first in a *mēnōg*, later in a *gētīg* state, in order to determine the cosmic battlefield against Ahreman. Thus, Ahreman's aggression was limited into a temporal and spatial framework, the creation, comparable to a cosmic trap. Pahlavi texts describe Ohrmazd as "omniscient," while Ahreman was given only a knowledge *a posteriori*.

While in the earliest Iranian tradition, the image of Ahura Mazda was not represented, already in the later Achaemenid period a new trend started; the image of Aramazd was venerated also in Parthian times, while Ohrmazd's figure was engraved on many Sasanian royal investiture scenes in front of the king: this god, standing or on horseback, is clearly distinguishable for his special crown and for the priestly *barsom*. The name of Ohrmazd is attested in Middle Persian onomastics, isolated or in compounds, and it was assumed also by some Sasanian kings.

Ohrmazd is still venerated by the little Zoroastrian community, mostly living in India and Iran.

Bibliography: ▪ M. Boyce, *A History of Zoroastrianism*, I (Leiden 1975). ▪ M. Boyce, "Ahura Mazdā," *EIr* 1 (London 1982) 684–87. ▪ J. Darmesteter, *Ormazd et Ahriman* (Paris 1877). ▪ G. Gnoli, "Osservazioni sulla dottrina mazdaica della creazione," *AION* N.S. 13 (1963) 163–93. ▪ G. Gnoli, "Einige Bemerkungen zum altiranischen Dualismus," in *Proceedings of the Second European Conference of Iranian Studies* (Rome 1995) 213–31. ▪ H. Humbach, "Ahura Mazdā und die Daēvas," *WZKSO* 1 (1957) 81–94. ▪ A. V. W. Jackson, *Zoroastrian Studies* (New York 1928). ▪ J. Kellens, "Ahura Mazdā n'est pas un dieu créateur," in *Études irano-aryennes offertes à G. Lazard* (Paris 1989) 217–28. ▪ R. G. Kent, *Old Persian* (New Haven, Conn. ²1953). ▪ S. Konow, "Medhā and Mazdā," in *Jhā Commemoration Volume* (Poona 1937) 217–22. ▪ F. B. J. Kuiper, "Avestan Mazdā-," *IIJ* 1 (1957) 86–95. ▪ F. B. J. Kuiper, "Ahura Mazdā "Lord Wisdom"?," *IIJ* 18 (1976) 25–42. ▪ M. Lidzbarski, *Aramäische Inschriften aus Kappadocien* (Ephemeris für semitische Epigraphik 1; Giessen 1902) 59–74, 319–26. ▪ H. Lommel, *Die Religion Zarathustras* (Tübingen 1930). ▪ A. Panaino, *Rite parole et pensée dans l'Avesta ancien et recent* (Vienna 2004). ▪ A. Panaino, "Trends and Problems concerning the Mutual Relations between Iranian Pre-Islamic and Jewish Cultures," in *Schools of Oriental Studies and the Development of Modern Historiography* (eds. A. Panaino/A. Piras; Melammu Symposia IV; Milan 2004) 209–36. ▪ H.-P. Schmidt, "The Non-Existence of Ahreman and the Mixture (gumēzišn) of Good and Evil," in *K.R. Cama Oriental Institute. Second International Congress Proceedings* (5th to 8th January, 1995) (Bombay 1996) 79–95. ▪ S. Shaked, "The Notions "mēnōg" and "gētīg" in the Pahlavi Texts and their relation to Eschatology," *AcOr* 33 (1971) 59–61. ▪ R. C. Zaehner, *Zurvan* (New York ²1972).

Antonio Panaino

Ahuzzam

Ahuzzam (MT *ʾĂḥuzzām*) is identified in 1 Chr 4 : 6 in a genealogy of the tribe of Judah as the son of "Ashhur the father of Tekoa" and his wife Naarah. Many scholars refer to 1 Chr 2 : 24 to emphasize the Calebite connection of Asshur, and thus also of Ahuzzam.

Louis Jonker

Ahuzzath

Ahuzzath (MT *ʾĂḥuzzat*; LXX Οχοζαθ) appears in Gen 26 : 26 as a man who accompanies Abimelech and Phicol from Gerar to make a pact with Isaac at Beersheba, according to the MT and the Greek versions of the text. He is referred to as the "friend of the king," an official administrative title (see Donner and Van Selms). In the Aramaic Targumim and the subsequent history of Jewish interpretation of Gen 26 : 26, the word *ʾĂḥuzzat* is interpreted as a common noun meaning "company," despite the fact that the root of this word never carries that meaning elsewhere. Gen 26 : 26–32 is similar to Gen 21 : 22–32, although in the latter text, the word *ʾĂḥuzzat* is missing altogether. Many scholars suggest that the two stories represent variant traditions of a single "Pact of Beersheba." If this is the case, Safren offers a compelling argument that it makes more sense that the name was initially present, as attested in Gen 26 : 26, and then later subtracted, perhaps because the title "friend of the king" was no longer intelligible in the context of the pact.

Bibliography: ▪ H. Donner, "Der 'Freund des Königs'," *ZAW* 73 (1961) 269–77. ▪ J. Safren, "Ahuzzath and the Pact of Beer-Sheba," *ZAW* 101 (1989) 184–98. ▪ A. van Selms, "The Origin of the Title 'The King's Friend'," *JNES* 16 (1957) 118–23.

Kristin Helms

al-Aḥzāb (Sura 33)

→Clans, The (Sura 33)

Ahzai

The name Ahzay (MT *ʾAḥzay*), probably short for Ahaziah (Heb. *ʾĂḥazyāhû*) appears only once in the Bible (Neh 11 : 13). He is identified as son of Azarel and grandfather of Amashai as one of the heads of the priestly families that settled in Jerusalem after the rebuilding of the wall in the Septuagint. The list in Neh 11 is paralleled by 1 Chr 9, and there (v. 12) Ahzai seems to be identified with Jahzerah (Knoppers).

Bibliography: ▪ G. Knoppers, "Sources, Revisions, and Editions," *Textus* 20 (2000) 141–68.

Jacob L. Wright

Ai

Ai (MT *hāʿAy*) is a city in the tribe of Ephraim on the border with Benjamin, east of Bethel (Gen 12 : 8), near Beth-aven (Josh 7 : 2; 18 : 12). In Josh

8:12, 16, "Ai" (Qere) should probably be preferred over "city" (Ketib).

Following M. Noth, most take the name to mean "the ruin," especially in light of Josh 8:28; however, evidence for the persistence of the *ghayin* in Hebrew has prompted some to suggest that in light of Arabic cognates, *hāʿay* may refer to a topographical feature, such as the height of the city (Zevit).

Ai is usually identified with Khirbet et-Tell ("ruin of the hill/mound"; map reference 1747.1472), adjacent to the modern town of Deir Dibwan, ca. 3 km east of Beitîn (Bethel). Given their inseparable linkage in the Bible, et-Tell is the only convincing site east of Bethel that would have been called by the name Ai.

1. Biblical References. Ai is first mentioned in relation to Abram who pitched his tent on two occasions between Ai and Bethel (Gen 12:8; 13:3). The best known reference to Ai, however, comes after the fall of Jericho to the Israelites (Josh 7:2–5; 8:1–29). To reach Ai, the Israelite warriors had to march from their base camp at Gilgal in the Jordan Valley (ca. 260 m below sea level) into the Ephraim hills (ca. 850 m above sea level). This meant a steep ascent of ca. 1,110 m in a distance of just 14 km.

Apparently, Joshua's objective was to seize the central highlands by taking control of the strategic Central Benjamin Plateau alongside the north-south watershed route. While the most direct road into this area was by way of Geba and Michmash, the Israelites took a parallel ascent some 4 km to the north by way of Ai. Since Ai is situated topographically higher than the parallel road to Michmash and Geba, Ai was able to maintain a commanding view of the region. Anyone ascending to Ramah and the Central Benjamin Plateau by way of Michmash and Geba would have been visible to sentries at Ai. Thus, by taking Ai from the outset, Joshua had secure access to the more direct route later on, as was apparently the case in Josh 10:7–9.

The Israelites failed in their initial attempt to take Ai (Josh 7). After seeking God's counsel, Joshua learned that someone had violated the ban on taking booty from Jericho; a person later identified as Achan. Justice was served on Achan and his family by stoning them in the Valley of Achor. Thus, Israelite troops successfully conquered Ai the second time (Josh 8).

The details of the second battle fit the geographical setting of et-Tell perfectly: a commanding position, ravines to the west and north to serve as hiding places for two groups of Israelite warriors, and a flat area to the east where soldiers feigning retreat could have fled. The Palestinian town of Deir Dibwan sits on this small plateau today.

To take Ai, an ambush force secreted themselves in a valley behind the city to the west (Josh 8:9), while the main force led by Joshua camped above a ravine to the north (Josh 8:11). Joshua's troops then approached the city. When the men of Ai left their city to engage them in combat, Joshua's warriors turned and ran eastwards towards the desert. In hot pursuit, the men of Ai thought they had once again routed the Israelites; however, through a prearranged signal, the ambush force left their hiding place, entered the city, and set it on fire. Once the fleeing Israelites saw the signs of smoke, they turned and faced off their pursuers, sandwiching the men of Ai between both groups of warriors (Josh 8:1–22). Thus, the city of Ai was burned and made a *tēl ʿôlām šĕmāmāh ʿad hayyôm hazzeh* ("perpetual mound and desolation to this day"; Josh 8:28).

After this, Ai disappears from the biblical record until it is mentioned together with Bethel in the context of returning Babylonian exiles (Ezra 2:28; Neh 7:32).

It is unlikely that Aiath (ʿayyāt) of Isa 10:28 and Aija (ʿayyāh) of Neh 11:31 are variant names for Ai. In the latter instance, "Bethel and Ai" are already mentioned in Neh 7:32, and any reference to this town is missing from the LXX. Most likely, Aiath and Aija are different towns in the same locale, but with names that sound similar to Ai.

2. Archaeological Evidence. The identification of et-Tell with Ai was first suggested by E. Robinson in 1838 and defended by Albright (1924). Initial soundings were carried out by J. Garstang in 1928, followed by the excavations of J. Marquet-Krause in 1933–35. In 1964–76, further work was carried out by J. Callaway at et-Tell and neighboring sites in the region, effectively ruling out a few other alternatives for Ai. More recently, work has been renewed at the site on a small scale by H. Nur el-Din of Al-Quds University.

Archaeological activity at et-Tell revealed the remains of a 2.5 acre Iron I village built on the remains of an extensive 27.5 acre Early Bronze (EB) Age city. The thick walls of the EB city were reinforced by semi-circular towers. This same construction can be found at the EB site of Arad in the northern Negev, and cities from this period in Syria. This extensive fortification system would have been visible to the Iron I villagers, possibly inspiring the biblical narrative. Portions of this city wall remained visible well into modern times.

Based on the current evidence, Ai was first established in EB IB (ca. 3300 BCE) and lasted until the end of EB III when it was finally destroyed (ca. 2350 BCE). After a settlement gap of some 1,100 years, a small Iron I village (12th-11th centuries BCE) was established on the earlier ruins. This village existed in two phases. Callaway's original suggestion that the earlier Iron IA ("Hivite") village was the one conquered by Joshua, with the later phase resettled in Iron IB by the Israelites has not been generally accepted (Callaway). After the aban-

donment of the Iron IB village, et-Tell was never resettled, which raises understandable concern about the reference to Ai in Neh 7:32. However, it is possible that the Persian period town existed somewhere else in the vicinity.

3. The Problem of the Conquest of Ai. The main objection to et-Tell as biblical Ai has been the lack of Late Bronze Age remains. For this reason, Albright suggested that the biblical narrative confused Ai with neighboring Bethel; a city that was clearly destroyed in LB II (Albright 1939). Few, however, have accepted this hypothesis. Others believe that Ai was a small outpost that defended Bethel to the east, though the biblical narrative describes it as a fortified city with its own king (Josh 7:5; 8:1).

While the search for a suitable site continues, no convincing alternative has yet been located. This raises the possibility that the Ai tradition is unhistorical, despite the site's topographical and tactical plausibility. In such a case, the story would have served as an etiology to explain the visible EB ruins as a Canaanite city destroyed by Joshua. Such a narrative would have enhanced the importance of this strategic region by linking the roots of those living there to a formative national past.

It is possible that the Ai narrative originated in the time of the Judges when there was an Iron I (Israelite?) village on the mound, though a later date for this tradition has also been conjectured on the basis of Josh 6:24, which mentions objects from Ai being kept in the treasury of the "house of YHWH" (presumably Solomon's temple). In any case, once incorporated into the biblical tradition, the story of Ai became part of a much larger theme of obedience to God's word and a reminder about the consequences of disobedience seen most strikingly in the punishment of Achan and his family (Zevit).

Bibliography: ▪ W. F. Albright, "Excavations and Results at Tell el-Ful (Gibeah of Saul)," *AASOR* 4 (1924) 141–49. ▪ W. F. Albright, "The Israelite Conquest of Canaan in the Light of Archaeology," *BASOR* 74 (1939) 11–23. ▪ J. A. Callaway, "New Evidence on the Conquest of Ai," *JBL* 87 (1968) 316–19. ▪ J. Marquet-Krause, *Les fouilles de ʿAy (et-Tell), 1933–1935* (Paris 1949). ▪ Z. Zevit, "Archaeological and Literary Stratigraphy in Joshua 7–8," *BASOR* 251 (1983) 23–35.

Robert Mullins

Aiah

Aiah (MT ʾAyyâ; LXX Αια, Αιε; "Hawk") is the personal name of two individuals in the Bible.

1. Son of Zibeon

Aiah is the name of one of the sons of Zibeon, belonging to the clan of Horites from Seir, that is, Edom (Gen 36:24; 1 Chr 1:40).

2. Father of Rizpah

The name is also given to the father of Rizpah, one of the concubines of Saul (2 Sam 3:7, 21:8).

Kenneth Numfor Ngwa

Aiath

→Ai

Aija

→Aiah

Aijalon

Aijalon is a place name with the etymological meaning "pasture land of the (fallow) deer" (Heb. ʾayyāl + ōn, KBL I: 39). Contrary to Dus (1960: 355) the (fallow) deer is not associated with the moon god, but should be situated within the sphere of the unnamed goddess (Keel/Uehlinger 1998: §§32.36.117.208). However, the toponym may only refer to the natural conditions of the locality without any religious connotations.

Aijalon is attested in various ancient sources. It is first mentioned in cuneiform as (A)jaluna in Egyptian texts of the 14th cent. BCE as a place within the territory of Gezer acting together with Gaza in collusion with ʿApiru (EA 273,20) and as a scenery of a hold-up of a caravan on its way from Jerusalem to Egypt (EA 287,55); a possible earlier reference in the Execration Texts of the early second millennium BCE is doubtful (Gaß: 172–73). Furthermore, the triumphal relief of Pharaoh Sheshonq I (Shishak) dating to the late 10th cent. BCE lists Aijalon (ỉyrn; no. 26) in sequence with other sites in the Judean foothills.

The Hebrew Bible knows two places called Aijalon. Of ten references nine point to a southern location. Aijalon is either associated with the tribe of Dan (Josh 19:42; 21:24; Judg 1:35; twice mentioned together with Shaalbim on Dan's north-eastern border) or with Ephraim (1 Chr 6:54) in conjunction with Gezer, Jokmeam, Beth-Horon and Gath-Rimmon and therefore situated in the northern Shephelah. According to 2 Chr 11:10, Aijalon was one of the fortified cities of Rehoboam in Judah/Benjamin (this source, however, should be dated to the time of Hezekiah, cf. Naʾaman). Equally, 2 Chr 28:18 places Aijalon within the territory of Judah. 1 Sam 14:31 and 1 Chr 8:13 do not bear sufficient information regarding the localization of Aijalon, though the Benjaminite leader Beriah mentioned in the latter passage is also associated with Gath. Finally, Josh 10:12 poetically mentions the valley of Aijalon as the place where the moon stood still on Joshua's command.

In a single occurrence (Judg 12:12), a northern Aijalon is mentioned as burial place of Elon – one