

## CHAPTER I

### THE TRIBAL PARTICIPANTS OF THE EXODUS

The first phase of the conquest of Palestine by the Israelites followed the initial migration of the Hebrew patriarchs into Palestine from the northeast<sup>1</sup> by some three hundred fifty to five hundred years.<sup>2</sup> During this interval from entrance to conquest, the tribal descendants of the patriarchs, having settled in the hill-country of western Palestine and desert Negeb, lived as immigrants without legal rights or territorial claims.<sup>3</sup> This region of settlement, which was only sparsely populated and a relatively good distance from the settled civilizations and cultural centers along the Palestinian coast, was susceptible to two types of migratory movements; namely, the successive waves of migrating ethnic units and composite groups, and the ever shifting movements of nomadic clans seeking grazing and pasture lands.<sup>4</sup>

It was in response to the conditions involved in either one or both of these two types of migratory movements that certain elements of the Israelite tribes went down into Egypt. Meek<sup>5</sup> asserts that the Hyksos avalanche from the north was the cause of the initial entrance and descent of some Hebrews into Egypt, with the possibility that the Hebrews even constituted a part of the conglomerate mass of the Hyksos in Egypt. The basic reasons underlying this assertion of Meek are (1) the reflection in the Old Testament accounts of Abraham's visit to Egypt (Gn. 12:10) and Joseph's sojourn (Gn. 39ff) of the successive waves by which the Hyksos invaded Egypt; and (2) the presence of a Hyksos king named

Jacob-Har, which would indicate that Jacob was a good Hyksos name and suggests that the Hebrews participated in the Hyksos regime in Egypt.<sup>6</sup>

However, Meek does not identify the Hebrews of the Hyksos period with the Hebrews involved in the Biblical accounts of the Egyptian sojourn and exodus. He states:

The Hebrews who went with the Hyksos to Egypt must have had an exodus, but it can scarcely have been the exodus recorded in the Bible. No people who had been in Egypt as conquerors and masters would have represented their sojourn there as servitude, as the Hebrews have throughout all their literature.<sup>7</sup>

As for the Hebrew participants of the exodus narratives in particular, Meek maintains that the cause of their entrance and descent into Egypt was the Ḥabiru migration and activity.<sup>8</sup> As a result of the Ḥabiru movements in Palestine, certain masses of migrating hordes (of which the Hebrews were a part) had been forced to seek home and pasturage elsewhere for their flocks and families. The push of this migrating mass was westward; but, according to Meek, because of their inability to conquer southern Palestine, some groups from the total body made a circuit southward and mingled with the Calebites, Kenites, and Jerahmeelites while others went to the border country of Egypt where they were allowed entrance into Wadi Tumilat, the land of Goshen.<sup>9</sup> This latter group which entered Egypt made up that element of Hebrews which experienced the sojourn, oppression, and exodus as recorded in the biblical tradition.

Albright accepts as definite the hypothesis which identifies the Hebrew descent into Egypt with the Hyksos inva-

sion.<sup>10</sup> This he states in summary as follows:

The Hyksos conquerors are now known to have been mainly—perhaps entirely—of Hebrew Semitic stock, closely akin to the Hebrews, who probably formed one of their component elements. . . . There are numerous details in Hebrew tradition which square so completely with Egyptian records that an intimate connection between the Hebrew settlement in Egypt and the Hyksos conquest may be considered certain.<sup>11</sup>

Albright, differing from Meek, identifies the Semites of the Hyksos invasion with the Israelites of the biblical sojourn and exodus narratives.<sup>12</sup> However, along with Meek, he does not identify the retreat and exodus of the Hyksos after their defeat by Amosis I, the founder of the eighteenth dynasty, with the biblical account of the Hebrew exodus. According to Albright, the Semites were not necessarily driven out of the country, although some of the leaders and the more nomadic elements may have withdrawn to Palestine. It is more likely that those who escaped death at the time of the Hyksos fall were either enslaved or permitted to remain in a status of serfdom.<sup>13</sup>

Wright,<sup>14</sup> however, asserts that the migration of the Hebrews to Egypt was due to the nomadic search for agricultural and grazing lands. Egyptian reliefs and inscriptions indicate that Egyptian border officials were constantly allowing such nomadic peoples to enter the land in the area of Wadi Tumilat.<sup>15</sup> According to Wright, the inevitable problem which arose from an increase in the nomadic minority were solved by the Egyptians by forcing the people into public works and labor battalions. Such was the experience of the Hebrews in Egypt and the nature of their oppression until the exodus under Moses.<sup>16</sup>

Rowley<sup>17</sup> has not only disassociated the Israelite descent into Egypt from the Hyksos invasion, but he has completely rejected the possibility. His rejection is based primarily on the absence of any biblical evidence indicative of such an entrance and the incompatibility of such a view with the biblical tradition as it now stands, especially the chronologies of Ex 12:40 and I Kings 6:1. Rowley prefers to assign the Hebrew descent to the Amarna age, with the cause of the migration being the physical insecurity in this era and the inability of certain tribes to maintain their land claims. According to Rowley, it is the Amarna period which is in closest harmony with the Joseph traditions in reference to both chronology and the cause and effect sequence.<sup>18</sup>

Thus, while there is lack of complete agreement as to the immediate reason and era of the Hebrew descent into Egypt, it is now—in light of the vast amount of corroborative evidence coming from the delta area<sup>19</sup>—agreed that the Hebrews did go to Egypt.<sup>20</sup> The question on which there is almost total disagreement addresses itself to determining the particular migrating groups which, from all of the Hebrew tribes, went to Egypt.<sup>21</sup>

It has long been realized that the traditional interpretations as derived from the Joseph traditions (Gn, 39ff) and the fragments of P (Ex. 6:16–23; Num. 3:17–19, 16:1, 26:33), which assume that all the sons of Jacob participated in the sojourn and exodus, give rise to a great number of problems when related to other biblical data.

These problems and differences may be summarily listed as follows:

(1) The place of settlement in Egypt, which was only sixty to eighty square miles, could not have supported the supposed 600,000 as reported by P in Ex. 12:37 and Num.

11:21.<sup>22</sup> Thus it has been suggested by Petrie that no more than 5,000 people could have been taken out of Goshen or into Sinai.<sup>23</sup>

(2) According to Ex. 1:15 the Hebrew group in Egypt was small enough to be ministered to by only two midwives; and, according to J, was small enough to be called together to one place to be addressed by Moses.

(3) The record of P in Gn. 46:27 is that only seventy went into Egypt.

(4) The genealogies in I Chronicles 1–8 ignore the exodus and suggests the continuous presence of Hebrews in Palestine since their initial migration.

(5) According to Skinner<sup>24</sup> Gn 46:12 (P), which is from a cycle of tradition quite independent of the Joseph traditions and speaks of Judah's separation from his brethren, has the intention of relating Judah's permanent settlement in Palestine, and evidently ignores the exodus altogether.

(6) Ju. 11L26 speaks of the Hebrews as living in certain cities in the Trans-Jordan three hundred years before Jephthah which is c. 1400 B.C., and they would subsequently precede the Hebrews of the exodus.<sup>25</sup>

The obvious conclusion which grew out of these problems and differences within the narratives of the sojourn and exodus was that all the tribes did not go down into Egypt. This same conclusion is reflected in the later developments of the individual tribes, and indirectly in the available extra-biblical material.

The available extra-biblical data, pertinent to this problem, consists primarily of names found in texts and inscriptions which possibly refer to or are equal to Israelite names. These sources include Egyptian execration texts of both the Eleventh and Twelfth Dynasties; inscriptions from the reign

of Seti I and Ramases II; alleged references from Ras Shamra, Mari, and Amarna; and the names of certain Hyksos rulers.<sup>26</sup>

In 1926, Sethe<sup>27</sup> published a series of Egyptian execration texts which were from the Eleventh Dynasty (c. 20th century B.C.). These texts contained the names of numerous Palestinian and Syrian states and rulers, including a name which Albright vocalizes as  $Tb^c n w$  and equates it with Zebulun.<sup>28</sup> However, if this is equated with the Israelite tribe of Zebulun, it would necessitate dating Zebulun's existence some two centuries before Abraham since the text is dated to the twentieth century B.C. Thus the identification would invalidate all the biblical chronology and tradition as it is known today. Consequently, the identification of this group with the Israelite tribe has not been widely accepted.<sup>29</sup>

In 1940, another series of Egyptian execration texts were published by Posener<sup>30</sup> which were dated within the Twelfth Dynasty. Among the names which appear in this list is  $^?sm^c n$ , which is vocalized by Posener as  $su-má^c-ni$  and identified with Simeon. Posener had made the following statement earlier:

Il ya de fortes possibilités que nous ayons de la nom propre שִׁמְעוֹן (Συμεων) que est escrit dans les textes cuneformes  $\check{s}a-ma-ah-u-nu$ .<sup>31</sup>

However, this identification is not commonly accepted; and Albright makes the following statement rejecting the identification with Simeon:

( $Shamu^c anu$ ) is probably  $\check{s}amhuna$  of the Amarna tablets, reflecting a later pronunciation of  $sam^?on(a)$ . . . . while the latter form of the name cannot be separated from the name Simeon ( $\check{s}im^c on$  in Hebrew),

the Brussels spelling suggests an original form which contained the elements *šamu . . .* and *ʿAnu . . .*.<sup>32</sup>

Were the identification of *su-má<sup>c</sup>-ni* with Simeon certain and fully accepted, there would still exist the problem of chronology since Simeon would antedate Abraham by more than a century. Thus, this alleged reference offers little aid in identifying the tribal participants of the Egyptian sojourn and exodus.

Mention of *ʿAsaru* (*ʿsr*) in the inscriptions of Set I (c. 1301 B.C.) and Rameses II (c. 1301-1234 B.C.) has generally been accepted as the equivalent of the biblical Asher since the name refers to precisely the same territorial district.<sup>33</sup> On the basis of a late date of the exodus, this would indicate that Asher was already settled in Palestine and had not participated in the Egyptian exodus.<sup>34</sup> However, Rowley and others accept this reference as an indication of an early exodus with Asher being one of the tribes which was settled only after the exodus.<sup>35</sup> The value of this identification is relative to the interpretation placed on the date of the exodus and is thus non-conclusive of itself as Asher's participation.

From Ras Shamra there have come several alleged references to Asher and Zebulun, which, if identified for certain, would necessitate their residence in Palestine prior to the fifteenth century and would thus prohibit their participation in the Egyptian sojourn and exodus. Rowley, who states, "it is clear that the alleged occurrence of the names of the Israelite tribes are too insecure to build on,"<sup>36</sup> accepts the following conclusions of Albright: (1) the alleged reference to Zebulun is to be pronounced approximately as *zabûlânîm* which is a collective plural formation of *zabul* (exalted, noble) and has nothing to do with the Israelite tribe of Zebulun; (2) and the

alleged reference to Asher is but the perfect plural of the verb  $\text{ʔatr}$  (to step), and likewise is not a reference to the tribe of Asher.<sup>37</sup>

The possible mention of an Israelite tribe from Mari stems from the words *Banû Yamîna*, identified with Benjamin.<sup>38</sup> However, Albright pointed out the meaning of these words to be manifest in its counter part, *Banû Simʔal*; the meaning of these being “children of the South” and “children of the North,” respectively.<sup>39</sup>

Dossin’s identification of *Banû Yamîna* with the southern branch of the Rachel tribes of Israel limits this term far more than is likely, for such a term could well be applied to any number of different groups who lived in southern territory. If this identification were made, it would also necessitate the existence of the tribe of Benjamin c. 2000 B.C., which is much earlier than the birth of Benjamin in any chronology.

The reference to Jacob and Joseph in the place names Jacob-el and Joseph-el which were inscribed in the time of Thutmoses III (c. 1504–1450 B.C.) in the temple of Karnak are only questionably so read.<sup>40</sup> The š sibilant in the Egyptian text, which reads *Y-š-pʔa-ra* and is identified with Joseph, is not the normal sibilant equivalent of the 𐤃 in Joseph’s name.

Thus, in summary it should be noted that of the six alleged references to Israelite tribal names coming from Egypt, only two are considered as somewhat definite, namely *Ṭḅc̣nw* with Zebulun and *ʔAsaru* with Asher. But of these two, the first is in disagreement with the chronology of the period, and the second is relative to the dating of the exodus. The other four alleged references are extremely doubtful from a linguistic examination, and three of these four are incompatible with the chronology. Consequently, the extra-biblical

data, consisting primarily of names in texts and inscriptions, offer no definite evidence of settled Israelite tribes in Palestine, and which, by virtue of the fact that they were settled, would probably not have participated in the Egyptian sojourn and exodus.

Most biblical scholars have approached this question of identifying the tribal participants of the Egyptian sojourn and exodus through either (1) an analysis of the biblical material in an attempt to attain the primary source(s) and historical elements and thereby determine the actual events, or (2) determine the course of events by retrospect after the examination of the later developments in the individual tribes. The biblical scholars at the turn of the twentieth century, including Meyer, Cook, Luther, Schiele, Haupt, Wellhausen, Benzinger, Steuernagel, and Paton, approached this problem primarily in terms of the latter option.

The older scholars made a sharp division in the tribes of Israel into the Rachel group and the Leah group. This division was extended further so as to identify the Rachel group with Sinai and the Leah group with Kadesh—the assumption being that Sinai was geographically distinct from Kadesh and the activities at each locale were the activities of distinct groups.<sup>41</sup> The problem was then simply a matter of determining which group, Kadesh-Leah or Sinai-Rachel, made the descent into Egypt.<sup>42</sup>

Paton in a summary presentation of this approach listed the following factors as the basic areas of inquiry in this approach: (1) the most prominent tribe in the sojourn tradition; (2) determining the tribe to which Moses belonged; (3) determining the site to which Moses was connected, i.e., Sinai or Kadesh; (4) what was the source of the Mosaic religion.<sup>43</sup>

But as evident from the lack of agreement, these factors were inadequate and unsatisfactory to determine the tribal participants. For, although the Joseph tribes were admitted to the most prominent in the sojourn traditions of Genesis 37–49, this tradition was dismissed by the advocates of the Sinai-Rachel group as a late invention.

The determining of the tribal relationship of Moses was also non-conclusive. For, as Paton summarized, Ex. 2:1 (E) and 6:16–20 (P) consider Moses as a Levite, but Ju 7:17 mentions a Levite from Bethlehem-Judah, and 18:30 says of him, “Jonathan, the son of Gershom, the son of Moses,<sup>44</sup> he and his sons were priests to the tribe of Danites unto the day of the captivity of the land,” thus witnessing to a tradition that the Levites of Dan were descended from Moses.<sup>45</sup>

Paton also maintains that J never refers to Moses as a Levite, but rather (after Luther) refers to him as an Ephramite. Likewise, the attempt to identify Moses with either of the two sites was unsuccessful. On the one hand Ex. 2:15f (J) and 3:1 (E), which state respectively that Moses fled from Egypt to Midian and lived with the priest of Midian and that Moses attended the flocks of his Midianite father-in-law in Horeb, identify him with Sinai. On the other hand, Meyer joined Ex. 2:33 with 4:19 and asserted that the revelation of Yahweh came to Moses on his way to Egypt from Midian, and argued that the burning bush (Ex. 3:2) was a thorn bush in Kadesh which burned from natural gas in the area.<sup>46</sup>

The conclusion of these earlier scholars as to the origin of the Mosaic religion was also unsuccessful in definitely identifying the tribal participants of the sojourn and exodus. While maintaining that Judah and the Kenites worshiped Yahweh prior to the exodus<sup>47</sup> and that the Mosaic concept of Yahweh was introduced to the Joseph tribes in consequence

of the exodus, it was impossible to account for the following: (1) the compound names with Yahweh in the Rachel tribes<sup>48</sup> and (2) that the ark of Yahweh was connected with Sinai and the Rachel-Sinai group.<sup>49</sup>

It was assumed necessary for purposes on consistency to assign an early settlement in Canaan to that group of Israelite tribes which did not go down into Egypt. Thus, Myer, Schiele, and Haupt claimed that the Rachel tribes were settled in Canaan long before the Leah tribes went to Egypt; and Wellhausen, followed by Steuernagel, Benzinger, and Paton, claimed the weight of evidence was in favor of the earlier settlement of the Leah tribes.<sup>50</sup>

Burney in his Schweich lectures of 1917 claimed that Joshua led only the Joseph tribes across the Jordan and that in all probability, if Joshua were the successor to Moses in the leadership of Israel, the tribes led out of Egypt by Moses included only Joseph and certain elements of Simeon and Levi.<sup>51</sup> Burney reconstructed the course of events as follows: Simeon and Levi suffered together in the retribution which followed their treacherous outrage against Shechem and subsequently settled as two small tribal remnants in the desert region bordering Egypt where they would perforce be nomads and probably seek refuge at some time in Egypt. This they did, according to Burney, and thus came into association with the Joseph tribes who had settled in Goshen.<sup>52</sup>

Of the other tribes, Burney claimed that five of the six Leah tribes were grouped together in early times in the central hill country at a period possibly long before the entrance of the Joseph tribes under Joshua. These tribes include Simeon and Levi in the Shechem district, Issachar in an unidentifiable position, Zebulun in the southwest, and Reuben in the southeast.<sup>53</sup> Judah, the remaining Leah tribe to be accounted

for, was considered by Burney to have been stationed in the neighborhood of Adullam where it entered into relationships with the Canaanites prior to “its reinforcement by the Arabian clans to which its name was subsequently extended.”<sup>54</sup> The concubine tribes were not involved in the Egyptian sojourn and exodus according to Burney since they were at least partially of alien extraction.<sup>55</sup>

This position of Burney was generally accepted and followed by Jack, even though he considered the solution as extremely questionable since there was little or no direct evidence available.<sup>56</sup>

Rowley in his reconstruction of early Israelite history comes to the following conclusions concerning the tribal participants of the exodus and sojourn:

A group of Israelite tribes including Joseph, Simeon and Levi, with associated Kenite and other elements, pressed into Palestine from the south in the Amarna age. . . . In the same age other Israelite elements<sup>57</sup> separated from the group that pressed in from the south, and went into Egypt. . . . The Simeonite and Levite elements reached the district of Shechem, of which they took treacherous advantage, with the result that they suffered some serious disaster. This caused Simeon to fall back on Judah, to be absorbed in the tribe, while Levi was more widely scattered. Some Levite elements fell back on Judah, while some went into Egypt to join the recently separated group that had gone thither.<sup>58</sup>

Rowley arrived at these conclusions in the following way. According to Ju 11:16, which is identified by Rowley as the earliest tradition, the Israelites who came out of Egypt proceeded straight to Kadesh; but, as the tradition now stands

in the Pentateuch, the tribes went to Horeb or Sinai and only came to Kadesh, which was a good distance away, subsequently. It is therefore likely that the two accounts have been combined, namely a J narrative which displays a particular interest in Judah, and an E narrative which has a similar interest in Ephraim. The conflation of these two accounts is unhistorical, but the separate traditions may be accepted as genuinely historical.<sup>59</sup>

Even though every element cannot be taken literally, since accretions are generally made to such stories, Rowley accepts the substantial historical value of the Joseph story. Thus, he accepts the evidence of the biblical tradition that the Joseph tribes which were born in Egypt came out under Moses rather than the group of tribes associated with Judah. According to the biblical account, Joseph is later joined by several of his kinsmen (plus wives and dependents) who include the ancestors of all the tribes. For Rowley this joining of the seventy was the descent of the Levite and Simeonite elements who were scattered after the treachery of Shechem. Included amongst them was the ancestor of Moses.<sup>60</sup>

Rowley draws this same conclusion from his consideration of Yahwism. In view of the differences in the statements of J and E<sup>61</sup> he maintains that the Leah tribes which were not with Moses at the time of the exodus were the ones that did not ascribe their Yahwism to him, and the Joseph tribes who were with him did so ascribe their Yahwism to him.<sup>62</sup>

Asher, Dan, and Zebulun are considered as kindred tribes of the north who were generally related to the Israelites proper. They exerted pressure simultaneously from the north as the Hebrew, including Judah, at Kadesh exerted pressure along with the Kenites from the south.<sup>63</sup>

Albright claims that both the Leah tribes and the Joseph tribes were in Egypt and that each of these tribal groups had

an exodus of its own.<sup>64</sup> That Moses was a Hebrew who was born in Egypt and reared under a strong Egyptian influence is assumed by Albright on the basis of biblical tradition and the evidence of his Egyptian name and the Egyptian names current among his Aaronid kinsmen for two centuries.<sup>65</sup> Thus, on the basis of the Egyptian background of Moses, Albright finds it necessary to identify the Leah tribes with Moses and Egypt. He states:

The close connection of the Leah tribes with Moses is supported by a number of traditions, and especially by the fact that the first conquered territory, the land of Sihon, became the heritage of Reuben, the eldest son of Leah. Moses himself, as a Levite, belonged to a Leah tribe.<sup>66</sup>

On the basis of this identification, Albright states that Judah itself probably came with Moses out of Egypt since it was one of the Leah tribes and entered the land from the north in the thirteenth century B.C.

However, Albright also maintains that the Joseph tribes were in Egypt at the time of the Hyksos control, and may even have played a part in the Hyksos movement.<sup>67</sup> But as early as 1918 he maintained that Joseph returned from Egypt to Palestine much earlier than the group led by Moses.<sup>68</sup>

Meek limits the participants of the sojourn and exodus to the tribe of Levi alone, and interprets the biblical account which represents all the tribes as being in Egypt as a later fused account. This later account reflects, according to Meek, the consolidation of various tribes and groups into a national unit, at which time the traditions of each tribe became the common possession of the whole.<sup>69</sup> Meek's reasons for identifying the Levites as the only Israelite tribe in Egypt may be

summarily listed as follows:

(1) Both Moses and Aaron were traditionally “Levites and chief shamans of the Levites.”<sup>70</sup>

(2) Ex. 2:1 (J), which is identified by Meek as the oldest source, calls them Levites.

(3) I Chr 6:3, 23:13 state that Moses was the son of Amram, a Levite.

(4) Ex. 6:20 and Num. 26:59 (P) state that Moses was the son of Amram and Jochebed, both of whom were Levites.

(5) I Sam. 2:21–22 which reads “house of your fathers” equals the house of Levi.

(6) Egyptian names in Levite genealogies (I Chr. 6:22, 23, 37; Jer. 20:1, 21:1, 38:1; Ex. 2:38, 8:33; Ju. 20:28, I Sam. 1:3, 2:27), e.g., Assir, Pashur, Merari, Phinehas, and Hophni. The Levites alone possess the Egyptian names.<sup>71</sup>

Meek also maintains that Asher, Dan, Naphtali, Issachar, and Zebulun are all more native than Hebrew and only became Hebrew as they were later drawn into the Hebrew confederacy by the common peril and menace of Sisera in the time of Judges.<sup>72</sup> He also finds strong suggestions that certain elements of Judah were native to the land of Canaan, e.g., Gn. 38 which states that Judah in patriarchal times separated from his brothers, intermarried with the natives, and settled down there.<sup>73</sup>

According to Noth, it is difficult to identify those tribes which had settled in Egypt since the tribal structure as such was not well-defined until later times.<sup>74</sup> Those who fled from Egypt probably mixed again with other tribal groups. But Noth states that how this happened is not known. They mingled enough to tell to all the others what had happened in

the exodus and desert wanderings so that all in the course of time told and retold the story with a complete identification of themselves, with the result that it became common knowledge to all and a unifying bond.<sup>75</sup>

Noth further maintains that it seems highly probable that it was the Rachel tribes which experienced the exodus from Egypt, but admits that the grounds for this identification are very poor. He discounts all value in the Joseph traditions as being a historical source since the motive of this narrative was not a historical explanation.<sup>76</sup>

Thus in summary it should be noted that the extra-biblical material is inconclusive for identifying and determining the tribal participants of the sojourn and exodus, and the conclusions of the biblical scholars is the same. All the scholars are generally agreed that the concubine tribes were at least partially alien to the Israelites proper. In turn, the following scholars identify the following tribes as those who descended into Egypt and made the exodus:

- (1) Meyer, Schiele, Haupt, and Albright identify the tribes as the Leah tribes.
- (2) Meek identifies the Israelites there as the Levites.
- (3) Wellhausen (followed by Steuernagel, Benzinger, Paton, and Noth) identify them as the Rachel tribes.
- (4) Burney, Rowley, and Albright (with an earlier exodus) identify them with the Joseph tribes plus certain Simeonite and Levite elements.

## CHAPTER I NOTES

1. The date of Abraham is generally accepted as c. 1750 B.C., although this is no longer based on the questionable identification of Amraphel of Gn. 14 with Hammurabi. See Albright, *BASOR* 88 (Dec., 1942) p. 35; *JPOS* I (1942) pp. 68–70.; Meek, *Hebrew Origins*, pp. 14–16. Garstang, however, maintains a date of 2092 B.C. for Abraham's departure from Haran; see Garstang, *Heritage of Solomon*, p. 151.
2. The problem of dating the Israelite exodus and conquest is extremely complex and inconclusive at present. A date of c. 1400 B.C. is demanded by Garstang's dating of the fall of Jericho and the chronology implied in I Kings 6:1. A date within the thirteenth century is demanded by Palestinian archaeology in general and the chronology implied in Exodus 12:40. See Rowley, *From Joseph to Joshua*, for the latest complete discussion of the problems of dating; also see Garstang, *AJSL* 58 (1941) pp. 368–370; Albright, *BASOR* 57 (Feb., 1935) p. 30; and Glueck, *BASOR* 55 (Sept., 1934) p. 3–4.
3. The biblical term *gerîm* means living in a land with certain moral rights, but without any legal rights and claims, i.e., living in the land on sufferance.
4. Wright, *BA* 3 (Sept., 1940) pp. 28–30.
5. Meek, *op. cit.*, pp. 17–32.
6. The Hyksos invasion of Egypt occurred c. 1700 B.C. and lasted until c. 1570 B.C. (15th–17th dynasties). Concerning the ethnic composition of the Hyksos, see Speiser, *AASOR* 13

(1933) pp, 147–151, especially his summary statement, “. . . the Hyksos were composed of several disparate groups. They were not simply Semites, or Hurrians, but definitely a conglomeration of Semites and Hurrians, with an admixture of other strains which defy identification at present” (p. 5). See also Meek, *ibid.*, p. 5 where he maintains that the Hyksos contained a Hittite element; and Albright, *JPOS* 15 (1935) pp. 228–230, where Albright claims that the efforts to show that the non-Semitic Hyksos names were Hurrian are unsuccessful.

7. Meek, *op. cit.*, p. 18.

8. See below, Chapter III, which deals with the Ḫabiru problem.

9. The Wadi Tumilat is a narrow valley about thirty to forty mile long in the eastern part of the Nile delta, connecting the Nile with Lake Timsah. See Wright and Filson, *Westminster Historical Atlas*, p. 150.

10. Albright, *Archaeology of Palestine*, p. 83; and *Stone Age to Christianity*, p. 150.

11. Albright, *Biblical Period*, p. 7. (Reprinted from *The Jews: Their History, Culture, and Religion*, edited by Finkelstein.)

12. See Albright, *JBL* 37 (1918) pp. 138–140, where Albright maintained that there were two exodi: the first was obscure and nowhere indicated in the Hexateuch, but involved the withdrawal into Central Palestine of the Hebrew tribes after the decline of the Hyksos power; and the second was the

exodus some three centuries later under Moses of the Hebrews who had been imported into Egypt as slaves.

13. Albright, *Biblical Period*, *op.cit.*

14. Wright, *BA* 3:1.

15. See Breasted, *Ancient Records of Egypt*, I, p. 281; and Wright and Filson, *op. cit.*, p. 29.

16. This is the same position which is held in general by Noth who rejects the view that the entrance was associated with the Hyksos. He maintains that the Egyptian sojourn was the result of drought and famine among the nomadic Hebrews. See Noth, *Geschichte Israels*, pp. 72 and 98.

17. Rowley, *op. cit.*, pp. 77ff and 117–119. (See also his earlier article in *BJRL* 22 (1938) pp. 243–290.

18. See Rowley, *ibid.*, p. 116, where he states, “Since the carrying of Joseph into Egypt is represented as taking place while some Israelites were in the vicinity of Shechem, this would appear to point to the Amarna age for the background of the Joseph story. That age would provide a more satisfactory background for it than any other age we know.”

19. See Albright, *Stone Age to Christianity*, p. 184, and the following statement made there: “That there was a long Semitic occupation in the northeastern delta before the new empire is certain from Canaanite place names found there in the New Empire, which include Succoth, Baal-zephon, Migdol, Zilu (Sillo), and probably Goshen itself . . . It must be considered as practically certain that the ancestors of part of

Israel, at least, had lived for several centuries in Egypt before migrating to Palestine.”

20. Several older scholars, as Cheyne and Winckler, denied an Egyptian sojourn and identified North Arabic Muşri with the biblical Mişraim; others held that Goshen only extended to the southern Palestine-Egyptian border. See Paton, *JBL* 32 (1913) pp. 25–27.

21. See Wright, *BASOR* 86 (April, 1942) p. 35 where he states: “. . . when, however, we attempt to divide up the tribes into groups, telling just what they did and when, we immediately enter a realm which is largely speculative and for which there is almost no extra Biblical data.”

22. This is now generally accepted as the census taken by David (II Sam. 24) which has been incorrectly placed here. See Meek, *op. cit.*, p. 29.

23. For the statement of Petrie, see Driver, *Exodus*, p. xlv.

24. Skinner, *Genesis*, p. 450.

25. Meek, *op. cit.*, p. 30.

26. The Merneptah stela is of little aid in identifying any of the tribal activities since it refers only to “Israel”; it is though of extreme importance in dating the *terminus as quem* of the conquest.

27. Sethe, “Die Achtungstexte,” *APAW*, 1926, No. 5.

28. Albright, *The Vocalization of Egyptian Syllabic Orthography*, p. 7.
29. See Rowley, *op. cit.*, p. 34, note 2.
30. Posener, *Princes et pays d'Asie et de Nubie*.
31. Posener, *Syria* 18 (1937), p. 191.
32. Albright, *BASOR* 81 (Feb., 1941), p. 19.
33. See Burney, *Israel's Settlement in Canaan*, p. 82, and Rowley, *BJRL* 22, p. 259–260. For those who oppose the identification, see Jack, *The Date of the Exodus*, p. 230, where Jack states, “The identity of <sup>2</sup>*Asaru*, however, with Asher of the Biblical records must be regarded as most uncertain.” See also Dussaud, *Syria* 19 (1938).
34. See Meek, *op. cit.*, pp. 30–31.
35. Rowley, *op. cit.*, and *Joseph to Joshua*, pp. 33–34.
36. *Ibid.*, pp. 67 and 115, respectively.
37. Albright, *BASOR* 63, pp. 27 and 29.
38. Dossin, *Syria* 19 (1938) pp. 111 and 116.
39. Albright, *BASOR* 81 (Feb., 1941), pp. 19–20.
40. See Petrie, *History of Egypt*, Vol. II, pp. 323–325; Meyer, *Israeliten und ihre Nachbarstämme*, pp. 281–282 and *ZAW* 6 (1886). pp. 2–4; and Rowley, *Joseph to Joshua*, pp. 36–37.

The attempt by Dassaud (*Syria* 8 [1927] p. 231; and 21 [1940] p. 172) to identify the name *Ijsipj* from the Egyptian execration text c. 20th century B.C. with Joseph-el has not been readily accepted. See Albright, *JPOS* 8 (1928) p. 249. Even if it were accepted, the chronological problems of placing Joseph in the 20th century B.C. would still remain.

41. Paton, *JBL* 32 (1913) p. 21. It was considered impossible to combine successfully the stay at Kadesh as reported by E (Ex. 15:25b, 4–6; 17:8–16; 18; and Num. 11:16f) with the stay at Sinai as reported by J (Num. 10:33; 11:35; 12:16). It was commonly held that either Exodus 19–Numbers 10 is late and unauthentic, or J and E held different views as to the relation of Kadesh and Sinai, and these have been confused in later composition. See the recent statement of Meek (*op. cit.*, p. 36), “It is impossible to determine exactly what occurred at each site, and it is equally impossible to determine their location.”

42. Paton, *JBL* 32 (1913) pp. 28–30.

43. *Ibid.*, pp. 29–31.

44. Paton obviously read the מִי־שָׁה here (with the ן suspended, indicating an earlier reading) as מִשָּׁה.

45. *Ibid.*, p. 29.

46. *Ibid.*, pp. 31–33. Compare the included statement of Haupt who, in disagreement with Meyer, thought that the flaming bush was due to volcanic phenomena in Sinai. Wellhausen, *Prolegomena*, p. 354 suggested that *sinai* (Sinai)

should be read as *sene* (bush) since according to Dt. 33:2 Yahweh comes from Sinai to Kadesh.

47. It has long been recognized that the biblical tradition contains two accounts of the introduction of Yahwism to the Israelites. The one, Gn. 4:26 (J) declares that Yahweh was known from the beginning; the second, Ex. 3:13–15 (E) and 6:3 (P) assign its introduction to the foundation of Hebrew nationality under Moses. The following factors strongly suggest the hypothesis that Judah, which was associated with the Kenites in the south, adopted the Kenite religion of Yahwism: (1) Cain who had the mark of Yahweh upon him (Gn. 4:15) was the eponymous ancestor of the Kenites (Ju. 4:11); (2) Kenites settled with Judah in the southland (Ju. 1:16); (3) Moses received from Jethro, the Midianite priest, the Kenite Yahwism and introduced it to Israelites of the sojourn (Nu. 10:29 and Ju. 1:16); (4) the extra-biblical reference (presented by Gridsloff, *BEHJ* 1 [1946] pp. 81–82) of an Egyptian text in which the place name *Yhw* is found referring to an area in the neighborhood of Kenite settlements and dating from the time of Rameses II.

48. Examples of such names are (a) Joshua of Ephraim, (b) Joash, the father of Gideon, from Manesseh, (3) Jothan, the son of Gideon, (4) and Abijah, the son of Samuel.

49. Paton, *op. cit.*, pp. 32–33.

50. *Ibid.*, pp. 45–47. It was stated that, aside from the Merneptah stela (if the name Israel there has reference to only the northern tribes), the ‘theories’ of the Egyptian sojourn alone support the position of Meyer and the others mentioned. His

own position was defended in part by (1) the statement in Ju. 1:2 that Judah and Simeon were the first ones to invade Canaan, (2) Gen 34 states that Simeon and Levi attacked Shechem immediately after their arrival in Canaan, and (3) the geographical location of the Leah tribes into two divisions indicates a later intrusion of the Rachel tribes.

51. Burney, *op. cit.*, p. 36.

52. *Ibid.*, p. 47.

53. *Ibid.*, p. 52.

54. *Ibid.*, p. 52.

55. Note Burney's statements (*Ibid.*, 54 and 57) where he argues: "It is highly probable that these tribes were originally regarded as not fully Israelite, *i.e.* as partially (or, it may be, wholly) of alien extraction, and that it was only by degrees that they won their full place in the circle of the tribes. . . at the stage which the legend originated the Bilhah tribes, Dan and Naphtali, dwelt in contiguity to the Joseph tribes upon their southwest, whereas the Zilpah tribes, Asher and Gad, were among the Leah tribes, the one in the north, and the other east of the Jordan."

56. Jack, *op. cit.*; see especially pp. 17 and 234. Because of their descent from handmaids and their alien worship, Jack maintained that the concubine tribes of Asher, Gad, Dan, and Naphtali were "hardly entitled to a position in Israel" until the final settlement of all the tribes, and were thus excluded from any participation in the Egyptian sojourn and exodus. Beyond

this point, Jack makes no attempt to identify the tribes; he considers it impossible. “It is evident we can never know the true relation of the tribes of the Exodus to the twelve tribes afterwards known as Israel, so long as we have no contemporary documents” (p. 17).

57. *i.e.*, the Joseph tribes.

58. Rowley, *BASOR* 85 (Feb., 1942) p. 28. These same general conclusions have not changed in his latest presentation, *From Joseph to Joshua*.

59. Rowley, *Joseph to Joshua*, pp. 105–107.

60. *Ibid.*, p. 123. It should be noted that for Rowley Moses’ presence suggests the presence of Levite elements, and the tradition that Simeon was held a prisoner by Joseph (Gn. 42:24) suggests that Simeonites were amongst the Israelites in Egypt.

61. See note 47 above and note 53 in Chapter II.

62. Rowley, *Joseph to Joshua*, pp. 144–145 and 153. In the latter reference he states in more detail that Yahweh was not a new name, but a new name for the God of Israel (*i.e.* the Joseph tribes). The southern tribes learned of Yahweh by a gradual penetration of the Kenite religion, so that there was no moment of dramatic adoption. Moses learned of Yahweh when he came to the Kenite worshipers who initiated him into the faith (Num. 10:29, Ju. 2:16).

63. *Ibid.*, p. 164.

64. Albright, *BASOR* 58 (April, 1935) pp. 14–16.
65. Albright, *Stone Age to Christianity*, p. 193.
66. Albright, *BASOR* 58 (April, 1935) p. 21.
67. Albright, *Archaeology of Palestine and the Bible*. pp. 143–145.
68. Albright, *JBL* 37 (1918) pp. 138–140. The following statement should be noted, “The circumstances and date of the first exodus are obscure; I do not know of any passage in the Heptateuch which may have any bearing on the problem. . . . More than three centuries after the first ‘exodus’ comes the Mosaic period.” Compare his statement in *BASOR* 58 (April, 1935) p. 15, “That the Joseph tribes returned from Egypt to Palestine much earlier than the group led by Moses has been maintained by the writer since his original statement (although) very antiquated now in method and data.”
69. Meek, *op. cit.*, p. 33.
70. *Ibid.*, p. 31.
71. *Ibid.*, pp. 31–33, and Meek, *AJSL* 56 (1938) pp. 117–120. Compare Waterman, *AJSL* 58 (1941) pp. 49–56 and his concluding statement, “. . . of the six names discussed, three (Assir, Hophni, and Merari) have ample Semitic rootage and formation; one (Pashur) is doubtful, and of the remainder, Moses is very possibly Egyptian and Phineas certainly so. . . . None of these names with the exception of Moses . . . can be shown to have come into Palestine with the original Levites” (p. 56).

72. *Ibid.*, p. 42.

73. Waterman (*AJSL* 55, p. 25) maintains that there were no Israelite-Hebrew clans in the south, and that Judah was a later name for a new fusion of Edomite clans in the district of Judah. He states, "As soon as Judah declared independence under David, everything of Edomite origin . . . could now become Judean, not by antithesis or opposition but by political domination." *Ibid.*, p. 42.

74. Noth, *op. cit.*, p. 104.

75. *Ibid.*

76. *Ibid.*, p. 103.