

CHAPTER II

THE TRIBAL PARTICIPANTS OF THE CONQUEST

In that it is not merely a question of identification, the problem of the tribal participants of the conquest is more complex than the same problem of the exodus. Aside from the concubine tribes which are considered to have contained at least partial alien elements, the Israelite tribes were definitely not an indigenous ethnic group in Palestine. Yet, their ascendance in Canaan to the position of a relatively significant political group by the time of Merneptah and their developing into a nation by the time of David necessitated a conquest of some sort since in their initial entrance they came as *gerîm*. That this conquest involved all the tribes except Levi has not been seriously questioned by any biblical scholar, although the type of conquest has been subject to disagreement.

The nature of the problem here is to determine the tribal participants of the conquest in reference to their role and action and in respect to time and location. The complexity of this problem is multiplied by (1) the inner inconsistencies of the biblical tradition, (2) the demands of archaeology on the chronology of the events, and (3) certain ambiguous relationships and movements of the tribes.¹

The inner inconsistencies of the biblical tradition are centered primarily in the accounts of the conquest as recorded in Joshua (chapters 11 and 12 particularly) and the Book of Judges. According to the tradition of Joshua, Palestine was conquered by the Israelites in several different stages, including:

I. The conquest of Gilead and Bashan. Most of the strip country of the Trans-Jordan was depicted as won under Moses prior to his death. This was in turn promised to the tribes of Reuben, Gad, and half-Manasseh on the condition that they assist their kinsmen in conquering the territory west of the Jordan.²

II. The conquest of south-central Palestine. After crossing the Jordan, Jericho fell shortly after it was attacked. The advance was then to Ai, on the east side of the hill-country, which was captured after an initial repulse. Next came the alliance with Gibeon, Kephirah, Beeroth, Kiriath-jearim, all from the western hill-country. The Amorite alliance of Jerusalem, Hebron, Jarmuth, Lachish, and Eglon against Gibeon drew the Israelites further west to Beth-heron, Azekah, and Makkedah in the lowlands west of the central range.³

III. The conquest of southern Palestine. After the defeat of the Amorite kings, Joshua is depicted as capturing Makkedah, Libnah, Lachish, Gezer, Eglon, Hebron, and Debir.⁴

IV. The conquest of northern Palestine. A northern confederation of kings under Jabin of Hazor, including Achshaph, Madon, Shimron, Dor, and others is depicted as defeating them, claiming victory.⁵

According to the narrative in Ju. 1:1–2:15 the conquest was of a different nature; namely, the conquests of the various districts were represented as the efforts of the individual tribes which, in making their settlements, appear in many cases to have been unable to exterminate or drive out the inhabitants whom they found and were thus forced to settle down side by side with them.

The pertinent elements of this narrative may be summarized as follows. Judah, having enlisted the mutual cooperation of Simeon, conquers Adoni-zedek of Jerusalem and then advances against the Canaanites in the hill-country, Negeb, and Shephelah, attacking Hebron, Debir, Zophath (Hormah), Gaza, Ashkelon, and Ekron. Benjamin, unable to drive out the Jebusites of Jerusalem, settles down with them. Joseph goes up against Bethel and destroys it, but the Joseph tribes of Ephraim and Manasseh are unable to dislodge the Canaanites from Beth-shean, Tannaach, Dor, Ibleam, Megiddo, and Gezer. Likewise, Zebulun does not dislodge the inhabitants of Kitron and Nahalal. Nor does Asher those inhabitants in Acco, Zidon, Ahlab, Achzib, Helbah, Aphik, and Rehod; nor Naphtali those in Beth-Shemesh and Beth-Anath. Dan was forced into the hill-country by the Amorites, and the Amorites in turn became tributary to Joseph,

Another very significant inconsistency in the biblical tradition is the dual account of Num. 21:1–2 and Ju. 1:16–17. According to the former, the Israelites when they left Kadesh-Barnea were attacked by the king of Arad. Thereupon the Israelites vowed to put the enemy cities to the ban. This they did, and in turn called the name of the place Hormah. But, according to the latter account Judah and Simeon attacked Arad, having come from the city of palm trees,⁶ and killed the inhabitants of Zephath and called in consequence the name of the place Hormah.

The archaeological evidence coming from Palestine has created a highly complex problem in reference to the tribal activities during the conquest. Garstang dated the fall of Jericho between 1400 B.C. and the ascension of Akhenaton (c. 1370 B.C.);⁷ but both Albright and Vincent disagreed with this date. Albright states, “The fall of Canaanite Jericho therefore

took place somewhere between *cir.* 1375 and *cir.* 1300 B.C. in all probability.⁸ Vincent set the date for the fall of Jericho between 1250 and 1200 B.C.⁹ This latter date given by Vincent, as will be seen, harmonizes much more closely with the dates of the fall of other Palestinian sites. However, Wright has maintained that the final blow to Vincent's date has been given.¹⁰

The evidence from the other Palestinian sites would indicate that they fell within the late thirteenth century B.C. Albright dates the fall of Lachish into Israelite hands as 1231 B.C.¹¹ and Vincent dates it similarly by placing the date after 1250 B.C.¹² Debir is likewise dated in the same period of the thirteenth century,¹³ and Bethel is also assigned a destruction sometime within the thirteenth century B.C.¹⁴

The problem of dating the fall of Ai is quite different. It is certain that this site was in ruins between 2000 to 1200 B.C., and was thus not inhabited at any time during this interval. Albright's suggestion that there was a confusion between Ai and the neighboring town of Bethel is commonly accepted as the reason for its being included in Jos 8:28 as one of the towns conquered by Joshua.¹⁵

The exploration of Glueck in the Negeb and Trans-Jordan have far reaching implications on the historical value and interpretation of biblical accounts of the tribal activities in these areas. The results of his work have only further validated his conclusion of 1934, namely,

Had the exodus through southern Palestine taken place before the thirteenth century B.C. the Israelites would have found neither Edomites or Moabites who could have given or withheld permission to traverse their territories.¹⁶

The third area of difficulty which surrounds the role of the tribal participants includes a series of diverse elements within the biblical traditions, namely, (1) the activity and role of those tribes which did not go to Egypt in reference to how and when they acquired their lands of permanent residence, (2) the transition in the tribe of Levi from a secular tribe which was cursed after the Shechem incident into a tribe invested with priestly functions of Yahwism, and (3) the uncertainty of the experiences at Kadesh and Sinai.

The biblical scholars of the past fifty years, assuming that any tentative solution would of necessity have to discard some material as unhistorical, have been concerned with determining the primary tradition and harmonizing the material as it stands.

Paton,¹⁷ who followed the majority of the older scholars (including Wellhausen, Meyer, Stade, and Kuenen) maintained that a sharp contradiction existed between Judges 1 and the Book of Joshua. Through a process of source analysis he sought to determine the historical value of the respective narratives and thereby ascertain the actual historical events and participants. His conclusion was the same as that of his earlier colleagues, namely, that the Judges account was more reliable than that of Joshua. Underlying this conclusion were the following three factors:

(1) The other histories of the Bible (II Sam 24:7; I Kings 9:20–21; Ju. 3:1–6) were in agreement with Judges 1 that the Canaanites were not exterminated or driven out of the land, but continued to live with the Israelites.

(2) Nowhere else in biblical tradition is the tribal union as claimed in Joshua mentioned. According to the Song of Deborah voluntary assistance came only from the northern

tribes of Ephraim, Benjamin, Machir, Zebulun, Issachar, and Naphtali. Reuben, Gilead, Dan, and Asher will not come; and Judah, Simeon, and Levi are not invited. Throughout Judges, except for what was considered as editorial passages, the judges were only tribal leaders, and the tribes are often at war with each other (Ju. 3:27, 6:34–35, 8:1, 9:6, and elsewhere).

(3) The strongholds reportedly captured by Joshua in D and P in the Book of Joshua were not captured until later according to other sources, *e.g.*, Jerusalem was not captured until the time of David (II Sam. 5:6–9, Ju. 19:2), Gezer was not captured until the time of Solomon (I Kings 9:16, Ju. 1:29), Beth-shan remained in Philistine hands until the time of David (I Sam 31:10, Ju. 1:27), and Tanaach and Megiddo were in Canaanite hands until the time of Deborah (Ju. 5:19).¹⁸

In summary Paton states:

There is general agreement that Ju. 1 and the identical verses in Josh. 15–17 contain the earliest form of J's account of the conquest, and that the J section in Josh. 1–11 which represent the tribes as united under the command of Joshua form a secondary status in the J document that approximates the standpoint of D. These sections show a more legendary embellishment than is found in J's narrative in numbers of conquest east of the Jordan, and it is probable, therefore, that they are of a later origin.¹⁹

Paton also maintained that Num. 21:1–2 was not in its correct context but was evidently the continuation of J's account of that defeat at Hormah in Num. 14:45. The parallel narrative of this in Ju. 1:16–17 was assigned by Wellhausen, Kittel, and others as the more historical tradition; but Paton

identifies himself with Meyer, Steuernagel, and Kuenen who prefer to accept the accounts in Numbers as more historical.²⁰

Paton's final conclusion was that the Leah tribes were at Kadesh and advanced northwards while the Rachel tribes were at Sinai and advanced from the east Jordan.²¹ After the foundation of the monarchy when the two groups were united, the accounts of the two conquests were combined into a single account, and the various positions that Kadesh occupies in the tradition were due to the various attempts to combine the distinct cycles of tradition which dealt with Kadesh and Sinai.²²

Burney argued for the validity of the Judges' account of the conquest, as opposed to Joshua's account, since it first depicts the conquest as gradual and partial and since R^D in Joshua could readily be accounted for as the interpretation of the conditions of the conquest from a later time (i.e., the period of the Davidic reign onward).²³ Burney similarly dismisses the P narratives of Joshua (13:15–21:42), which regard Joshua as settling by lot the districts to be occupied by the tribes, since it presumes the whole of Palestine, with the exception of the Maritime Plain, to have been under the control of the Israelites. Although this document is "of immense value for topographical information . . . it does not represent the historical course of events."²⁴

Burney also held that there were two distinct movements of conquests which came from two different tribal elements at different times. The conquest of Arad as stated in Num. 21:1–3 is assumed to be more correct than its parallel in Ju. 1:16–17. The tribal groups mentioned in the Judges account are believed by Burney to be that group which participated in the northward thrust in the Negeb; namely, Judah and Simeon in alliance with the Kenites.²⁵ From this Burney inferred that

those clans which formed the tribe of Judah (North Arabian Kenites, Calebites, and Jerahmeelites) advanced northward from Kadesh-Barnea and, along with part of Simeon, conquered Arad and settled in the Negeb, after which they advanced further north into the hill-country of Judah.

The second half of the conquest according to Burney was the westward movement across the Jordan of the Joseph tribes which had been in Egypt under the leadership of Joshua. In light of the following factors this was the only valid conclusion for Burney. First, the only tribes mentioned in the old J narrative, Judges 1, which are involved in any conquest are the central tribes of Joseph which attacked Bethel, *etc.* Second, Judges 1 depicts the Joseph tribes as making an independent attack upon the hill-country, "to which they go up, *i.e.*, presumably from the Jordan valley after the passage of the river."²⁶ Third, the Simeonite and Levite groups which had been with Joseph in Egypt left him when he turned east around Edom to enter Canaan from the east Jordan.²⁷

As for the other Leah tribes, Burney maintained that Reuben was originally settled in east Jordan in southern Gilead, but evidently attempted to settle in west Jordan.²⁸ Zebulun and Issachar are placed in the southwest central hill-country since Ju. 12:11–12 states that Elon the Zebulunite was buried in Ajalon in the land of Zebulun and this is identified with the Vale of Ajalon. These last two tribes later moved northward and occupied territory which was entirely inland from the sea (contrary to Gn. 49:13 and Dt. 33:18–19).²⁹

The position of Burney, as indicated above, is generally accepted by Jack, although his conclusions are not as emphatically nor definitely stated. According to the remaining fragments of J in Joshua and the accounts in Judges, Jack

stated that Judah, Simeon, and probably Levi—with some of the nomadic groups of the Sinai peninsula (Kenites, Calebites, *etc.*) which ultimately became a part of Judah—made a gradual conquest of the southern hill-country and Negeb, but were unable to settle the western Maritime Plain and Jerusalem.³⁰ The Joseph tribes established themselves on the central ridge at Bethel but were shut off from the southwest plains by Canaanite strongholds. These tribes were settled south of the Canaanite cities of Dor, Ibleam, Megiddo, Tanaach, *etc.*³¹ Dan and Naphtali, who had taken up their positions in the Shephelah and Asher and Gad, were ousted and compelled to move northward and lived north of this same belt of Canaanite cities.

The movement of the northern tribes led by Joshua was directed from the east across the hill-country and was confined to the north and the west. The distinct movement of the southern tribes was a northward thrust confined to the southern plains and Negeb. It was the northern confederacy of Joshua which issued into what became the nation of Israel. The northern group had been in contact with the southern group at Kadesh-Barnea where they “certainly mingled with each other . . . under the leadership of Moses and had a common bond as Hebrews and worshipers of Yahweh.”³² After their arrival in Canaan the northern group evidently joined hands with the Israelites who had been in Canaan all along.³³

In opposition to the general consensus among earlier biblical scholars, Wright has denied that a contradiction exists between Joshua 10 and Judges 1 since such a distinction is an oversimplification of the whole import of Joshua on the one hand and the reliability of Judges 1 on the other.³⁴ Thus, according to Wright, the Deuteronomic editor of Joshua was

guilty of over schematizing his material, but he did not deliberately falsify his picture of the conquest. The account in Judges is at best a collection of miscellaneous fragments of varying dates and reliability within the general period of the Judges and not a unified document.

By thus identifying the accounts in Joshua as the primary source of information, Wright reconstructs the tribal activity as follows. After a year spent at Mount Sinai, Israel made a journey through the wilderness of Paran until they arrived at Kadesh-Barnea where they remained until the advent of a new and more optimistic generation. The movement from Kadesh-Barnea north through the Trans-Jordan was frustrated by Edom and Moab, and Moses was forced to lead the group northward into the Arabah. After crossing the river Arnon, the kingdom of Sihon was defeated. At this point, Joshua assumed command of the tribes and moved westward into Canaan. The area of central Palestine where the Joseph tribes were located probably did not need to be conquered since it was possible that either friends or relatives of the Israelites were already settled there and all Joshua needed to do was to make a covenant with them.³⁵ The southern and northern campaigns followed in turn as recorded in Joshua 10.

At the conclusion of the conquest the territory was parceled out among the eleven tribes, with the tribe of Levi being distributed among the others since it was to attend to religious matters. Reuben and Gad were settled in the territory of Sihon, and Reuben was later (in the ninth century B.C.) overcome by Moab which had been a continuous threat along with Ammon. Half-Manasseh occupied the kingdom of Og. The settlement of the tribes in Western Palestine, according to Wright, is accurately recorded in the documentary lists of Joshua 15 and 19,³⁶

Wright's general conclusion was that the campaigns against the Canaanite royal cities attributed to Joshua are historically accurate, and that after Joshua's death there was a long period of struggle for possession. This is verified for Wright by the archaeological finds at Bethel which had a major destruction during the middle of the thirteenth century and three additional destructions within the next two centuries.³⁷

According to Meek, the foreshortened account of the conquest in Joshua is highly inaccurate since the settlement must have been a gradual infiltration of the Hebrews into the country in small groups or clans. Meek holds that there were two distinct settlements in Palestine by the Israelites, both in reference to time and participants.³⁸ In light of the archaeological evidence of Jericho, Hazor, Shechem, and Bethel (all of which were destroyed at an earlier time than the cities in the south) Meek affirms that the first Hebrew conquest was in the north c. 1400 B.C. and the participants were the Joseph tribes, Gilead, Gad, Benjamin, and later Reuben. These tribes were organized into a confederacy or amphictyony under the leadership of Joshua at Shechem. It was probably just the Joseph tribes at first, but the common cause and enemy led other groups to unite with them. Of this group, Meek states:

The Israelites are to be identified with the Ḥabiru, they came down from the north and made their first conquest east of the Jordan a little before 1400 B.C.; they captured Jericho c. 1400 B.C. or slightly later, and then gradually extended their conquests into the highlands of Ephraim, capturing Bethel in the west c. 1300, or slightly later, from which reign they descended gradually into the borders of the coastal plain.³⁹

While this section of the Israelites were making their home in the north, a mass of migrating hordes, which had been displaced in the midst of the *Habiru* activity, sought territory in the west. An attempt at a southern conquest had been thwarted, and the group was driven back and forced to make a circuit southward where they either mingled with the Kenites, Calebites, *etc.* or pushed their way into Egypt where they were permitted to enter the Wadi Tumilat.⁴⁰

There in Egypt, this latter group consisting of Judah, Simeon, Levi, and Reuben grew and prospered under a benevolent government until the time of Rameses II, at which time they were subjugated to a status of serfdom. Then, in the reign of Seti II (c. 1215 B.C.) this group was led out of Egypt by Moses. They returned thus via Yam Suph to the desert and mingled with their kinsmen whom they had left behind in the Negeb. Here a confederate code was instituted by Moses which united the tribes and served as the stimulus in their gradual push to the north from Kadesh to Beersheba and Hebron, and even further north until they finally controlled most of the land south of Jerusalem between the Dead Sea and Philistia.⁴¹ This southern group was only later called Judah (named after the strongest tribe of the group) even though it was an amalgamation of Simeonites, Levites, Reubenites,⁴² Kenites, and Calebites.

The tribes of the far north including Asher, Dan, Naphtali, Issachar, and Zebulun were all considered to be more native than Hebrew. They became Hebrew only as they were drawn into the confederacy by a common peril beginning about the time of Deborah with the menace of Sisera.

It is important to note that Meek, in contradiction to the biblical tradition, makes Joshua antedate Moses:

He is so inextricably connected with Jericho that we have to disassociate him from Moses, and again we

would account for the disorder in the Old Testament narratives by the fusion of two different sagas of several groups that eventually coalesced to make the Hebrew people.⁴³

The conclusions which Albright drew concerning the tribal participants of the conquest are similar to those of Meek for Albright considers there to have been three dominant groups participating in the settlement of Palestine; namely, the Joseph tribes, the Leah tribes, and the concubine tribes. Albright, in following the method of Alt⁴⁴ and the evidence of archaeology, maintains the Israelites first settled in the wooded hill-country of East-West Manasseh and Ephraim.

Both from the results of archaeological surveys and from the early records we know that the Canaanite occupation was heavily centered in the low hill-country and plains of West Palestine, and that much of the higher hill-country of both East and West Palestine was not occupied at all by a sedentary population until the beginning of the Iron Age in the twelfth century B.C. It was therefore in these regions where the Hebrews first settled down late in patriarchal times and where they were first joined by the Israelites proper in the thirteenth century.⁴⁵

And Albright further notes that this area is not mentioned in the Egyptian records, nor the Amarna tablets, nor Joshua's campaigns in the Book of Joshua, nor in the independent Israelite traditions of Genesis, Judges, chronicles, and Jubilees of Joshua's conquests.⁴⁶

It was this territory that the Joseph tribes settled after their early exodus from Egypt in the reign of Amenophis III (between 1415 and 1380 B.C.). Albright admits that there is

no evidence from Tell Beit Mirsim or elsewhere that the Joseph tribes settled down in towns until the second half of the thirteenth century, *i.e.*, prior to the settlement of the other Israelites in the Shephelah—at which time there is abundant evidence that the Israelites proceeded immediately to destroy and occupy Canaanite towns.⁴⁷

Albright accepts the basic historical value of the wilderness wanderings since there has been discovered nothing to throw doubt upon them; and from this acceptance he projects the following reconstruction of the tribal activity and participants. Early in the reign of Rameses II the Leah tribes were led out of Egypt by Moses; and after a wandering experience of a generation the group conquered Sihon's territory, at which time the wandering experience came to an end. At this juncture came the confederation of Israelite tribes led by Moses with the other kindred pre-Hebrew tribes of Joseph and the remotely related concubine tribes.⁴⁸ This new Israelite confederation was then led by Joshua over a group of Canaanite city-states in Galilee.

Albright differs with Meek on two important points. First, Albright maintains that Judah came north with the Leah tribes and Moses, and they entered the land from the east and the north, whereas southern Judah was settled by Calebites and Kenites who were not related to Judah but were only amalgamated with the tribes. Second, Albright separates Joshua from Jericho rather than placing Joshua before Moses as Meek does.

Rowley's complete interpretation of the historical events in the period of Israelite settlement is dependent upon the equation of the age of Jacob with the Amarna age, and in turn the Amarna age is equated with the period of Israelite settlement.⁴⁹ The reference to Ḫabiru activity in northern, southern,

and central Palestine around Shechem is considered by Rowley to reflect the Israelite conquest.

In this manner he identifies the southern thrust in the Amarna age with the Israelite attack from Kadesh-Barnea. The tribes represented in this attack included Judah, Simeon, Levi, Reuben and other related tribes of the Kenites and Calebites.⁵⁰ According to Rowley, Simeon and Levi pressed further north than the other tribes did, and they finally reached Shechem but were unable to hold the city.⁵¹ In consequence they were unable to secure any permanent settlement, and eventually a portion of these tribes migrated to Egypt and joined the Joseph tribes which were living there. Reuben also moved northward up the western side of the Jordan and finally obtained a foothold east of the Dead Sea.

The simultaneous SA-GAZ activity in the north was equated by Rowley with the settlement and conquests of Dan, Asher, and Zebulun. It was in the later part of this age that Joseph was carried into Egypt and there joined by elements of Simeon and Levi which had not fallen back and had not been absorbed into the tribe of Judah. While in Egypt, the Simeonites became absorbed into Joseph and lost their identity, but the Levites retained their tribal distinctiveness and made the exodus out of Egypt along with the Joseph tribes under Moses. This group which was led by Moses was in turn led by Joshua into central Palestine c. 1230 B.C..⁵²

Rowley makes no apparent attempt to indicate how these tribes came together aside from stating that all the tribes were of kindred stock, and that those who went to Egypt came back and settled in their midst about a century and a half later. It was not until the time of David and Solomon that these kindred tribes were united, and this union grew out of their common worship of Yahweh.⁵³

Noth approached this problem of the tribal participants of the conquest and settlement by employing his own threefold approach which invested little authority and value in the archaeological method.⁵⁴ This method led him to this general conclusion: “the individual traditions from the time of the conquest in the Old Testament are in general either heroic sagas or aetiological traditions.”⁵⁵

In particular, Noth maintained that the tribes entered those parts of the land which were thinly settled during the Bronze Age, namely, the highlands of central East-Jordan and the mountainous areas of West-Jordan. Because of their settlement in such areas, he holds that there were no great battles in which the tribes conquered their territories. Rather they came in as individual tribes in a peaceful and quiet manner and settled only gradually a little at a time.⁵⁶

Noth indicates the following to have been the experience of the individual tribes.⁵⁷ Reuben seems to have settled in the West Jordan near Judah but was later forced out by Judah and took up its position in Trans-Jordan. Simeon did not come out of the Negeb but moved to its position in the southern tip of Judah from central Palestine. Evidence from the Shechem incident would indicate that it was forced out of its original position along with Levi in the same manner as Reuben was, but the tribe which displaced these two was that of Joseph. The place of settlement of Levi has been completely lost. The settlement of Judah was from the east since it apparently entered the land along with the earlier tribes and since its entrance from either north or south was blocked by strong Canaanite cities.

The tribe of Joseph including Ephraim and Manasseh undoubtedly came in from the east or southeast Trans-Jordan as two separate tribes. They were probably not admitted to the

amphictyony until the tribe of Levi was counted out. They settled slightly north of Benjamin at the Ephraim mountains. The Galilean tribes were the most difficult to account for in reference to their settlement. Zebulun and Issachar apparently came over the Jordan with Judah, Reuben, Simeon, and Levi. Among the Galilean tribes were the ones closest to the central West-Jordan hill-country. Issachar evidently gave itself to the Canaanites as servants in order to be able to settle in the territory of Sunem. Zebulun and Asher apparently served the Canaanites in a similar manner along the coastal area although they themselves did not settle on the coast. Dan was in service to Sidon and worked in the harbors of the Sidonites. The only Galilean tribe which was able to remain independent was Naphtali which was content with her own territory even though it was the least desirable.

Noth assigns the beginning of the Israelite settlement in the second half of the fourteenth century B.C. and sets its terminus ad quem at 1100 B.C..⁵⁸

Kaufmann in his recent study on the conquest of Canaan⁵⁹ has approached the problem in a distinct manner. Accepting the basic historicity of the conquests narratives in Joshua and Judges, he rejects the idea that there are “inconsistencies” in the narrative since the higher critics who have claimed the presence of such have failed to accept and understand the unreal utopian conception of the land of Israel in these sources and the Pentateuch. For Kaufmann, this unreal utopian conception of the land cannot be explained by the “real ethnic settlement of tribes or by the real political development of the Kingdom of Israel.”⁶⁰ Instead, it can only be understood in the context of five different conceptions of the land of Israel which corresponds to the changes in the historical situation; namely, (1) the land of Canaan, or the

land of the patriarchs, (2) Moses' land of Israel, (3) Joshua's land of Israel, (4) the land of the real Israelite settlement, and (5) the Kingdom of Israel.⁶¹

Kaufmann also points out that Joshua 23 contains the first reference to the idea of "the remaining peoples." It is at this point that the conquest becomes problematical and conditional, with the strong possibility that such a conquest may not be realized. Accordingly, Ju. 2:11–3:6 indicate the hope for a complete conquest is entirely abandoned.

Kaufmann defines the wars of Joshua as wars of destruction and extermination as opposed to wars of occupation by immediate settlement. Joshua did not leave garrison behind in the cities which he had destroyed, but returned all his forces to one place. Nor did he distribute by lot the territory before the major portion of the fighting was over. The consequences of this action, Kaufmann notes as follows:

Here we merely note that the natural consequences of such wars was that the Canaanite survivors fortified themselves in various places as best they could. Hence the tribes had to continue to fight when they started to settling in their portions. In such a situation a war by tribes was the inevitable second stage.⁶²

On this basis Kaufman maintains that Ju. 1 is the perfect continuation of the Joshua narratives. This same conclusion seems to be made evident by the following facts as well. First, the Canaanites disappear as a force after Judges 5. Second, the Israelites did not take over the military art of the Canaanites. Third, the Israelites did not adopt the political organization of the city-state after the Canaanites but maintained the tribal system. And fourth, in the area of Israelite settlement there were no Canaanite communities which exerted an idolatrous influence.

All these facts add up to a single monumental testimony that the Canaanite factor *had been liquidated* in the real land of Israel as early as the beginning of the period of Judges. At *no stage* was the conquest of the land a process of peaceful settlement. It did not produce a national or cultural *intermingling*. The Canaanite element was *defeated and driven out*. This was possible only by *great national wars*. Herein is a decisive proof of the truthfulness of the narrative in the Book of Joshua.⁶³

Thus, Kaufmann accepts as recorded the accounts of Joshua's conquest but with two exceptions. And these exceptions include the aetiological accounts about Gilgal (Josh. 4:2–24; 5:2–9) and the admitted legendary stamp which is the essence of the stories.⁶⁴ In like manner he accepts the accounts of the tribes and the tribal activity in Judges 1 and subsequent chapters.

In summary the following general conclusions in reference to the time, activity, and location of the tribal participants of the conquest should be noted. With the one exception of Jericho, and perhaps Bethel, the archaeological investigations in the Negeb, Trans-Jordan, and Canaan testify to a date about 1300 B.C. or a little earlier for the main era of conquest and destruction. Jericho has been dated variously between 1400 B.C. and 1200 B.C. and the heavy erosion which has occurred at this site in recent years has made the solution of this problem more remote than ever.

The activity of the tribal participants has been interpreted in several distinct ways. Wellhausen, Meyer, Stade, Paton, Burney, Jack, Albright, Rowley, and Meek have invested more historical accuracy in the accounts of Judges than

Joshua, and thereby make the tribes the primary units of conquest in the territory of each. Noth has denied the essential historicity of both accounts and considers the conquest to have been a slow and gradual infiltration of nomadic groups. Both Wright and Kaufmann maintained that the Joshua account is historically accurate and that Judges narrates the continued wars of settlement.

In reference to the location of the tribal movements, the following have maintained that all or part of the Leah tribes made a northward movement from Kadesh: Paton, Burney, Jack, Meek, and Rowley. Likewise, the following have maintained that the Rachel and Joseph tribes made a westward movement across the Jordan: Paton, Burney, Jack, Meek, Rowley, and Albright. And it has been maintained by Albright that the Leah tribes also made their approach from the Trans-Jordan.

CHAPTER II NOTES

1. The Israelite tribal structure which underlies the sequence of historical events has been dealt with by Noth in his *Das System der Zwölf Stämme Israels*. Therein he states (pp. 28–30) that the arising of the twelve tribe system can only be correctly understood from a time when the tribes claimed interest for themselves as they historically formed individual and separate groups. The *terminus ad quo* cannot be determined by the Old Testament record although the *terminus ad quem* is the Davidic formation of the nation. See also his statement (*op. cit.*, p. 25) that at no one time were all the tribes (either as recorded by Genesis. 49, in which Levi is

included, or Numbers 26, in which Levi is not included) in existence together.

2. Joshua 1 and 2.

3. Joshua 3:1–10:27.

4. Joshua 10:28–43.

5. Joshua 11. For a summary statement, see Joshua 10:40–41 and 11:16–17.

6. See Rowley, *Joseph to Joshua*, p. 101. “The city of palm-tree is commonly understood to be Jericho.”

7. Garstang, *Joshua-Judges*, p. 146; *PEFQS* 1936, p. 170. See also his earlier statement in ; *PEFQS* 1930, p. 132, that the fall was “in round figures about 1400 B.C.”

8. Albright *BASOR* 74 (April, 1939), p. 20.

9. Vincent, *RB* 39 (1930) pp. 403–433; *PEFQS* 1931, pp. 104–106.

10. “If there is anything certain in Palestinian archaeology, it is that the painted pottery from the ‘Middle Building’ is earlier than the thirteenth century. . . . The chronology of this type of painting . . . does not antedate the fourteenth century. At Jericho this sort of thing is entirely absent, and the final destruction of the Late Bronze city *must*, therefore, be earlier than the thirteenth century.” Wright, *BASOR* 87 (April, 1942), pp. 33–34.

11. Albright, *Stone Age to Christianity*, p. 194.
12. Vincent, *RB* 48 (1939), p. 419.
13. Albright, *AASOR* 17 (1938) pp. 71 and 78–79, and *Archaeology and the Bible*, Chapter 2.
14. Albright *BASOR* 74, p. 17 and *Stone Age to Christianity*, p. 212.
15. Albright, *BASOR* 56 (Dec., 1934) p. 11; and 74, pp. 16–17. Noth, *Joshua*, pp. 23–25, where he maintains that archaeological evidence proves that the account of Ai in Joshua 7–8 is completely aetiological and legendary. Ai belonged to Benjamin and Bethel to Ephraim.
16. Glueck, *BASOR* 55 (1934) p. 16. Note also his latest statements, *BASOR* 138 (Apr. 1955) pp. 7–30. He states in part, “. . . history of the occupation there (Negeb) paralleled that of the Trans-Jordan more closely than Palestine proper north of the Beersheba area . . . we proved furthermore that during the following MB II and in most of Trans-Jordan during the whole of LB I and LB II periods there was a sharp decline, if not an almost complete lack of strong authority to keep Bedouin in check and enable agriculture and trade to be carried on” (p. 30).
17. Paton, *op. cit.*, pp. 7–24.
18. For each of these strongholds see Josh, 12:10, 12, 21, and 21:25, respectively.
19. Paton, *op. cit.*, p. 8.

20. He states the basis of this conclusion as “the writer of the main stock of J harmonized the tradition of the southern tribes with that of the northern tribes by bringing all the tribes first to Kadesh and then around Edom (Num. 20:13–21) to invade the land from the east. He still preserved the memory, however, that the tribes has conquered their territories independently.”

21. *Ibid.*, p. 14.

22. *Ibid.*, p. 24.

23. Burney, *op. cit.*, p. 25. Compare Moore, *Judges* p. 8, “All the we know of the history of Israel in Canaan in the succeeding centuries confirms the representation of Judges that the subjugation of the land by the tribes was gradual and partial.”

24. Burney, *op. cit.*, p. 26.

25. *Ibid.*, pp. 29–31.

26. *Ibid.*, p. 35.

27. *Ibid.*, pp. 48–50.

28. The Blessing of Jacob when “divested of its symbolism and interpreted in inter-tribal relations seems to picture some sort of aggression upon the right of the Bilhah clan.” *Ibid.*, p. 51.

29. *Ibid.*, p. 53. See Chapter I, p. 12 and note 55 for Burney’s position on the concubine tribes.

30. Jack, *op. cit.*, pp. 72–73, 149.
31. *Ibid.*
32. *Ibid.*, p. 151.
33. *i.e.*, those tribes so identified by Burney (above pp. 11–12) and implied in the accounts of Jacob at Hebron and Simeon and Levi at Shechem. Jack identifies the covenant made at Mount Ebal (Deuteronomy 27 and Joshua 8) with the joining of the Shechemite Israelites to the Joshua community, at which time they accepted Yahwism.
34. Wright, *BA* 3 (1940) pp. 25–26, and *JNES* 5 (1946), pp. 105–114.
35. Wright completely disassociated the conquest of Jericho from Joshua. “It is probable that the author (*i.e.*, D of Joshua) again relying on an old tradition was wrong in ascribing the capture of Jericho to Joshua.” (*JNES* 5 [1946], p. 114). Note also Wright and Filson, *op. cit.*, p. 40, “Jericho fell not to Joshua but to relatives of Israel, perhaps from the Shechem area during the disturbances of the fourteenth century.”
36. These documentary lists are dated by Wright before 900 B.C. since Shechem was destroyed shortly after 900 B.C. and not occupied again for four centuries. See Wright and Filson, *op. cit.*, p. 43.
37. Wright, *JNES* 5 (1946), p. 111.
38. Meek, *op. cit.*, pp. 22–25.

39. Meek, *BASOR* 61 (Feb., 1946) p. 19. See also *Hebrew Origins*, p. 25, where he asserts—after identifying the ^c*Apiru* with *Habiru* and ^c*Ibrîm*—that the Hebrews were in Palestine as early as Amenophis II if the statement is correct that he captured 3,600 ^c*Apiru* on his second campaign since it was the northern limit of his campaign (northern Palestine or Southern Syria) that he captured them.

40. For Meek (*Hebrew Origins*, p. 28) the attempt at a southern campaign is reflected in Num. 14:39–45 and Dt 1:41–44. These events must have occurred before the exodus since the account “does not seem to have much point there and could well have occurred earlier.”

41. This reconstruction of the history of the southern tribes is verified for Meek by the excavations of Glueck in the Negeb, Albright at Tel Beit Mirsim, and Sellers at Beth-Zur since all indicate a Hebrew occupation c. 1200 B.C. He also finds evidence for it in the following accounts of preparation for a southern invasion: Num. 21:1–3; Josh. 15:14–19; and Ju. 1:1–21. See also *Hebrew Origins* pp. 39–41.

42. Since the earliest traditions of Gn. 35:22, 49:3–4; Num. 16; and Ju. 5:15–16 speak of Reuben’s arrogance, lack of cooperation, and dissension, Meek maintains that Reuben was undoubtedly expelled from the southern group and moved northward around Edom and through Moab to settle northeast of the Dead Sea. (See *Hebrew Origins*, p. 42.)

43. *Ibid.*, p. 35. In like manner he accounts for all the inconsistencies in the biblical tradition: “the nationalized form has dove-tailed the two conquests into each other as the work of

a single people, resulting naturally in a good deal of confusion and inconsistent” (*Ibid.*, p. 45).

44. See Alt, *Die Landnahme der Isreliten in Palestina*, and Albright, *BASOR* 58, pp. 14–15. Alt’s system is a combination of physical and historical geography with social and political history.

45. Albright, *Stone Age to Christianity*, p. 211.

46. Albright, *BASOR* 58, p. 14.

47. This would seem to be verified for Albright by Glueck’s excavations in Trans-Jordan.

48. Albright, *BASOR* 58, p. 17 and *Stone Age to Christianity*, p. 212.

49. Rowley, *Joseph to Joshua*, pp. 110–112.

50. *Ibid.*, p. 112.

51. It is this reference to Shechem that dates the Amarna age as the time of Jacob. Concerning the role of Shechem in the early history of Israel, Rowley states, “we may then with some probability find evidence of temporary Hebrew dominance in Shechem in the Amarna age, followed by a Hebrew withdrawal, and a reversion of the city to Canaanite control until after the time of Joshua.” *Ibid.*, p. 128. Compare also Meek, *Hebrew Origins*, pp. 122–124, where he suggests that Gn. 34 has nothing to do with Simeon and Levi.

52. Rowley, *ibid.*, pp. 123 and 141–142.

54 THE TRIBAL PARTICIPANTS OF THE CONQUEST

53. Rowley holds that the southern tribes adopted their faith in Yahweh out of their association with the Yahweh-worshipping Kenites. The Joseph tribes came to accept Yahwism through Moses who came under the influence of Jethro. The other tribes received it in undetermined ways.

54. This method included *Gattungsgeschichte*, aetiological explanations, and recognizing the tenacity of names and stories to particular sites. Compare Albright, *BASOR* 74, pp. 12–14 for a critique of this approach. Note also Noth, *Das Buch Josua*.

55. Noth, *PJB* 34 (1938), p. 10.

56. Noth cites the example of half nomads who came into the area during the various seasons and remained in the land without ever returning to their previous place of settlement. See *Geschichte Israels*, p. 59.

57. Noth, *Ibid.*, pp. 60–68.

58. *Ibid.*, p. 70.

59. Kaufmann, *The Biblical Account of the Conquest of Palestine*.

60. *Ibid.*, p. 47.

61. *Ibid.*, 48–55. Here he defines these territories as follows: (1) the land of Canaan was that territory destined for Israel in the Pentateuch (Genesis 12 to Numbers 26) and had its borders the Jordan on the east, the sea on the west, the Wadi of Egypt or the desert on the south, and the Euphrates

or Gateway to Hamath on the north; (2) Moses' land of Israel reflected in Num. 21:21–35; 32; and Dt. 2–3 consisted of Canaan and the Trans-Jordanian territories which had not been promised to Israel but which were captured by the tribes prior to the conquest of Canaan proper; (3) Joshua's land of Israel was a dynamic territorial unit, the boundaries of which were only temporary. It was made up of three countries: one conquered and allotted (Baal Gad to Negeb), a second was allotted but not conquered (the coastal strip, Emeq, Jerusalem, portion of Dan, *etc.*), a third neither allotted or conquered (Baal Gad to Gateway of Hamath); (4) the real land of Israel was that territory in which the tribes were located at the end of the Judges' period (marked by the expression of Ju. 20:1, "from Dan to Beersheba"); (5) the Israelite empire came with the establishment of the Davidic kingdom and it included the real land of Israel as its nucleus and surrounding non-ethnic territories as imperialistic provinces.

62. *Ibid.*, p. 86.

63. *Ibid.*, p. 91.

64. *Ibid.*, p. 74. "The legendary element is the essence of these stories, expressing as it does the idea which gives them their life and form. . . . (*i.e.*) that the conquest of the land is a miraculous sign."