Group 2b: A densely packed matrix with over 30% of rhombic dolomitic sand and no quartz.

- Group 2c: Similar to Group 2b but with bimodal QZ sand (both silt and sand sized inclusions).

**Group 3:** This group is not as well-defined as Groups 1 and 2. This clay possibly represents a terra rossa or some reddish more calcareous soil. The matrix is not calcareous although high quantities of calcareous inclusions as limestone, chalk and nari often appear (usually 1-10%); quartz inclusion are more common with 15-35%. The firing temperature of most of the samples from this group may have been slightly higher than that of Group 1. Note, this is probably the most popular clay used for regular pottery vessels in this period in this region. Such clay probably represents soils coming from the Judean hills in the vicinity of Jerusalem, but mostly in the west site, and the Jerusalem hills.

Three sub-groups were defined basically according to the quartz inclusions characteristics:

- Group 3a: This group is rich in silty QZ up to 30-50 % of slide area (it should be noted that it is sometimes similar to loess type soil).

- Group 3b: The more common variant with high amounts of silty QZ, up to 20-35%, but also substantial FR/chalk inclusions reaching 5-20%; some nari also occurs, as well as few dolomite, mica and clay balls.

- Group 3c: similar to Group 3a but with a finer and more porous matrix.
**Group 4:** unidentified clay type with coastal sand (one sample, COD EM 21)

**Group 5:** This group probably represents loess type soil common in the southern coastal plains and the Shephelah as well as the northern Negev. Two sub groups were defined:

- Group 5a: regular loess type clay with silty quartz and some calcareous inclusions (Shephelah provenance?).
- Group 5b: similar to 5a but with bimodal QZ including rounded coastal sand (coastal plains provenance).

**Group 6:** possibly represents Hamra soil; could come from the Shephelah; somewhat similar to 3a- dark-quartzic, hardly any LS; two cooking pots YS61-62.

**Group 7:** Brown shephela soil (only one sample: the zoomorphic head cup(?) - COD EM 42)

**Discussion**

About 68 samples are made of Group 1 clay, both figurines and vessels, the majority 38, belong to Group 1a and Group 1e closely related to it. This calcareous, low fired clay was used only for figurines and not for vessels. This may indicate an important workshop producing figurines located in or in the vicinity of the City of David. However, a possibility of various workshops using the same clay in this region or a regional workshop outside the COD can also fit the Petrographic evidence.
The more popular clay, probably terra rossa type used for vessels, was only used secondarily for figurines; this clay usually comes from more western locations in Jerusalem, and may indicate a different workshop. Motza clay was hardly used for figurines; possibly the figurines made of this clay were produced outside proper Jerusalem.

There seems to be more variability in zoomorphic figurines especially horse figurines, regarding to clay types used; while pillar figurines are almost all made of Group 1a-1c; the pinched heads re a bit more variable than the molded heads and pillar fragments; Therefore, according to TSPA there does not seem to be yet any evidence that the pinched heads were produced in a different or specific workshop than the pillar figurines. If indeed this types represents the ‘Jerusalemite’ more an-iconic figurine maybe it was produced on request in any workshop that also produced the other figurines. Only about 5-6 figurines seem to come from outside the central hill area, probably from the Shephelah or the coast. These include one molded head, one pinched head, one horse figurine and two other zoomorphic figurines. No figurines were made in more distant locations.

In a previous study of 15 figurines from Y. Shiloh excavations at the City of David (Goren et al. 1996), most samples were identified as made of terra rossa type soil (although not much was elaborated on that; e.g., the description figurine E2/1997 of Goren et al. 1996 could fit out Group 1). The INAA analysis of 18 figurines (Yelin 1996) indicated two related groups: one slighter higher in Calcium and lower in Iron than the other.
From this study it seems that when a larger sample is analyzed only about 20-25% of figurines were made of clay related to terra rossa while nearly 70% were made of more calcareous clay derived from rendzina, a clay not used for any of the vessels.

Possibly this clay was more easily available for potters within the city of David and was used for figurines as they were not highly fired (and thus highly calcareous clay can be used without risk of cracking). Another option could be the selection of this clay due to some religious or ritual reasons. Generally, this study may support a possible general uniformity of the figurines clay as regards to possible workshops or geographical regions, but the clay itself is rather un-homogenized in relation to clay used in this period for common pottery vessels.

**Table 79: Petrographic groups**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>no. of samples</th>
<th>Matrix</th>
<th>main inclusions</th>
<th>suggested provenance</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a</td>
<td>26-27</td>
<td>calcareous, silty-fine</td>
<td>foraminifers, silty quartz</td>
<td>eastern Jerusalem</td>
<td>related to rendzina soil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b</td>
<td>12-15</td>
<td>calcareous, silty</td>
<td>foraminifers, dolomitic sand, silty quartz</td>
<td>eastern Jerusalem</td>
<td>related to rendzina soil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c</td>
<td>9-10</td>
<td>calcareous, fine</td>
<td>foraminifers, clay balls, opaque minerals</td>
<td>eastern Jerusalem</td>
<td>related to rendzina soil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1d</td>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>calcareous, fine</td>
<td>foraminifers, silty quartz</td>
<td>eastern Jerusalem</td>
<td>related to rendzina soil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1e</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>calcareous, fine</td>
<td>high quantity foraminifers, silty quartz</td>
<td>eastern Jerusalem</td>
<td>related to rendzina soil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total 1</td>
<td>65-68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>related to motza formation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>calcareous, silty</td>
<td>foraminifers, chalk, fine dolomite</td>
<td>northwestern Jerusalem</td>
<td>related to motza formation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>calcareous, silty</td>
<td>dolomite sand, chalk</td>
<td>northwestern Jerusalem</td>
<td>related to motza formation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2c</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>calcareous, porous, fine</td>
<td>dolomite sand, bimodal quartz</td>
<td>northwestern Jerusalem</td>
<td>related to motza formation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10-11</td>
<td>related to motza formation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a</td>
<td>10-15</td>
<td>reddish, dark</td>
<td>silty quartz, limestone, chalk</td>
<td>western Jerusalem area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b</td>
<td>9-13</td>
<td>reddish, dark</td>
<td>silty quartz, foraminifers/chalk, nari, limestone, chalk</td>
<td>western Jerusalem area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3c</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>reddish, dark, fine</td>
<td>silty quartz, foraminifers/chalk, nari, limestone, chalk</td>
<td>western Jerusalem area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29-30</td>
<td>related to terra rossa soil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1?</td>
<td>calcareous?</td>
<td>bimodal quartz, clay balls</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>calcareous, silty</td>
<td>silty quartz, limestone, chalk</td>
<td>shephelah loess type soil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>calcareous, silty</td>
<td>bimodal quartz</td>
<td>coastal plain loess type soil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>loess type soil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>reddish, coarse</td>
<td>silty-sand quartz</td>
<td>western Jerusalem area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>dark</td>
<td>silty quartz, limestone</td>
<td>shephelah brown soil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 48: COD YS 26, Group 1a

Figure 49: COD EM 15, Group 1e
Figure 50: COD YS 40, Group 2b

Figure 51: COD YS 39, Group 3b
Figure 52: COD YS 30, Group 5b
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