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they are not too significant. The fact remains that nothing comparable to an alphabetic system of writing is known. We must accordingly see the alphabet as the invention of a single person or group of persons in Phoenician or Palestinian sometime during the first half of the second millennium B.C. The possibility of writing language by using a system of symbols corresponding to an arbitrary fragmentation of speech could have been suggested by any of the writing systems then in use, but the peculiar concept of partial representation—i.e., of consonants alone—is, so far as is known, common only to Egyptian writing, and it was perhaps from that quarter that the chief inspiration sprang. But due to the inventor’s genius alone is the working out of a system, dismembered of traditional extras, which has proved so flexible in subsequent worldwide adaptation.

E. EPITAPH: Epigraphy is the study of written records which have survived from the ancient past. As such, epigraphy shares—and to a great extent subsumes—the aims of other disciplines such as paleography and epigraphy, but any narrower definition of the subject would not do justice to the divergent areas of study to which the term is currently applied.

While every facet of an inscription is of potential interest to the epigrapher, his attention is generally focused on the following categories of data, all of which are pertinent to the determination of the date and historical context of a given epigraph: (a) material on which the writing has occurred; (b) tools and techniques employed in producing the original; (c) type of writing employed; (d) language in which the inscription is written; (e) relationship between language and writing (i.e., orthography); and (f) the type of inscription in regard to content and original purpose.

For further information on these subjects, see, in addition to the bibliography below, INSCRIPTIONS: WRITING AND WRITING MATERIALS.


ALPHAeus (Ἀλφαῖς). A purely Greek name, one of many such names used commonly by first-century Jews in Palestine. Westcott and Hort, accepting the supposition that it is a transliteration of the Aramaic אֱלָפָּא, give this name a rough breathing. This is, however, only an assumption, and not a necessary one. The name does not occur in the OT, but it does occur five times in the NT. These divide readily into references to two persons, both of whom are mentioned only indirectly.

1. The father of Levi (Mark 2:14). If, by comparison of Matt. 9:9, Mark 2:14; Luke 5:27, it is thought that Levi and Matthew are the same individual, then this Alphaeus cannot be identified with the father of James (2 below), because Matt. 10:3; Mark 3:18 show an Alphaeus who is father of James but not of Matthew. Even if Levi be identified with Matthew, it tells us nothing more about Alphaeus father of Levi. The NT offers no more data on this Alphaeus.

In Mark 2:14, D. O, and words read Ἀλϕαὶος ("Levi") for "Levi," but this is probably no more than scribal effort to harmonize this passage with Mark 3:18 and parallels. The preponderant weight of MS evidence supports the reading Λευί ("Levi").

2. The father of James (Matt. 10:3; Mark 3:18; Luke 6:15, Acts 1:13). The first three of those passages are Synoptic parallels and indicate more than that Alphaeus is the father of the James who in the Mark and Matthew passages is clearly distinguished from James son of Zebedee. The same distinction is made in Acts 1:13.

Past efforts to identify this Alphaeus with Clopas (John 19:25) and with Cleopas (Luke 24:18) are quite arbitrary and rest upon no firm evidence. Κλαύρας (Luke 24:18) is a contraction of Κλαύρακε, a purely Greek name, and is not to be identified with Κλαύραζ (John 19:25), which is of Aramaic origin. Κλαύρας cannot be reduced to the same Hebrew original as Alphaeus: hence they cannot be identified.

J. M. NOBES

ALTANEUS, KJV Apoc. form of MATTHAEI 2.

ALTAR.

1. Terminology. The word ἄλατος, formed from the verb for "slaughter" (i.e., to cut up the animal killed according to Jewish ritual) is the most prevalent designation of the altar—indeed of the sacrifices made on it. One might conclude from Gen. 22:9 that the animal to be sacrificed was given the slitting blow after it had been laid down bound on the logs of the altar. But even if this may once have been a sacrificial rite (in the early days), it was soon given up, especially since the jerking victim might break down the stacked-up logs of wood. The killing of the animal in front of the altar became absolutely necessary if the blood was to be collected and sprinkled on the horns of the altar. This is assumed in Lev. 1:7 and

Altar is also the term used for altar, as in Ac. 2:46, applying the fact of the altar's construction to the one of the early days, the altar of the first altar built by the Israelites after they came out of Egypt (Exod. 20:24). The altar in this case was a stone altar built by the congregation in the wilderness. The terms altar and altar of burnt offering are used in the Septuagint and in other versions for the altar which was built by Solomon in the temple of Jerusalem (1 Kings 4:1). The term altar of burnt offering is also used for the altar which was built by the priest in the temple of Jerusalem for the burnt offering (Lev. 8:23). The term altar of burnt offering is also used for the altar which was built by the priest in the temple of Jerusalem for the burnt offering (Lev. 8:23). The term altar of burnt offering is also used for the altar which was built by the priest in the temple of Jerusalem for the burnt offering (Lev. 8:23). The term altar of burnt offering is also used for the altar which was built by the priest in the temple of Jerusalem for the burnt offering (Lev. 8:23).
is also true of animal sacrifices on the altars without horns, as 1 Sam. 14:34-35; 1 Kings 18:23 indicate. Accordingly 52a-2 (with a 2 location only indirectly applying) means the spot on which the pieces (and the fat) of the animal, which had already been cut up, were deposited and burned. The OT distinguishes between the following types of altars according to the material: the altar of earth (Exod. 20:24), the altar of stone (vs. 25); the bronze altar (1 Kings 16:13 and repeatedly). The altar intended for the burning of incense was called "altar of incense" (Exod. 30:27, cf. 1 Chr. 29:18), which is treated along with 52a under Incense Altar.

2. Descriptions in the OT. Particulars are lacking concerning the form of the altar of earth, which is assumed in Exod. 20:24 as the normal one (in the pre-exilic period in Palestine). It should probably be thought of as a relatively low cube of clay or clay, not as one out of air-dried bricks, since otherwise the expression "brick altar" would appear. In any case, Palestine, which was rich in stones, the altar of stone (Exod. 20:24) was probably more common, not only among the Israelites, but also among the Canaanites (cf. Deut. 12:3). The sites indicate that the worship concerned (cf. 1 Kings 8:22 with 18:24); the altar of Gideon (Judg. 6:34) bore the name, "Yahweh is peace.

In addition to the contexts "make the temple build...most commonly used for the erection of an altar" (in the case of destroying "near down"). These terms, also used of the construction of houses, indicate that in the case of a "built" altar—where no more particulars are given—one should imagine an altar of stone (Num. 23:1; Deut. 27:3-6; Josh. 8:31; Isa. 27:9). Understandably they were used for this purpose: "Is not this (altar) built around the ground just as they said? Such stone altars could be erected in a short time (Judg. 2:14; 1 Sam. 14:34) and also fell to pieces if they were not taken care of for constant use. The number of stones used was of no significance. It depended on the size of the stones collected and the desired dimensions of the altar. By way of exception, there is mention in 1 Kings 18:31-32 of twelve stones of the Elijah altar, but this secondary statement might have developed out of the Syrian tradition in Exod. 19:4, where there is mention of an altar erected by Moses and, in addition to this, of twelve stones set up to represent the tribes of Israel (cf. Jos. 7: and that the stones are to be unhewn is expressly commanded in Exod. 20:25. This could be directed against the luxury of stones, but the idea that these stones used in worship should not lose their special numinous quality by damaging heaving is probably also based on this practice. The Deuteronomist in Deut. 27:3-5; Josh. 8:31 (or later 1 Macc. 4:48) refers to the restriction in Exod. 20:25. Without a doubt, this prohibition did not prevail permanently. The very fact that we know of the "twelve stones of the altar of 1 Kings 19:50—Massobeth, "pillars," once originally set at the four corners?—proves that the stones were heewn! (The incense altars which are known archaeologically in Palestine from the time of the Israelites were also heewn!) The precise statements of dimensions of certain altars (i.e., in Jerusalem) also prove it. The presentation (in vain) against steps is the case of monumental altars (Exod. 20:26) is based on the danger that the one who was making the sacrifice might expose his nakedness. This was prevented by a special low-reflecting dress (Lev. 6:10). The Jerusalem burnt-offering altar explains the fact that in Lev. 9:22 the "stepping down" of the priest is mentioned without hesitation.

Very much more infrequently than an altar built of several stones (stone heap), in the early period a large rock (1 Sam. 6:14 "a great stone") was used as an altar; for this was possible only if the stone had a sufficiently large supporting area. Of the examples mentioned for this, that of the altar of Manoah (Judg. 13:19) is pertinent. On the other hand, the rock (with holes for bowls) which bore the mealtime offerings in Judg. 6:19-21 is not designated as an altar (in contrast to the altar built later by Gideon in vs. 24).

We have further particulars about the burnt-offering altar in Jerusalem. It stood in front of the temple and is not to be confused with the altar of David on the threshing floor of Ophrah—"in spite of 1 Chr. 23:1. The old archeological note concerning Solomon's cycle of offerings in 1 Kings 8:25 designates the altar as one which Solomon had built: this indicates an altar of stones. When, in the Deuteronomic note in 1 Kings 8:34 (corresponding to II Kings 16:13), it is called a bronze altar, this appears to mean a stone altar (altar which was set on top of it (see below). The Deuteronomistic statement of the consecration of the middle of the court before the temple by Solomon for the innumerable sacrifices (I Kings 8:63-64) does not signify that there were henceforth two altars. This statement is, on the contrary, connected with King Ahaz' regulations for worship; it was inapplicable to the Deuteronomist that the altar of Solomon which was pushed aside by Ahaz because of its small size, could have been adequate in the beginning. The statement in II Kings 16:10 ff., taken from the original temple annals, says the following: King Ahaz, who was giving submission to Tiglath-pileser III, saw in Damascus (in the court of the temple of Baal) an altar which so impressed him that he passed a description on to Uriah the high priest with the command that it be copied. Uriah built this altar in Jerusalem. In order that this could take place, the bronze altar was moved aside and set up to one side. Since the dedicatory sacrifices of the king undoubtedly took place on the new, great altar, the direction to make all sacrifices for the king and the people upon the great altar can only be interpreted to mean that the Ahaz altar displaced Solomon's. No matter what II Kings 16:15 has to say about the bronze altar (which still existed in 353; cf. Ezek. 9:2), it plays only a secondary role. In any case, Ahaz wanted to preserve tradition; on the other hand, he wanted to possess a modern "Yahweh" altar. The Deuteronomist sees no reason for complaint, perhaps, since the legitimate worship of Yahweh was continued. No particulars are given concerning the appearance of the (stone) altar accessible by steps. The (supplementary) use of bronze is therefore improbable, because the king saw himself forced—because of the tribute to the Assyrian king—to have the bronze portions of the existing vessels of worship melted.
Altar

Strangely enough, nothing is said in I Kings 6 ff about the bronze altar of Solomon, which was used in its proper place for approximately two hundred years. One would expect a note about it in connection with other bronze works, and it does appear in the "parallel account" of Chronicles (II Chr. 4:1). The form of the statement of its dimensions, which deviates from the usual wording of the Chronicles, corresponds to that of the building dimensions in I Kings 6, so that one may surmise that II Chr. 4:1 was borrowed from the account in the book of Kings—between I Kings 7:22 and 7:23—and (for reasons which cannot be explained with certainty) was omitted there; it is missing already in the LXX. Unfortunately II Chr. 4:1 is put very concisely. The bronze altar made by Solomon was said to be twenty cubits long, twenty cubits wide, and ten cubits high. What on this cube was of bronze? Scarcely the sides as plates, more likely a side (and top?) grating (cf. Exod. 37:1) and probably only a large grate standing on low feet and ornamented with corner horns. The height agrees, to be sure, with the altar described in Ezek. 41:13 ff, but not the length or the breadth; and there is no mention at all in II Chr. 4:1 of the fact that the bronze altar of Solomon was tapered from bottom to top in steps or sections. Probably, after the building of the new altar of Ahaz, interest in a detailed description of this which had been put aside dwindled—if this is by no means certain—the plans for the altar in Ezek. 41:13 ff is based on an actual altar in Jerusalem, it may possibly have been that of Ahaz, but not that of Solomon.

The secondary passage (Ezek. 41:13 ff) attached to the Ezekiel vision of the new temple in chs. 40 ff reads as follows (cf. 19): "These are the measurements of the altar in cubits: its base [read "altar"] one cubit and one cubit its breadth, and its rim at the edge one span. And this is the height [instead of MT 'mound'] of the altar from the base on the ground to the small enclosure, two cubits and a breadth of one cubit, and from the small enclosure to the large enclosure four cubits and a breadth of one cubit (thus LXX). And up to the sacrifice socle [stage] were four cubits, and from the sacrifice socle upward were four horns [addition from vs. 16] on its four sides. And the sacrifice socle was twelve cubits long by twelve cubits broad, a square, and the [supply large] enclosure was fourteen cubits long in fourteen broad on its four sides, [supply as follows: and the small enclosure was sixteen cubits in length by sixteen in breadth on its four sides,] and the rim around it was a half cubit and the base of it, one cubit round about. And its steps face the east." Seen as a whole, the description is consistent and clear, so that one can sketch a picture of this altar (Fig. ALT 19). First comes the 'bowl of the earth,' the foundation of the Babylonian term, wherein the impression into which the altar block is placed, so that all that remains of it is a gutter. Then follow the three socles (stages), which become smaller toward the top. The two lower ones are called "enclosures," or "incasings," this recalls the Babylonian term "cover" for the burnt brick of the outer face of the tower of Babel. The uppermost socle is called "Ariel," which one may associate with the Babylonian word 'atlu' (underworld and mountain of the gods). Instead of "hearth," which is surely incorrect, we have a paraphrased "area" with "sacrifice socle." The steps of the altar might presumably have led up to the upper edge of the sacrifice socle, so that the sacrificing priest could move about on the upper surface of the socle (cf. Middoth III.61). Since it is a question of the altar in the future vision, it must remain an open question as to whether the description is based on definite earlier data concerning the Altar of the Ahas, or on the postexilic altar used in 535 B.C., or whether it was drawn up quite independently. The remarkable thing in the case of this altar design, indeed, is that its type is unique. To be sure, there are in the area of the ancient Orient and Egypt altar terraces reached by steps, and altars with an offset (also called stepped altars), but not square altars which taper upward uniformly in offsets like a stepped tower. On the other hand, the stepped tower (compare—the best known example is that of Babylon—see Babel, Tower of) represents an elevated terrace (a mountain of the gods), at the very top of which is a temple (cella), and it was never—as a whole—regarded as a large altar. It is true that isolated sacrifices were made on top in front of the cela and on the roof of the chamber of the gods, also, in addition—according to the evidence of Assyrian seals—naturally, below in front of the tower, but the reinterpretation of a stepped tower as an altar, as it appears in Ezek. 41, is without precedent. One might reckon with the possibility of a stepped-tower altar on a late painting from Dura Europos, though the offerings are missing in the picture. A description of the Jerusalem altar for burnt offerings, which in point of time follows the representation in the vision in Ezek. 41, stemming from the time of the Romans, differs from it. According to Josephus (War V.6), the altar of the Herodian temple was a block fifty by fifty by fifteen cubits, hence smaller and larger, and had a ramp approach. The Mishnah treatise Middoth (III.4), which concerns the same altar, distinguishes three offsets (as Ezek. 41), but with the dimensions thirty-two by thirty-two by one cubit for the base and thirty by thirty by five for the main block; the measurement of the three offsets are not quite clear, but they are smaller than those of the main block in any case. According to Middoth III. 1, it is a matter of an extension of the pre-exilic (Solomonic) altar which had already taken place Babylon.

The Proto-Hebrew name (NT "Cubits") which cubit shows up in Exod., 3:17, is the root _Seat_ in the K.G. 1912 form. Although there the graph Pales was not part of the arrangement.

In [1845] temp. wall was an upright enco-273 muting of a temple of gods. 729. Shor was an open area where some might take the three steps (1400) 8000000 to a bar). A V.C. were two courtyards, one cubit wide,心脏 was in front of the other, and the roof was brick. It had a wide entrance into the temple. The base of the column was an
Altar place at the time of the return of the exiles from Babylon (related to Ezra 3:2). Figs. TEM 27; BAB 10.

The showbread table (the table for the bread of the Presence), which 1 Kings 6:20; 7:48 mention and which (with horns) measured two by two by three cubits in Ezek. 41:22, is a presentation altar. The showbread table of the wilderness sanctuary was supposed to have been half as large, according to Exod. 25:23 ff.

3. Archaeological discoveries. If we disregard the rock altar found at Tannach and the rock altar in the outer area of Tell el-Mutesselem (= Megiddo), K. Galling, Der Altar in den Kulturen des Altertums (1925), plate 11, fig. 1, which are problematic in form and function, and also with regard to interpretation, there do, nevertheless, exist, thanks to the stratigraphic excavation in Megiddo, at other places in Palestine and in Syria, examples of altars secure enough in their dating, which can be used for comparison with the descriptions in the OT. They are arranged in chronological order below.

In stratum XIX of Megiddo (G. Loud, Megiddo II [1949], pl. 94, 64) there was uncovered a broad-room temple (dimensions ca. 5.8 by 8 meters), on the rear wall of which—exactly opposite the entrance—was unearthed a platform, which was enlarged in the second phase of its utilization to 1.6 by 1.6 by 0.92 meters, with a step (0.7 by 1.9 by 0.5) meters before it.* This must probably be regarded as a table altar or a deposit altar, possibly intended for images of gods. According to Albright and Wright (cf. AVEP 729), the stratum, and along with it the temple, should be dated to 1200 B.C. The altar, built of stones and plastered (covered in an Early Bronze period shrine located close to the city wall in Tell el-Mutesselem) might be a scant half millennium newer. It measures 0.80 by 0.70 by 0.70 meters and should probably be regarded less as a deposit altar (table altar) than as a burnt-offering altar (Fig. TEM 42). In a temple area of stratum XVIII-XVII in Megiddo (G. Loud, Megiddo II [1949], pp. 73–81; cf. AVEP 734) which was constructed in the Middle Bronze period between ca. 2000 and 1500 B.C., and enlarged in the course of time, the oldest installation was an open court yard. In it was erected an altar of stones and plaster—first more ellipsoidal, later almost round—which measured not less than 8 meters in diameter and was preserved to 1.40 meters high. At one spot four steps in a stairway cut into the stone led up to the level which was to be mounted by those making the sacrifices. One may assume that burnt offerings were also presented on this uncovered altar.* Of the covered temples in the immediate vicinity the main room of the W temple had at the back a flat mud-brick altar table, 4.00 by 5.00 by 0.50 meters in size. It is noteworthy that in the rebuilding of the main interior room (dated with stratum XIII) the altar of this N temple appears as the platform of a cela. This indicates that the images of gods were probably placed upon this altar even earlier. Figs. TEM 41; ALT 20; MEG 27.

In the temple area in Beth-shan (A. Rowe, The Topography and History of Beth-shan [1930], pp. 10–14; cf. AVEP 732), where the various strata are unclear and therefore difficult to date, in the area fourteenth century B.C. usually designated the Mekal temple after an Egyptian stele which was found there, bearing the name of the god, there is in one corner of the main courtyard an irregular structure accessible by steps, which probably was considered a burnt-offering altar. Within strata VII–VI A at Megiddo, which can be dated between the fifteenth and the twentieth centuries, there has been uncovered a long-room temple (with towers)Shell, the so-called Migdol temple type, which had been repeatedly rebuilt. In the second and third phases it had on the rear wall a platform which was intended for deposit (and images of gods). G. Loud, Megiddo II [1949], pp. 102–3; cf. AVEP 735). No altar for burnt offerings was found in this excavated area in the front of the temple, although one would assume that there was such a one on the basis of the analogous temple structure in Alalakh (Atchana in Syria see below). In a section of excavation area DD in stratum VIII of Megiddo (G. Loud, Megiddo II [1949], pp. 113–14) in what should be regarded as the court of the temple, a partially lime-plastered mud-brick table or altar (1.30 by 1.10 by 0.35 meters) was found. It suggests the so-called altar (T) of Tell 'Ataraf. F. Parfee, Ingrid (1931), pl. 6), and corresponds to the low mud-brick platform in the axis in front of the great temple at Shechem (dimensions: 2.0 by 1.30 by 0.30 meters) which must certainly be regarded as an altar. E. Sellin, "Die Ausgrabung von Sichem" (1929), 312).

In the most of the city of Lachish a long-room temple which should be dated between 1450 and 1250 was found. In addition to deposit shelves and niches on the back wall, it had an elevated "holy of holies," and in the last phase there was in front of this shrine a mud-brick altar which was approached at the side by means of steps. The altar was 1.30 by 0.80 by 1.00 meters in size. Since the temple had a roof, burnt offerings can only have been presented at this altar if the roof had a sufficiently large vent (O. Tufnell et al., Lachish II [1949], plate 10; cf. AVEP 731). In stratum V (sixteenth to fifteenth century) L. Woolley discovered in Alalakh in Syria
Al Taschit

(L. Woolley, A Forgotten Kingdom [1953], plate 10a; 21) a temple in which there was a mud-brick altar (ca. 0.60 by 0.30 by 0.45 meters) next to a bench. It had a shallow depression on the top surface and was—so judge by the traces of burning—intended for burnt offerings. The stone altar in front of the Baal temple in Ugarit-Syria, which was approached by two steps, was indented on the top surface in a similar fashion (Syria, no. 16 [1933], plate 36). It was situated before the long-room temple, in its axis. This is also the position of the altar, which measured ca. 0.10 by 1.00 by 0.70 in front of the temple of stratum III (fourteenth century) in Alalah (L. Woolley, A Forgotten Kingdom [1953], fig. 20).

The altar in Hazor (dimensions: ca. 40 by 90 by 40 inches), which consists of a single huge limestone block weighing ca. five tons, is unique; half of its top surface is hollowed out for solid offerings and burnt offerings; and besides, it had a rectangular basin carved out which was probably intended to receive the blood or for liquid offerings (Fig. ALF 2). The altar block stood in a sanctuary area of the end of the Late Bronze Age.

In Sar'a, ca. 13.5 miles W of Jerusalem, there stands, even today, on the top of a rock a stone block hewn from an outcropping of natural rock which was certainly used as an altar. The period when it was fashioned cannot be determined. It is probably correct to regard it as the altar on which Manoah, the father of Samson, offered a sacrifice, according to Judges 13:19. The altar consists of an approximately rectangular block of 2.16 by 2.16 by 1.30 meters with 0.27 meters high, but smaller. The unfiled gap in one corner of the platform was surely not the station of the priest, but was intended instead for the erection of an incense altar (K. Galling, Der Altar in den Kulturen des Alten Orients [1925], plate 12, fig. 15c).

In Hamath on the Orontes in open country between the castle gate and the two palaces a sharply hewn altar block (ca. 0.70 by 1.35 by 1.06 meters) was found (cf. H. Ingemar, Rapport preliminaire sur sept campagnes de fouilles à Hamah en Syrie [1910], pp. 90, 108). Like a throne, it has a low "railing" on three sides. On the upper side two low round podiums have been left free. Whether holocausts for sacrifices or the like were set on them or whether images of gods stood here (in which case it would not be an altar) cannot be determined with certainty. The basin block, which is called an altar by the excavators, should probably be dated to the ninth or eighth century.

The numerous places of worship at Petra, most of which also have an altar hewn out of natural rock for the sacrifices presented, stem from a very much more recent period, the Greek or Roman era which cannot, however, be established exactly. A large, almost level courtyard, with benches for those taking part in the ceremony, occupies the center of the "high place" of Zibb'alut. On the W side there was an unevenly cut-out altar for liquid offerings (Altorientalische Bilder aus Al [1927], fig. 447) and immediately beside it a stepped altar 1.83 by 2.72 by 0.95 meters. The depression in the middle (0.35 by 1.08 by 0.17 meters) was presumably intended for a stone pillar (magalllah). The altar could be approached by a passage leading to the altar by means of a story which is four steps hewn out of the rock, which led halfway up the altar. On the top of the temple next to the ceremonial place a stepped altar was hewn out, it measured 2.13 by 3.00 by 0.30 meters; three steps in front of it. In the middle there is a small hump, reduced in size by the weathering, of ca. 0.80 meters in diameter and 0.25 meters in height. This might well be the remaining vestige of a former (rectangular) higher stone pillar (magallalah). K. Galling, Alter (1925), plate 12, fig. 12; cf. H. Grossmann, Altorientalische Bilder aus Al 1927, fig. 449. A similar altar of the same kind is shown in Altorientalische Bilder aus Al [1927], fig. 433. K. Galling, Alter (1925), plate 11, fig. 57; in this case the stone pillar is attached to the back, so to speak. In spite of the difference in time and place, the legitimate and the illegitimate (the true and the false) "holy high places" often mentioned in the OT must be thought of as similar to the places of worship at Petra (Fig. ALF 2). Of Incense Altar.


AL TASC KIT. See Music.

ALUSH [אַלֻּשָׁ (Aššur), Num. 33:43]. A station of Israel in their journey through the wilderness between Dophkah and Rehobith. It has not been identified.

ALVAH [אֵלָו; LXX Ελάοι] (Gen. 36:40). Alternatively: ALIAH [אֵלִיָּה], 1 Chr. 15:1. The second of eleven clan chiefs (2 Sam. 18:19; KJV "dukes") of Saul's family, the son of Joab. He is also the father of the so-called "House of David" in Prov. 22:15 ("...the son of Eliah the Proverbs are in the mouth of Eliah the Prophet").

ALV. Alters, restoration of the cliff.

AMA, territory of Hebron.
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