

**THE TRIBAL PARTICIPANTS OF  
THE EXODUS AND CONQUEST**

**A THESIS  
IN ORIENTAL STUDIES  
PRESENTED TO  
THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL  
OF THE  
UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA**

**IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT  
OF THE REQUIREMENTS  
FOR THE DEGREE OF  
MASTER OF ARTS**

**BY  
THOMAS FRANCIS MCDANIEL**

**1956**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface .....	ii
Abbreviations .....	iii
Chapter:	
I. The Tribal Participants of the Exodus .....	1
II. The Tribal Participants of the Conquest .....	28
III. The Relationship of the Ḥabiru to the Hebrews .....	56
Conclusions .....	67
Bibliography .....	79

Approved by:

Professor Ephraim A. Speiser  
Professor Moshe Greenberg

## PREFACE

The Israelite descent to and exodus from Egypt and the subsequent conquest of Palestine is surrounded by a series of complex and interrelated questions and problems. These stem from the nature of the biblical sources, the evidence of extra-biblical and archaeological material, and the uncertainty pervading the chronological material. This study addresses itself to the primary question of the participants in the Egyptian exodus and Palestinian conquest. Consequently, the problems of chronology, archaeology, *etc.* will be considered only as they bear upon the problem at hand.

The bibliography compiled by Dr. H. H. Rowley in his recent study, *From Joseph to Joshua*, was a great help in the preparation of this study.

Assistance was given by Miss Adelheid Buss for some of the source material in German

- Thomas McDaniel

Philadelphia, Pa.

January, 1956

## ABBREVIATIONS

<i>AASOR</i>	<i>Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research.</i>
<i>AJSL</i>	<i>American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literature.</i>
<i>APAW</i>	<i>Abhandlungen der preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.</i>
<i>BA</i>	<i>The Biblical Archaeologist.</i>
<i>BASOR</i>	<i>Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research.</i>
<i>BEHJ</i>	<i>Bulletin des études historiques juives,</i>
<i>BJRL</i>	<i>Bulletin of the John Rylands Library.</i>
<i>ET</i>	<i>Expository Times</i>
<i>HUCA</i>	<i>Hebrew Union college Annual.</i>
<i>JAOS</i>	<i>Journal of the American Oriental Society.</i>
<i>JBL</i>	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature.</i>
<i>JNES</i>	<i>Journal of Near Eastern Studies</i>
<i>JPOS</i>	<i>Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society.</i>
<i>PEFQS</i>	<i>Quarterly Statement of the Palestine Exploration Fund.</i>
<i>PEQ</i>	<i>Palestine Exploration Quarterly.</i>

- PJB* *Palastinajahrbuch des deutschen evangelischen Instituts für Altertumswissenschaft des Heiligen Landes zu Jerusalem.*
- RB* *Revue Biblique.*
- RHR* *Revue de l'histoire des religions.*
- ZAW* *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft.*

## 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 <sup>ʿ</sup>*Asaru* (<sup>ʿ</sup>*sr*) 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.



## 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.<sup>1</sup>

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.<sup>2</sup>

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.<sup>3</sup>

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.<sup>4</sup>

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.<sup>5</sup>

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,<sup>6</sup> 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.);<sup>7</sup> 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.<sup>8</sup> Vincent set the date for the fall of Jericho between 1250 and 1200 B.C.<sup>9</sup> 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.<sup>10</sup>

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.<sup>11</sup> and Vincent dates it similarly by placing the date after 1250 B.C.<sup>12</sup> Debir is likewise dated in the same period of the thirteenth century,<sup>13</sup> and Bethel is also assigned a destruction sometime within the thirteenth century B.C.<sup>14</sup>

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.<sup>15</sup>

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.<sup>16</sup>

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,<sup>17</sup> 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).<sup>18</sup>

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.<sup>19</sup>

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.<sup>20</sup>

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.<sup>21</sup> 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.<sup>22</sup>

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<sup>D</sup> 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).<sup>23</sup> 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."<sup>24</sup>

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.<sup>25</sup> 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."<sup>26</sup> 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.<sup>27</sup>

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.<sup>28</sup> 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).<sup>29</sup>

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.<sup>30</sup> 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.*<sup>31</sup> 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.”<sup>32</sup> After their arrival in Canaan the northern group evidently joined hands with the Israelites who had been in Canaan all along.<sup>33</sup>

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.<sup>34</sup> 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.<sup>35</sup> 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,<sup>36</sup>

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.<sup>37</sup>

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.<sup>38</sup> 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.<sup>39</sup>

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.<sup>40</sup>

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.<sup>41</sup> 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,<sup>42</sup> 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.<sup>43</sup>

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 Alt<sup>44</sup> 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.<sup>45</sup>

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.<sup>46</sup>

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.<sup>47</sup>

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.<sup>48</sup> 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.<sup>49</sup> 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.<sup>50</sup> 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.<sup>51</sup> 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..<sup>52</sup>

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.<sup>53</sup>

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.<sup>54</sup> 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.”<sup>55</sup>

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.<sup>56</sup>

Noth indicates the following to have been the experience of the individual tribes:<sup>57</sup> 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..<sup>58</sup>

Kaufmann in his recent study on the conquest of Canaan<sup>59</sup> 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.”<sup>60</sup> 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.<sup>61</sup>

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.<sup>62</sup>

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.<sup>63</sup>

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.<sup>64</sup> 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 <sup>c</sup>*Apiru* with *Habiru* and <sup>c</sup>*Ibrîm*—that the Hebrews were in Palestine as early as Amenophis II if the statement is correct that he captured 3,600 <sup>c</sup>*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."

**CHAPTER III**  
**THE RELATIONSHIP OF THE ḪABIRU**  
**TO THE HEBREWS**

The archaeological investigations in the Near East within the past sixty to seventy years have recovered a wide variety of texts in which there is reference to the *Ḫabiru*, the *SA.GAZ*, and the *ʿApiru*. It has now been well established by the scholars in this field that these terms apply to the same group,<sup>1</sup> and this group was spread throughout the entire Near East during the second millennium B.C. According to the analysis of Greenberg the *SAG.AZ* were found in Ur III (20th century B.C.), Isin (19th century B.C.), Larsa (18th century B.C.), Babylon (17th century B.C.), Alalah (19th century B.C.), and Phoenicia, Boghazköi, and Palestine (14–13th century B.C.). The *Ḫabiru* were found at Alishar (19th century B.C.); Alalah, vicinity of Harran, Mari, and Larsa (18th century B.C.), Boghazköi (17th century B.C.); Nuzi and Alalah (15th century B.C.); and Palestine and Boghazköi (14–13th century B.C.). The *ʿApiru* were found at Joppa and in Egypt (15th century B.C.); in Palestine and Egypt (14–13th century B.C.); and the *ʿprm* were at Ugarit (14th century B.C.).<sup>2</sup>

The problem at hand is the proposed identification of this *Ḫabiru/SAG.AZ/ʿApiru* group (hereafter referred to as *Ḫabiru*) with the *ʿIbrîm*, the Hebrew of the Bible. Of primary importance is the identification of the *Ḫabiru* of Tell el-Amarna with the tribal participants of the Israelite conquest of Palestine. But since both terms, *Ḫabiru* and *ʿIbrîm*, are used of larger groups over several centuries, it is necessary

to consider the relationship of the *Ḥabiru* to the Hebrew patriarchs.

Whether or not this identification and equation of the *Ḥabiru* to the Hebrews is valid or not is dependent on the following three factors: (1) the philological relationship of the terms *ḥabiru* and *‘ibrî*, (2) the nature of the ethnic-social structure of both groups, and (3) the historical activity of both groups.

The philological relationship of the two terms is dependent upon the etymology of the terms as well as their morphological relationship. That *‘ibrî* is a gentilic form of the root *‘br*, having the basic meaning “to cross, pass, or traverse” is now generally accepted.<sup>3</sup> Without the gentilic ending it is found in the name of the eponymous ancestor of the Hebrew people, Eber. Just as *melek* is derived from the earlier form of *milk* (and that from an earlier form of *malk*), so *‘eber* and *‘ibrî* are derived from an earlier form of *‘abir(u)*.<sup>4</sup> The cuneiform equivalent of *‘ab/piru* would be *ḥabiru*. Thus, the equation of *‘ibrî* to *‘ab/piru* to *ḥabiru* is quite possible.

Speiser indicates that there is good evidence that etymologically the relationship of *‘ibrî* to *ḥabiru* is very close. The root *‘br* is capable of yielding the meaning “passing from place to place,” and in a derived sense “being a nomad.”

Such an interpretation is by no means inconsistent with what we have learned about the *Ḥabiru*. . . . They were nomads in the same sense as the Bedouin . . . ‘Nomad’ is not an ethnic designation, it is an appellative, but so was also *ḥabiru* at the start. As yet there is no way of establishing this etymology beyond possibility of dispute; it appears however to be gaining in likelihood with each new strand of evidence.<sup>5</sup>

## 58 RELATIONSHIP OF THE ḤABIRU TO THE HEBREWS

The social status of the *Ḥabiru*, who were scattered throughout the Near East in the second millennium B.C., varied from place to place and from time to time in the same place. These various social positions included being socially independents, military auxiliaries, private dependents, state dependents, slaves, vagrants, or members of a settled population.<sup>6</sup>

The social status of the migrating and nomadic Hebrew patriarchs is well expressed in the term *gerîm*, “being sojourners, living in the land on sufferance, without legal rights.” Thus, only in part is the social status of the Hebrews coincident with the *Ḥabiru*.

Concerning the Amarna period and the conquest in particular, the Hebrews and the Israelites which participated in the conquest were united into tribal units of related kinsmen and moved in large massive tribal groups. Contrary to this it should be noted that there is no indication that the scattered *Ḥabiru* of the Amarna period were ever constituted into such a structured social organization and moved in such large and ordered groups.

Also of importance in the problem of the ethnic nature of these two groups is the question whether the respective terms for these groups are appellatives or ethnicons. There is little, if any, doubt raised that the term *‘ibrî* is an ethnicon in the gentilic, denoting the descendants of Eber the Noachide, and in particular the ancestors of the Israelite nation. As Greenberg indicates, this is well demonstrated by (1) the antithesis of the *‘ibrîm / ‘ibriyyot* and the *mišrîm / mišriyyot* in Gn 43:32, Ex 1:19, and implied in Ex 2:7; (2) the use of *‘ibrî* as a distinguishing term after the honorific *bēnê yisra’ēl* is assumed in Ex. 1:19; and (3) the distinction of the ethnic Israelites from the non-Israelites in the slave laws of Lev. 25:44–46,

Ex. 21:2. Dt. 15:12—the former serve for a limited period and the latter for a lifetime.<sup>7</sup>

However, there has been widespread disagreement as to whether *‘apiru* / *ḫabiru* is an ethnic form of an appellative. According to Speiser, an ethnic form *‘ibrî* developed from the appellative *‘abiri* (*ḫabiru*).<sup>8</sup> This development was as follows: the term *ḫabiru* represent in earlier times socially organized groups of diverse national elements, but the large Semitic element in this group at the Amarna period may have imparted to this group as quasi-ethnic status. Full ethnic content, issuing in the term *‘ibrî*, paralleled the conquest of the *Ḫabiru* over the Ammonites, Moabites, *etc.* On the other hand, Rowley—contrary to the social usage of the term in Nuzi—on the basis of the reference to the gods of the *Ḫabiru* in Hittite texts maintains that the term is essentially ethnic and may have developed into an appellative and non-ethnic term.<sup>9</sup>

Dhorme has also rejected any possibility of *ḫabiru* being an ethnic term. He states, “Les *Ḫabiri* ne seraient donc pas une peuplade, une quantité ethnique ou géographique, mais la désignation d’une collectivité.”<sup>10</sup> Greenberg likewise rejected the ethnic usage of the term, saying, “*‘Apiru* is the appellation of a population element composed of diverse ethnic elements, having in common only a general inferior social status.”<sup>11</sup>

It should be noted that Greenberg disagrees with the view of Parzen, Meek, and Rowley that there is a corresponding derogatory nuance to the term *‘ibrî* as there is to the term *ḫabiru*.<sup>12</sup>

When Abraham is called an *‘ibrî*, when the land of the patriarchs’ sojourn is called *‘ereṣ ḫa‘ibrîm* (Gn. 40:15), when Joseph and his brothers are called *‘ibrîm* (Gn 39:14, 43:32) it is merely because this was the



## 60 RELATIONSHIP OF THE ḪABIRU TO THE HEBREWS

only gentilic available to the writer to set off those proto-Israelites from the surrounding Canaanites and Egyptians of his narrative.<sup>13</sup>

The equation of the *Ḫabiru* to the Hebrews with reference to the historical activity of each group addresses itself to the identification of the *Ḫabiru* with the patriarchs and with the tribes of the Palestinian conquest. In reference to the question of the *Ḫabiru* and the patriarchs, Albright stated, "The *Ḫabiru* correspond closely, at all events, to the Hebrews of the patriarchal period in many important respects: in their independence of towns, in their geographical location, in their warlike spirit."<sup>14</sup> Likewise, Speiser stated, "If Abraham had not been called a Hebrew, we should be nevertheless justified in classing him with the *Ḫabiru*."<sup>15</sup>

The identification and equation of *Ḫabiru* of the Amarna letters with the Israelite conquest of Palestine has been made by Meek<sup>16</sup> Rowley,<sup>17</sup> Albright,<sup>18</sup> and others<sup>19</sup> on the basis of the following factors: (1) the biblical accounts speak of the infiltration of the migrating patriarchs and their attacking Shechem, which is the only place where the *Ḫabiru* are known to have been active in the center of the land;<sup>20</sup> (2) the chronology of Jericho and I Kings 6:1 demand a date of the conquest in the Amarna period; (3) Ju. 1 would suggest a conquest different from the united movement under Joshua in that it was gradual, sporadic, and executed by individual tribes; (4) the unlikeliness of a historical coincidence of two different peoples, having the same form of a name, invading the same area in the same general era; and (5) the strong parallels between the two accounts, including the actions of the native princes in making alliance with the invaders, the intrigue of the petty kings of the city-states, and the evidence

of an incomplete conquest.

Speiser's statement,

Historical conditions render the equation attractive; there are still many knotty problems on the whole subject, but the situation become hopeless if the equation is rejected<sup>21</sup>

is perhaps the most accurate statement of those who maintain the equation of the two groups, in that it recognizes the problems inherent in the identification and makes no final and particular identification.

Opposed to this identification and equation of the *Ḫabiru* to the Israelites of the conquest are Greenberg and Dhorme.<sup>22</sup> This rejection is based upon the following evidence: (1) the apparent purpose of the *Ḫabiru* was the ending of the Egyptian authority, as opposed to the Hebrew conquest in which there is evidently an absence of Egyptian authority; (2) the lack of evidence that the *Ḫabiru* of Amarna were an invading element,<sup>23</sup> (3) the *Ḫabiru* adopted the role of military contingents subordinate to the local chieftains; (4) the purpose of the *Ḫabiru* attacks was the acquisition of the spoils of *razzia* as compared to the destruction, depopulation, and acquisition of land of the Hebrews; (5) the *Ḫabiru* of Amarna gave the appearance of being small bands of fugitives and renegades which thrived on the anarchy that existed in that era and not the appearance of united and organized tribes of kinsmen which was characteristic of the Israelites; and (6) the ease with which one could become a *Ḫabiru*—which would indicate a social and political status—had no parallel among the Israelites.<sup>24</sup>

In summary, it may be stated that the equation of the *Ḫabiru* to the Hebrews and the identification of the Amarna

groups to the Israelite tribes of conquest is philologically possible from both the standpoint of morphology and etymology, but it is neither certain nor required. In reference to the social-ethnic aspect, it appears certain that *Ḫabiru* was an appellative (which may easily have developed into an ethnonym) even though the geographical determinative is found in reference to the gods of the *Ḫabiru* (for these latter references may well indicate a familial relationship). Nor did the social status of the *Ḫabiru* correspond directly to the Hebrew *gerîm* or the Israelite tribal units. In reference to the historical aspect, there seems to be adequate grounds for accepting the possibility of a relationship or equation between the patriarchal *‘ibrîm* and the *Ḫabiru*. However, the identification of the *Ḫabiru* of the Amarna period with the Israelite tribes of the conquest, or even with the patriarchal period, seems most unlikely. The evidence against this equation, based on concrete and specific differences of the two groups, seems definitely to outweigh the evidence for the identification, based as it is upon indefinite references in the Bible and possible similarities between the two groups.

### CHAPTER III NOTES

1. See Greenberg, *The Ḫab/piru*, pp. 210–211 and 224–228. Here he states that the primary support for the identification of the *SA.GAZ* with the *Ḫabiru* (*Ḫab/piru*) is from the texts themselves. The Hittite god-lists coming from the fifteenth and fourteenth centuries alternate freely the terms *DINGER.MES lu SA.GAZ* and *DINGER.MES ḫa-BI-ri*. There is also evidence from Ugarit in the parallel usages of *SA.GAZ* and *‘prm*, and from Larsa in which there is reference to the state-

supported *SA.GAZ* of Warad-Sin, the state supported *Ḫabiru* of Rim-sin, and the *SA.GAZ* under Hammurabi's *aklum*—all of which can hardly be disassociated from each other. The validity of this identification is evident also from the social status of the *SA.GAZ* and the *Ḫabiru* as they are found in Larsa, El-Amarna Syria-Palestine, and Alalah; namely, an element of the settled population as over against the nomadic population, and an ethnic composite as over against an ethnic unit.

As for the identification of the *Ḫabiru* and the *ʿApiru* Greenberg makes the following statements: “The derivation of *Ḫab/piru* is still obscure. In form it appears to be a *qatil* verbal adjective. The first consonant is established as *ʿ* [*ʿayin*] by Ugaritic and Egyptian *ʿpr.w*. Its appearance in Akkadian as *ḫ* points to a West Semitic derivation since an original *ʿ* would have become *ʾ* [*ʾaleph*] in Akkadian. The quality of the labial is still a matter of dispute. On the one hand is the unequivocal Ugaritic and Egyptian evidence for *p*. . . . On the other hand, *b* offers the advantage of an immediately transparent etymology from West Semitic *ʿbr* and facilitates the combination with Biblical *ʿibrî* . . . . Some evidence is available to show that Egyptian *p* occasionally represented a foreign *b* and Ugaritic as well can be made to yield an original *b* losing its voice” (pp. 224–226).

2. *Ibid.*, p. 209.

3. Speiser, *op. cit.*, p. 41. See also Meek, *op. cit.*, p. 7, and Rowley, *op. cit.*, p. 51.

4. Speiser, *ibid.*, and Greenberg, *op. cit.*, p. 229.

5. Speiser, *Ibid.*

6. Greenberg, *op. cit.*, p. 209.

7. *Ibid.*, pp. 230–234.

8. Speiser, *op. cit.*, pp. 41–42. This is also the position of Meek (*op. cit.*, p. 13) who stated, “That the word ‘*apiru*, *ḫabiru*, was not an ethnic term originally, but an appellative, is confirmed by an examination of all the *ḫabiru* names that we have. . . . But though the term had no ethnic content originally, tendencies early developed in that direction, as was natural under the circumstances.”

9. Rowley, *op. cit.*, pp. 52–53. See also Albright, *JBL* 18 (1934) p. 391 and Jack *PEQ* (1940), p. 95, where the ethnic usage of the term is maintained.

10. Dhorme, *op. cit.*, p. 166. He also made the statement “que le terme Ḫabiru est un mot du vocabulaire cananeen qui represente essentiellement les ennemis de la domination egyptienne en Canaan” (p. 163).

11. Greenberg, *op.cit.*, p. 230.

12. See Greenberg, *ibid.*; Parzen, *AJSL* 49 (1933) pp. 254–258; Meek, *op. cit.*, pp. 10–11; and Rowley, *op. cit.*, p. 55.

13. Greenberg, *ibid.*, p. 30.

14. Albright, *Archaeology and the Bible*, p. 132.

15. Speiser, *op. cit.*, p. 43.

16. Meek, *op. cit.*, p. 21. He states: "This contemporaneous account of the settlement of the Ḫabiru in Palestine so exactly parallels the Old Testament account of the Israelite conquest of Jericho and the invasion of the highlands of Ephraim under Joshua that the two manifestly must reference the same episode."

17. Rowley, *op. cit.*, p. 164. Rowley, whose entire reconstruction of the period relies on this identification, states, "Pressure northwards from Kadesh of Hebrew groups, together with Kenite and other elements equals the Ḫabiru of the Amarna letters. Simultaneous pressure from the north of kindred groups including Asher, Zebulun, Dan, and other Israelite tribes, together with other groups, equals the SA.GAZ of the Amarna letters."

18. Albright *BASOR* 58, p. 15. He identifies at least a part of the Israelites with the Ḫabiru in his statement, "That the tribe of Joseph belonged to the group designated as Khabiru in the Amarna Tablets and as Shasu in the inscriptions of Sethos I is more and more probable."

19. See Lewy, *HUCA* 14 (1939), pp. 609 and 620; and Jack, *op. cit.*, p. 128.

20. See especially Rowley, *op. cit.*, pp. 111–113, who states, "I connect the Amarna age rather with the age of Jacob."

21. Speiser, *op. cit.*, p. 40.

22. Dhorme (*JPOS* 4, p. 126) rejects this identification completely, stating, "Le mouvement des Ḫabiri est l'insurrection

de l'indigene contre de l'etranger. L'invasion d'Israel est l'installation de l'etranger chez l'indigene. . . . l'identification des Hebreux et des Ḥabiri ne nous semble acceptable.” Likewise Greenberg in his statement (*op. cit.*, p. 243), “The proposed <sup>c</sup>*Apiru* - Hebrew equation faces thus at present a series of objections. None of these is indeed decisive, but their accumulative effect must be conceded to diminish its probability. . . . Further historical combinations between the two groups appear to be highly doubtful; they may serve now as they served in the past, only to obscure the distinctive features of each.” See also Garstang, *Joshua–Judges*, p. 255.

23. Greenberg, *op. cit.*, pp. 186–187, 238–239.

24. *Ibid.*, p. 186. “It seems that to ‘become a Ḥabiru’ did not involve any particular ethnic affiliation, but rather the assumption of a special status. ”

## CONCLUSIONS

The following conclusions which are submitted are in no way considered to be final and definitive. The preceding study of the problems and the various interpretations given them has pointed out several areas where the divergent views might be in harmony with each other. As has been evident in the preceding chapters, no conclusion can account for all of the material and answer all of the questions satisfactorily.

Concerning the tribal participants of the Egyptian sojourn and exodus, it may be concluded with a great deal of certainty that the accumulative result of the various inconsistencies and diverse biblical statements as listed is that only a portion of the Israelites went into Egypt.

Since the extra-biblical material is of no substantial aid in identifying the particular tribal participants, the biblical account becomes the only source of information. The division of the tribes into three groups (Leah, Rachel, and concubine) seems natural and valid. In view of the evidence which would locate Sinai in Seir, away from the Sinai peninsula, there would seem to be no reason to identify the Leah and Rachel tribes with a distinct geographical place of Kadesh and Sinai respectively. Nor does it seem necessary, in light of the nomadic and migratory nature of the Israelites, to define the descent into Egypt as an either-or matter in reference to the Leah and Rachel tribes. The predominant conclusion of the scholars that the concubine tribes were at least partially of alien stock can readily be accepted as valid.

As Albright and Rowley have indicated, there is no reason why the historicity of the account of Joseph's sojourn should



be questioned. Meek, on the other hand, has given good reasons for identifying the Levites with Egypt. Albright's identification of Levi with the tribes in Egypt has led him to conclude that all the Leah tribes were there. However, in and of itself, the presence of Levi would not necessitate the presence of all the Leah tribes. That the Simeonites went with the Levites to Egypt is possible though not conclusive. Thus, the tribes which went to Egypt would include the Joseph tribes, the Levites, and perhaps Simeon. The other Leah tribes, with Judah being the strongest and largest, were located in the Negeb and territory of the Kenites. The concubine tribes evidently remained in the highlands of the north and central hill-country.

In reference to the tribal participants of the conquest of Palestine, the conclusions are somewhat more tentative. First, in addition to the summary remarks which were made above (pp. 62–63) on the equation of the *Habiru* with the Israelites/Hebrews of the conquest, it may be stated that the probability is that the *Habiru* of Amarna cannot be equated with the Israelites of the conquest, although there is a possibility that they might. This would seem to be more accurate than the obverse statement that the probability is that they can be equated although there is the possibility that they were not. This would not exclude though a relationship or identification of the patriarchal *‘ibrīm* with the *Habiru*.

Any identification of the tribal participants of the conquest and their respective activities must take into consideration (1) the fact that the accounts in Joshua and Judges do not relate the events of the same historical situation; (2) that, aside from Jericho, all archaeological evidence would indicate that the conquest of Canaan occurred in the thirteenth century: central Palestine at the beginning and southern Palestine at the

end; (3) that there is sufficient evidence to suggest that there was a “dual” conquest, *i.e.*, a movement westward across the Jordan and a movement northward from the Negeb.

If the conclusions of Wright and Kaufmann (in reference to the historical accuracy of Joshua and the accounts in Judges being a continuation of Joshua) can be accepted, the following reconstruction of the tribal activity is possible. The Joseph and Levi tribes, who had come to adopt Yahwism through Moses’ contact with Jethro his Kenite kinsman, made the exodus from Egypt, perhaps under Rameses II. In Kadesh / Sinai they joined their kinsmen of the Leah tribes who had adopted Yahwism through their close interconnections with the Kenites.

The movement was then north according to the basic traditions of Joshua. From the highlands of central Trans-Jordan, the tribes of Joseph, Levi, and Leah—having united with the more distantly related and partially alien concubine tribes—made the assault westward and the wars of extermination were commenced. Towards the end of this conquest the tribes received their lots and the wars of occupation and settlement were begun, namely, the tribal wars as recorded in Judges. The strategy of Judah may have demanded a movement from the south into their territory, and subsequently the northward thrust from Kadesh.

This possible reconstruction of events would account for the earlier destruction of towns in central Palestine as over against the slightly later destruction of the towns in southern Palestine. It would also account for the separate westward and northward movements of the conquest, as well as the two distinct types of military activity in Joshua and Judges.

A final conclusion which would account for all the material is at present not available. The following statement

of Albright (*Stone Age to Christianity*, p. 329) seems to summarize the present state of biblical scholarship:

The probability is that the actual course of events was closer to the Biblical tradition than any of our critical reconstructions have been, and that some vital clues still elude or search.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Albright, W. F. 1918, "Historical and Mythical Elements in the Story of Joseph," *JBL* 37: 111–143.
- Albright, W. F. 1924. "The Topography of Simeon," *JPOS* 4: 149–161.
- Albright, W. F. 1929. "The American Excavations at Tell Beit Mirsim," *ZAW* N. F. 6: 1–17.
- Albright, W. F. 1931. "The Third Campaign at Tell Beit Mirsim and Its Historical Results," *JPOS* 11: 105– 129.
- Albright, W. F. 1932. *The Archaeology of Palestine and the Bible*. New York: Fleming H. Revell
- Albright, W. F. 1935. "Archaeology and the Date of the Hebrew Conquest of Palestine," *BASOR* 58: 10–18.
- Albright, W. F. 1934. *The Vocalization of the Egyptian Syllabic Orthography*. AOS 5. New Haven: American Oriental Society.
- Albright, W. F. 1935. "Palestine in the Earliest Historical Period," *JPOS* 15: 193–234.
- Albright, W. F. 1936. "The Song of Deborah in the Light of Archaeology." *BASOR* 62: 26-31.

- Albright, W. F. 1937. "Further Light on the History of Israel from Lachish and Megiddo." *BASOR* 68: 22-26.
- Albright, W. F. 1939, "The Israelite Conquest of Canaan in Light of Archaeology," *BASOR* 65 1939: 11-23.
- Albright, W. F. 1941, "New Egyptian Data on Palestine in the Patriarchal Age," *BASOR* 81: 16-21.
- Albright, W. F. 1946, *From Stone Age to Christianity*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Albright, W. F. 1946. *Archaeology and the Religion of Israel*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Albright, W. F. 1954. *The Archaeology of Palestine*. Baltimore: Penguin Books.
- Alt, A. 1953. *Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israel*. Munchen: C. H. Beck.
- Barton, G. A. 1935. "The Possible Mention of Joshua's Conquest in the El-Amarna Letters," *ET* 47: 380.
- Bergman, A. 1936. "The Israelite Tribe of Half-Manasseh," *JPOS* 16: 224-254.
- Breasted, J. H. 1906. *Ancient Records of Egypt: Historical Documents from Earliest Times to the Persian Conquest*. Volume I. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Burney, C. F. 1918. *Israel's Settlement in Canaan*. (Schweich Lecture, 1917). London: Oxford University Press.

- Burrows, M. 1941. *What Mean These Stones? The Significance of Archaeology for Biblical Studies*. New Haven: American Schools of Oriental Research.
- Burrows, M. 1942. "A Comment on Professor Rowley's Paper in the February Bulletin," *BASOR* 86:35–26.
- Chiera, E. 1932. "Ḫabiru and Hebrews," *AJSL* 49: 115–124.
- Cook, S. A. 1909. "Simeon and Levi," *AJSL* 13: 370–386.
- Cooke, G. A. 1918. *The Book of Joshua*. Cambridge: University Press; New York: G. P. Putnam.
- Cooke, G. A. 1918. *The Book of Judges*. Cambridge: University Press; New York: G. P. Putnam.
- Dhorme, P. E. 1908-1909. "Les pays bibliques au temps d'el Amarna," *RB* N. S. 5: 500–519, 6: 50–73.
- Dhorme, P. E. 1924. "Les Ḫabiru et lex Hebreux," *JPOS* 4: 162–168.
- Dhorme, P. E. 1938. "La question des Ḫabiri," *RHR* 118: 170–187.
- Dossin, G. 1938, "Les Archives epistolaries de Mari," *Syria* 19: 105–126.
- Driver, S. R. 1953, *The Book of Exodus*. Cambridge: University Press.

Dussaud, R. 1930. "La chronologie de Jericho et les nouvelles fouilles de M. J. Garstang." *Syria* 11: 390–392.

Dussaud, R. 1938. "Review of J. Simons, *Handbook for the Study of Egyptian Topographical Lists Relating to Western Asia*," *Syria* 19: 176–177.

Finkelstein, L. 1949. *The Jews: Their History, Culture, and Religion*. Philadelphia, Jewish Publication Society of America.

Garstang, J. 1930. "Jericho," *PEFQ* 1930: 123–132.

Garstang, J. 1931. *The Foundations of Bible History: Joshua, Judges*. London: Constable.

Garstang, J. 1935. "The Fall of Bronze Age Jericho," *PEFQ* 1935: 61–68.

Garstang, J. 1931. "The Story of Jericho: Further Light on the Biblical Narrative," *AJSL* 58: 369–372.

Glueck, N. 1934. "Explorations in Eastern Palestine and the Negeb," *BASOR* 55: 3–21.

Garstang, J. 1934. *The Heritage of Solomon: An Historical Introduction to the Sociology of Ancient Palestine*. 1934. London: Williams and Norgate.

Glueck, N. 1940. "Kenites and Kenizzites," *PEQ* 1940: 22–24.

- Glueck, N. 1955. "Explorations in Eastern Palestine and the Negeb," *BASOR* 138: 7–30.
- Greenberg, M. 1955. *The Ḥab/piru*. New Haven: American Oriental Society.
- Jack, J. W. 1925. *The Date of the Exodus in the Light of External Evidence*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.
- Jack, J. W. 1936. "Recent Biblical Archaeology," *ET* 48: 549–551.
- Jack, J. W. 1940. "New Light in the Ḥabiru-Hebrew Question," *PEQ* 1940: 95–115.
- Kaufmann, Y. 1953. *The Biblical Account of the conquest of Palestine*. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, Hebrew University.
- Kraeling, E. G. H. 1941. "The Origin of the Name Hebrews," *AJSL* 58: 237–253.
- Lewy, J. 1939. "Ḥâbîru and Hebrews" *HUCA* 14: 587–623.
- Lewy, J. 1940. "A New Parallel Between the Ḥâbîru and Hebrews," *HUCA* 47–58.
- Meek, T. J. 1920. "A Proposed Reconstruction of Hebrew History," *AJTh* 24: 209–216.
- Meek, T. J. 1950. *Hebrew Origins*. New York: Harper.



- Meek, T. J. 1936. "The Israelite Conquest of Ephraim," *BASOR* 61: 17–19.
- Meek, T. J. 1939. "Moses and the Levites," *AJSL* 56: 113–120.
- Meyer, E. 1905. *Die Israeliten und ihre Nachbarstämme*. Halle.
- Moore, G. F. 1898. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Judges*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.
- Noth, M. 1930. *Das System der zwölf Stämme Israels*. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer.
- Noth, M. 1938. *Das Buch Joshua*. Tübingen: Mohr.
- Noth, M. 1950. *Geschichte Israels*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Olmstead, A. T. 1931. *History of Palestine and Syria to the Macedonian Conquest*. New York: Scribners.
- Parzen, H. 1933. "The Problem of the Ibrim ('Hebrews') in the Bible," *AJSL* 49: 254–261.
- Paton, L. B. 1913. "Israel's Conquest of Canaan," *JBL* 32: 1–53.
- Posener, G. 1937. "Une liste de noms propres étrangers sur deux ostraca hiéroglyphiques du nouvel empire," *Syria* 18: 183–197.

- Posener, G. 1940. *Princes et pays d'Asie et de Nubie*.
- Robinson, T. H. 1932–1938. *The History of Israel*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Robinson, T. H. 1932. “The Exodus and Conquest of Palestine,” *Theology* 25: 267–274.
- Robinson, T. H. 1935. “The Possible Mention of Joshua’s Conquest in the El-Amarna Letters,” *ET* 47: 380.
- Rowley, H. H. 1938. “Israel’s Sojourn in Egypt,” *BJRL* 22: 243–290.
- Rowley, H. H. 1938. “The Exodus and the Exodus,” *ET* 50: 503–508.
- Rowley, H. H. 1939. “The Danite Migration to Laish,” *ET* 51: 466–471.
- Rowley, H. H. 1940. “Ras Shamra and the Habiru Question,” *PEQ* 1941: 90–94.
- Rowley, H. H. 1941. “The Date of the Exodus,” *PEQ* 1941: 152–157.
- Rowley, H. H. 1942. “The Exodus and the Settlement in Canaan,” *BASOR* 85: 27–31.
- Rowley, H. H. 1942. “Habiru and Hebrews,” *PEQ* 1942: 41–53.

- Rowley, H. H. 1944. "Early Levite History and the Question of the Exodus," *JNES* 53: 73–78.
- Rowley, H. H. 1949. "The Patriarchal Age." *BJRL* 32: 44–79.
- Rowley, H. H. 1950. *From Joseph to Joshua: Biblical Traditions in the Light of Archaeology*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Skinner, J. 1951. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Genesis*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.
- Speiser, E. A. 1933. "Ethnic Movements in the Near East in the Second Millennium B. C.," *AASOR* 13: 13–54.
- Steuernagel, C. 1901. *Die Einwanderung der israelitischen Stämme in Kanaan*. Berlin, C. A. Schwetschke und sohn.
- Vincent, L. H. 1931. "The Chronology of Jericho," *PEFQS* 1931: 104–106.
- Waterman, L. 1937. "Some Determining Factors in the Northward Progress of Levi," *JAOS* 57: 375–380.
- Waterman, L. 1938. "Jacob the Forgotten Supplanter," *AJSL* 55: 25–43.
- Waterman, L. 1934. "Some Late Repercussions from Late Levitical Genealogical Accretions in P and the Chronicler," *AJSL* 58: 49–56.

- Wellhausen, J. 1885. *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*.  
Edinburgh: A. & C. Black.
- Wright, G. E. 1940. "Epic of Conquest," *BA* 3:1–40.
- Wright, G. E. 1942. "Two Misunderstood Items of the  
Exodus-Conquest Cycle," *BASOR* 86: 32–35.
- Wright, G. E. 1946. "The Literary and Historical Problem of  
Joshua 10 and Judges 1," *JNES* 5: 105–114.
- Wright, G. E. and F. V. Filson. 1945. *The Westminster  
Historical Atlas*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press.