



Israel's Conquest of Canaan: Presidential Address at the Annual Meeting, Dec. 27, 1912

Author(s): Lewis Bayles Paton

Reviewed work(s):

Source: *Journal of Biblical Literature*, Vol. 32, No. 1 (Apr., 1913), pp. 1-53

Published by: [The Society of Biblical Literature](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3259319>

Accessed: 09/04/2012 16:53

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at

<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



The Society of Biblical Literature is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of Biblical Literature*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

JOURNAL OF BIBLICAL LITERATURE

Volume XXXII

Part I

1913

Israel's Conquest of Canaan

Presidential Address at the Annual Meeting, Dec. 27, 1912

LEWIS BAYLES PATON

HARTFORD THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

NO problem of Old Testament history is more fundamental than that of the manner in which the conquest of Canaan was effected by the Hebrew tribes. If they came unitedly, there is a possibility that they were united in the desert and in Egypt. If their invasions were separated by wide intervals of time, there is no probability that they were united in their earlier history. Our estimate of the Patriarchal and the Mosaic traditions is thus conditioned upon the answer that we give to this question. The purpose of this paper is not to solve this problem, but only to exhibit its elements in their logical relation, in the hope that thus the direction may be shown in which a solution is to be sought.

I. The Biblical Sources for the History of the Conquest.

a. *The Book of Joshua*.—It is now generally recognized that the Book of Joshua is composed out of the same four elements that we find in the Pentateuch, namely, J, E, D and P. These four documents agree that the twelve tribes entered Canaan together from the east, under the command of Joshua, and that he defeated the coalitions of Canaanite kings both in the south and in the north.

D and P add that he captured all the cities of the land (Jos. 10 28-43; 11 10-12. 23), and gave these cities to the tribes of

Israel (Jos. 13—22). J and E record no such extensive conquests, and in a number of passages J asserts that cities were not conquered which D and P claim were taken by Joshua; e. g. Jerusalem (Jos. 12 1. 10; 15 63), Gezer (10 33 D; 12 12 D; 21 21 P; 16 10 J), Taanach and Megiddo (12 21 D; 21 25 P; 17 11-18 J). J also says that several cities were taken by other persons than Joshua; e. g. Hebron by Caleb (15 13f. J; 10 36f.; 11 21a D), Debir by Othniel (15 15-17 J; 10 38f.; 11 21b; 12 13a D), the Highland of Israel by the tribe of Joseph (17 14-18 J; cf. 11 16-20 D; 12 18-24 D; 15 4-8 P).

J and E also agree that the Canaanites were not annihilated, as represented by D and P (10 40; 11 19f.). In 13 1b. 13; 15 63; 16 10; 17 12f.; Jud. 2 23; 3 5, J tells us that the Canaanites "dwell in the midst of Israel unto this day," and in the legislation of J (Ex. 34 11-13) it is assumed that they are still a menace. E also says of the Canaanites, "I will not drive them out before thee in one year, lest the land become desolate, and the beast of the field multiply against thee; by little and little I will drive them out from before thee" (Ex. 23 29f.; cf. Jud. 3 4 E).

b. *The first chapter of Judges.*—The first chapter of the Book of Judges gives another account of the conquest. This does not mention Joshua; it represents the tribes as conquering their territories separately, or at most in pairs, and it does not regard the Canaanites as exterminated, but as retaining all the important cities.

Various theories have been formed to harmonize this narrative with the Book of Joshua:

1. *The theory that Jud. 1 follows Jos.*—This is the view of Augustine, RaSHI, RaLBaG and most of the older commentators, and in modern times of Bachmann, Ewald, Bertheau, Cassel, Keil, König, Blaikie and McCurdy. According to it, Joshua conquered the land in the decisive battles of Gibeon and the Waters of Merom, then divided it by lot, and left it to the individual tribes to complete the conquest as narrated in Jud. 1.

This theory depends upon the introductory words in Jud. 1 1a, "and it came to pass after the death of Joshua," but this clause is certainly an editorial addition (cf. Ex. 1 1; Lev. 1 1; Num. 1 1;

I Sam. 1 1; I Ki. 1 1, all of which begin with an "and," designed to link the Law and the Former Prophets in a consecutive narrative). The death of Joshua is not narrated by Jud. until 2 8, and the events recorded in Jud. 1 do not follow the death of Joshua. When in vv. 1b-2 the children of Israel inquire, "Who shall go up first to fight against the Canaanites?" and Yahweh replies, "Judah shall go up first," this is evidently the beginning of the invasion of Canaan, not an expedition by Judah after the united tribes have conquered the land. If Jud. 1 follows Jos., we shall have to assume that the hosts of Canaanites annihilated by Joshua came to life again, like the dry bones in the vision of Ezekiel, so that the tribes of Israel had to destroy them and their towns all over again.

2. *The theory that Jud. 1 precedes Jos.*—Toffteen supposes that when Israel revolted against Moses at Kadesh (Nu. 14 39-43), the nation was divided into two hostile camps that remained separate for forty years. Parts of the tribes mentioned in Jud. 1 joined the revolt, and parts of these same tribes remained with Moses. The rebels then invaded Canaan as recorded in Jud. 1. Meanwhile the fragments of the tribes that were left with Moses wandered forty years in the desert, and subsequently invaded the land from the east under Joshua and completed the conquest.

The objections to this view are, that it makes Joshua conquer over again the cities that had already been taken by the individual tribes, and that it assumes a permanent division of the tribes at Kadesh. If only half-tribes remained with Moses, and if Joshua found the other half-tribes already settled in Canaan, we should expect some hint of these facts elsewhere. This splitting of the tribes is so contrary to Semitic conceptions of tribal unity and loyalty as to be most improbable.

Against both of the theories that have just been mentioned is the fact that Jud. 1 and Jos. are so similar in their main features that they must be regarded as parallel accounts of the conquest. Jud. 1 1 assumes that the Hebrews were together before the invasion, evidently in the east of Canaan, since the first attack is directed against the king of Jerusalem (vv. 4-7), and the subsequent campaigns proceed first southward and then

northward (vv. 1 ff. 22 ff.). With this corresponds Jos. 1—2. Jud. 1 16 makes Judah go up out of the City of Palms (Jericho; cf. 2 1a. 5b, where the angel of Yahweh goes up from Gilgal). With this corresponds the crossing of the Jordan and the capture of Jericho (Jos. 3—6).

Judah and Simeon then fight with Adoni-Bezeq (Jud. 1 5), who seems to be the king of Jerusalem, because after his defeat and mutilation he returns to Jerusalem to die (v. 7), and because he is powerful enough to have seventy kings gather their food under his table (v. 7; cf. the position of the king of Jerusalem in the Amarna Letters). With this corresponds Joshua's expedition against Adoni-Şedeq, king of Jerusalem (Jos. 10). The parallelism of the narratives in all other details compels us to identify these campaigns, Adoni-Şedeq and Adoni-Bezeq seem to be merely textual variants. The various recensions of the Greek read Adoni-Bezeq in Jos. Bezeq appears as a divine name in the place-name Qîr-Bezeq in a list of Ramses III (Müller, *Eg. Res.* p. 49) and Bezeq (I Sam. 11 8). In view of the rarity of Adoni-Bezeq and its attestation by the Greek in Jos., this seems to be the correct reading in both places. Adoni-Bezeq is defeated in Bezeq. The only Bezeq known to us is the modern Ibziq, 14 miles N.E. of Shechem (Nâblus). This is not a natural place for a battle with a king of Jerusalem. We must either assume that there was another Bezeq near Jerusalem or, more probably, that Bezeq is a textual error induced by the name of the king Adoni-Bezeq. It is a plausible conjecture that **בִּזְק** (Bezeq) is a corruption of **גִּבְעֹן** (Gibeon), the scene of the battle in Jos. 10 and in the ancient song Jos. 10 12.

The campaign against Adoni-Bezeq (Şedeq) is followed in Jud. 1 8-21 by a southward movement of Judah and Simeon through which they gained the Highland of Judah and the Negeb. With this corresponds Joshua's conquest of the same regions (Jos. 10 29-42). Jud. 1 22-36 then describes the conquests of the northern tribes, proceeding from south to north. With this corresponds Joshua's victory over the northern coalition of Canaanites (Jos. 11).

In the account of the distribution of the land (Jos. 13—18)

a number of verses of Jud. 1 are repeated verbatim. These parallel verses are as follows: Jud. 1 10. 20 = Jos. 15 13f.; Jud. 1 11-13 = Jos. 15 15-17; Jud. 1 14-15 = Jos. 15 18-19; Jud. 1 21 = Jos. 15 63; Jud. 1 27-28 = Jos. 17 11-13; Jud. 1 29 = Jos. 16 10. Those who hold that Jud. 1 follows Jos. are obliged to regard these parallel verses in Jos. as anticipations of the events recorded later in Jud. 1. This is an unnatural hypothesis. The real reason why they are inserted at this point is that the editor of Jos. regarded them as chronologically parallel to the material that he was using. A comparison of the two histories indicates, accordingly, that Jos. is only a variant and more elaborate version of the same conquest that is described in Jud. 1.

3. *The theory that Jud. 1 is a recapitulation of Jos.* — Recognizing that Jud. 1 is parallel to Jos., Hengstenberg, Ziegler, Bleek, Preiss and others have regarded it as a brief summary of Jos. This view derives some support from the fact just noted that a number of passages in Jos. are duplicated in Jud. 1, but it breaks down in view of the numerous differences between the two histories. It would be a strange recapitulation of the Book of Joshua that left Joshua himself out of account, and that summarized his annihilation of the Canaanites by reports of the failure of the tribes to capture the important cities. Jud. 1 is evidently written in complete ignorance of Jos.

4. *The theory that Jud. 1 is supplementary to Jos.* — Ottley thinks that the twelve tribes kept together under the leadership of Joshua until after the defeat of Adoni-Sedeq, king of Jerusalem (Jos. 10). Then Judah and Simeon seceded, and moved southward to fight Adoni-Bezeq, king of Jerusalem (Jud. 1 1-7). Afterwards Joshua with the rest of the tribes invaded the north country (Jos. 11—14; Jud. 1 22-36). The difficulty with this theory is that it distinguishes Adoni-Sedeq and Adoni-Bezeq, and thus makes it necessary for Judah and Simeon to fight a king of Jerusalem immediately after a king of Jerusalem has been routed by Joshua. It also makes Judah and Simeon conquer their own territories, whereas, according to Jos. 10, this was done by Joshua; and it makes these tribes gain their inheritances before these were assigned to them by lot according to Jos. 15.

Wade thinks that the twelve tribes held together until after the attack on Ai (Jos. 7), and that then Judah and Simeon seceded through dissatisfaction with the execution of Achan of the tribe of Judah (Jos. 7). Judah and Simeon then fought Adoni-Bezeq, king of Jerusalem; and subsequently Joshua and the rest of the tribes fought Adoni-Şedeq, king of Jerusalem. This view is open to all the objections that have been urged against the previous one, and has no additional argument in its favor.

Kittel holds that the tribes were united only until the conquest of Jericho (Jos. 6). Afterwards Judah went up to Gilgal to fight Adoni-Bezeq, king of Jerusalem, and Joshua went up later with the tribe of Joseph to fight Adoni-Şedeq, king of Jerusalem, whom Kittel regards as a successor of Adoni-Bezeq. The mention of Hebron and Debir as allies of Adoni-Şedeq (Jos. 10 3. 38) he regards as an erroneous interpolation in the tradition, since these cities had been previously taken by Judah (Jud. 1 10-18. 20). This is most unnatural. The parallelism in all details between Judah's conquest of the south in Jud. 1 and Joshua's conquest of the south in Jos. 10 shows that one narrative does not precede the other but is a substitute for it.

These theories that make the tribes act together up to a certain point, and then separate, are artificial. If the tribes had been united by Moses and Joshua, it is not likely that they would have separated after the conquest of Jericho, or of Ai, or after the battle of Gibeon, when the greatest perils still menaced them. That is much the same as if the states of Germany had united in the war against France until after the battle of Weissenburg, and then had parted to conquer the land separately. The variety of theories proposed to harmonize Jud. 1 and Jos. shows that they cannot be combined in any natural way.

5. *The theory that Jud. 1 is contradictory to Jos.* — Wellhausen, Kuenen, Meyer, Stade, Guthe, Budde, Moore, Nowack, Baudissin, H. P. Smith, Bennett, Cornill, Driver, G. A. Smith, Gemoll, and the majority of recent critics give up the effort to combine Jud. 1 with Jos., and regard it as an independent and contradictory account of the conquest. In this case it is ne-

cessary to determine the relative historical values of the two narratives.

There is general agreement that Jud. 1 is more reliable than Jos. for the following reasons: 1. There is no trace in later history of such a union of the tribes as the documents in Jos. assume. In the Song of Deborah (Jud. 5), Deborah, in the face of mortal danger, is able to get volunteers only from Ephraim, Benjamin, Machir, Zebulun, Issachar and Naphtali, i. e., the northern tribes who were directly menaced by Sisera. Reuben, Gilead, Dan, and Asher will not come, and Judah, Simeon, and Levi are not even invited. Throughout the Book of Judges, apart from editorial passages, the Judges appear as tribal leaders only, and the tribes are often at war with one another (Jud. 3 27; 6 34f.; 8 1; 9 6; 11 8; 12 4-6; 15 11f.). David and Solomon by force of arms held the tribes together for a while, but after Solomon's death they immediately fell apart.

2. The capture of the strongholds of Canaan by Joshua, according to D and P in Jos., is unhistorical in comparison with the statements of Jud. 1 and J in Jos. that the Israelites were unable to drive out the Canaanites. Jerusalem was not taken until the time of David (II Sam. 5 6-9; cf. Jud. 19 12; against Jos. 12 10). The Canaanites were not expelled from Gezer until the time of Solomon (I Ki. 9 16; cf. Jud. 1 29; against Jos. 12 12). Beth-shan remained in the hands of the Philistines until the time of David (I Sam. 31 10; cf. Jud. 1 27). Taanach and Megiddo were still Canaanite in the time of Deborah (Jud. 5 19; cf. 1 27; against Jos. 12 21; 21 25). Shechem was still a Canaanite city in the time of Abimelech (Jud. 9 28; cf. Gen. 34 2).

3. The older histories agree that the Canaanites were not exterminated, as D and P in Jos. record, but that they continued to dwell in the midst of Israel, as narrated in Jud. 1 and J in Jos. (cf. Jud. 3 1-6; II Sam. 24 7; I Ki. 9 20-21). The prohibitions of marriage with the Canaanites and of worship of their gods that continue down to Deuteronomy (Ex. 23 24. 32f.; 34 11-13; Deut. 7 1-5. 22) show that the Canaanites lived among the Israelites long after the conquest. Only thus can we explain the Canaanizing of the religion of Israel that the Prophets denounce.

It appears thus that in every particular the narrative of Jud. 1 is more credible than that of Jos. It must be made the basis of our conception of Israel's conquest of Canaan.

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

c. *The narratives of conquests in the Book of Numbers.* — In Num. 14 J, E and P narrate how Moses sent spies into Canaan from Kadesh-Barnea on the southern frontier, how their report so terrified the Hebrews that they refused to invade the land, and how they were sentenced to die in the desert. In Num. 14 39b-45 (J, Addis, Gray; E, Bacon, Meyer; JE, Baentsch, Carpenter) we read how, in spite of Moses' prohibition, they invaded southern Canaan, and were defeated by the Amalekites and Canaanites, and pursued as far as Ḥormah. The story is repeated in Deut. 1 41-44 with verbal dependence upon Numbers, but here "Amorites" is substituted for "Amalekites and Canaanites", and the defeat is said to have been "in Se'ir (Gr. from Se'ir) even unto Ḥormah."

Ḥormah is mentioned frequently as a city of the extreme south (Jos. 12 14; 15 30; 19 4; I Sam. 30 30; I Chr. 4 30). It does not survive in any modern name, but in Jud. 1 17 its original name is said to have been Ṣephath. Ṣephath is commonly identified with Sebaita, 22 mi. NNE. from Ḳadesh (Ain Ḳadis) but this is philologically unsound. It is better with Robinson to identify it with the mountain ridge eṣ-Ṣafâ, about 40 mi. NE. of Kadesh. The Se'ir of Deut. 1 44 will then be es-Se'er N. of the Wâdy Fikreh.

Nu. 21 1-3 (J) has nothing to do with its present context. It describes a successful northward movement of Israel into Canaan, while the context describes a southward movement from Kadesh. These verses are evidently the continuation of J's

account of the defeat at Ḥormah in Nu. 14 45. V. 1 states that some Israelites were taken prisoners by the Canaanites; v. 2, that Israel vowed to devote the Canaanite cities to destruction, and v. 3, that they captured them, destroyed them, and called the region Ḥormah. The two narratives join on naturally to one another, and the mention of Ḥormah in both shows that they form a connected series of events.

In Jud. 1 16-17 we find a duplicate to this narrative in Num. It mentions an attack on the Amalekites and Canaanites in the South, as does Num. 14 45. The wilderness of 'Arad (v. 16) lies just north of Ḥormah, around the modern Tell 'Arad. The invasion ends in the destruction of the Canaanite cities and the giving of the name Ḥormah, just as in Num. 21 3. The Kenites, Judah and Simeon make the attack in Jud. 1 16 f.; in Num. 21 1 ff. the general name Israel is used. In Jud. Ṣephath receives the name Ḥormah, while in Num. 'Arad apparently receives this name. The two places cannot be identified (cf. Jos. 12 14). It seems probable, however, that the words "the king of 'Arad" are a gloss in Num. 21 1, because the personal title is strange after the general name "the Canaanite," because in the following verses only the Canaanites are mentioned, and because these words are redundant before the following clause "who dwelt in the Negeb" (so Moore, Gray). In this case the difference vanishes. Even if "the king of Arad" be retained, there is no real difficulty in v. 3, for "place" may mean "district" as well as "city" and Ḥormah is used as the name of a district in Num. 14 45 and Deut. 1 44.

As to the relation of these two narratives, Bachmann and Cassel hold that they refer to different events. Ṣephath was first destroyed by Moses, but was subsequently rebuilt and again destroyed by Judah and Simeon after Joshua's conquests. This is very unlikely. A place that had been subjected to the *herem*, or "ban," would not recover so easily. Palmer thinks that Num. 21 3 is an anticipation of Jud. 1 17, i. e., Israel vowed to devote Ṣephath in the days of Moses, but the vow was not fulfilled until over forty years later after Joshua's conquest. This is very unnatural. There is nothing in the passage that suggests that a long interval lies between vv. 2 and 3.

Moore thinks that Ḥormah meant originally "sanctuary" (cf. Ḥermon, Ḥorem), and that the connection with *herem*, "ban," is a fanciful etymology. In this case we have merely different explanations of a name. Granted, however, that the etymology is fanciful, it could not have arisen unless Israel had executed the *herem* on this region; and from the nature of the case that could not have happened twice. Accordingly, the great majority of critics hold that Num. 21 1-3 and Jud. 1 16f. are parallel accounts of the same event (so Studer, Ewald, Knobel, Bertheau, Dillmann, Wellhausen, Meyer, Kittel, Steuernagel, Bacon, Burney).

These two narratives, while agreeing in other particulars, differ fundamentally as to the manner of the entrance of the Hebrew tribes into Canaan. Num. 14 44f. + 21 1-3 brings them up from Kadesh in the south, while Jud. 1 16f. brings them in from the east. Steuernagel, Schiele, and H. P. Smith attempt to harmonize them by claiming that J had no account of the stay east of the Jordan, and that the City of Palms in Jud. 1 16 is not Jericho but Tamar, "Palm," in southern Judah; but, as Budde and Meyer show, the list of stations in Num. 21 18-20, the Balaam story, and the death of Moses in the land of Moab, belong certainly to J; and in Jud. 1 the conquest proceeds from the east. Jud. 1 1 assumes that the tribes are together, apparently at Gilgal, since in 2 1a. 5b (J) the angel of Yahweh goes up from Gilgal to Bochim (Bethel). The king of Jerusalem in the center of the land is attacked first (Jud. 1 4-7), and the conquest then proceeds southward and northward from this center. There is no reason, accordingly, why the "City of Palms" in Jud. 1 16 should not have the usual meaning "Jericho" (Deut. 34 3; II Chr. 28 15; Jud. 3 13). It is clear, therefore, that the main strand of J to which Jud. 1 belongs assumes that the tribes entered Canaan together from the east.

Kittel attempts to solve the discrepancy by omitting the words "with the children of Judah" in Jud. 1 16, and the words "and Judah went with Simeon his brother" in v. 17; the invasion from the south then refers to the Kenites only. In justification of this emendation he points out that Judah was settled farther north than Şephath, and that it did not capture Hebron

or Debir; it is doubtful, therefore, whether it penetrated so far south as Şephath. This argument assumes the correctness of Jud. 1, which makes the conquests of Judah proceed from north to south. If Judah and Simeon came in from the south, as Num. relates, then there is no difficulty in supposing that they conquered Şephath with the Kenites before they moved up into their later abodes. It is manifestly unfair to emend the text on no other basis than the foregone conclusion that Judah and Simeon entered Canaan from the east.

We find here, accordingly, conflicting traditions. The main stock of J brings all the tribes into Canaan from the east; the unrelated fragments that J has incorporated in Num. 14 44 f. and Num. 21 1-3 bring some of them in from the south. We must choose between these conceptions.

Wellhausen, Guthe, Kittel, Benzinger, Cornill, Matthes, Kent, Peters, prefer the tradition in Jud. 1; but there is much in favor of the correctness of the narrative of Num. If Judah and Simeon conquered their territories independently, as Jud. 1 relates, it is improbable that they were united with the other tribes as far as Gilgal. If such a union had existed, it would not have been dissolved on the border of Canaan, when the hardest fighting remained still to be done. The account of Num. which makes part of Israel invade Canaan from Kadesh furnishes a much more natural introduction to the separate conquests by Judah, Simeon, Caleb, Othniel and the Kenites in Jud. 1 than does the present context in J. Şephath is only about 40 miles distant from Kadesh. It is more probable that it was conquered directly from Kadesh, as Num. relates, than by the circuitous route around the land of Edom, by way of Gilgal, Jericho and Jerusalem, as Jud. 1 assumes. In the time of David Judah lived far north of Şephath. If Jud. 1 is correct, we must suppose that this tribe conquered southward as far as Şephath; and then, for some unknown reason, returned to the north. If Num. is correct, then the capture of Şephath was merely an incident in the northward movement of Judah from Kadesh to its later seat. The separation of Judah from the northern tribes down to the period of the monarchy by Jerusalem and a belt of Canaanite towns in the center of the

land is more easily explained, if the two main divisions of Israel invaded Canaan from opposite sides and failed to make connection, than if they entered the land together.

This view is strengthened by the consideration that the clan of Caleb, which Jud. 1 10 f. 20 couples with Judah, seems to have invaded Canaan from the south. In Jud. 1 13 Caleb is called the son of Kenaz, and in Jos. 14 6. 14; Num. 32 12, the Kenizite. Jos. 15 13 suggests that the clan was of non-Israelitish origin by saying that Caleb received a portion "in the midst of the children of Judah." In Gen. 36 11. 15. 42 Kenaz appears as an Edomite family. In this case it is more likely that Caleb invaded Canaan from the south than from the east, since Kadesh was on the border of Edom (Num. 20 16 E). This view is favored by the story of the spies in Num. 13. In J Caleb alone is mentioned as the one sent from Kadesh to explore the south of Canaan. He encourages the people to go up (13 30), and he alone is promised an inheritance in the land (Num. 14 24; Deut. 1 36). This seems to be a reminiscence of the fact that the clan of Caleb entered Canaan from Kadesh. This view is confirmed by the fact that in Num. 13 22 (J) Caleb finds the three sons of Anak, Ahiman, Sheshai, and Talmi at Hebron when he goes to spy out the land, and the same three personages again when he conquers Hebron (Jud. 1 10. 20b = Jos. 15 14). This shows that in the thought of the original J document there was no long interval between Caleb's spying out of Hebron and his conquest of it, that is, Caleb's conquest was made from Kadesh, just as his tour of exploration. The union of Caleb with Judah is commonly assigned to the time of David, but there is no evidence for this view, and David's choice of Hebron as his capital suggests a much earlier incorporation. The genealogies of Judah also contain many Calebite and Edomite names.

It appears, accordingly, that the tradition in Num. that makes the southern tribes enter Canaan from Kadesh is more probable than the tradition in Jos. and Jud. 1 which makes them enter from the east (so Kuenen, Meyer, H. P. Smith, Steuernagel, Cook, Baentsch, Burney, Gressmann, Asmussen, Schiele, Segond). When under David and Solomon the tribes were united into one nation, it was supposed that their forefathers

were similarly united; consequently 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. 20¹⁴⁻²¹) to invade the land from the east. He still preserved the memory, however, that the tribes had conquered their territories independently. The next step was taken by the Judean writer in Jos., who made the tribes conquer the land unitedly under the leadership of Joshua, but who did not represent the conquest as complete. The final step in the evolution of the tradition was taken by D in Jos. who represented the land as completely conquered by Joshua, and the Canaanites as entirely destroyed.

d. *The conquest by the Danites in Jud. 18.*—In Jud. 18 the J document narrates how the Danites migrated and captured the city of Laish near the source of the Jordan, which they renamed Dan. In Jos. 19⁴⁷ we find a briefer account of the same migration, and in Jud. 1³⁴ we read, "The Amorites forced the children of Dan into the Highland, for they would not allow them to descend into the Maritime Plain." There is general agreement that this verse refers to the same period as Jud. 18 and Jos. 19⁴⁷.

e. *The war with Sisera (Jud. 4—5).*—Jud. 4 and 5 contain independent accounts of a war with the Canaanites under the leadership of Sisera; the former is from E, the latter from J. In 4^{2.7.17.24} Sisera is called "the general of Jabin, king of Hazor." Jabin was the king with whom Joshua fought (Jos. 11), and this has led a number of critics to suppose that Deborah was a contemporary of Joshua. Jabin is not mentioned, however, in the Song of Deborah (Jud. 5), and Sisera appears there as the king (vv. 19. 20. 28-30). In chapter 4 also Sisera is the chief figure. Most critics, accordingly, are of the opinion that the combination of Jabin with Sisera in Jud. 4 is the work of the Deuteronomic editor. The position of the tribes in the Song of Deborah indicates a later time than that described in Jud. 1.

f. *The genealogies in Chronicles.*—In I Chr. 2 we find a number of fragments of genealogies that refer to early migrations of Caleb. In 2¹⁸ we are told that Caleb's first wives were

'Azubah, "the desert," and Jerioth, "tents"; or perhaps we should read, "'Azubah, daughter of Jerioth." In either case there is an illusion to the primitive nomadic life of Caleb. Caleb's "sons" by 'Azubah were Jeshar, Shobab, and Ardon (v. 18) which seem to be localities in the extreme south of Judah. In 2 42-45 other "sons" of Caleb are mentioned namely, Ziph, Maresha, Hebron, and other towns in central Judea. In 2 19 f. 50-54 Caleb takes Ephrath as wife, and her children are Kirjath-jearim, Beth-lehem, Beth-gader and other towns of northern Judah in the district of Ephrath. Here we have a migration of Caleb from the southern desert into northern Judea that corresponds to Num. 13 22; Jud. 1 10. 20b and Jos. 15 14.

In like manner the genealogy of Jerahmeel in I Chr. 2 25-44 seems to preserve a memory of the migration of this tribe (cf. I Sam. 27 10; 30 29).

The genealogy of Simeon contains a curious record, not found elsewhere in the Old Testament (I Chr. 4 39-43), which tells how the Simeonites invaded Gedor (Gerar), smote the Me'unim (Minaeans), and settled in Mount Seir (cf. Deut. 1 44 = Num. 14 45). Simeon had already disappeared by the time of the Blessing of Moses (Deut. 33), about 800 B.C.; these conquests, accordingly, must belong to an early period. It is possible that here we have a reminiscence of the first conquests by Simeon in the extreme south. All these fragments of genealogies favor the theory that the southern tribes entered Canaan from Kadesh.

g. *The Patriarchal stories in Genesis.* — The Book of Genesis contains several accounts of Hebrew settlements in Canaan. It is important that we should determine the relation of these to the narratives of Jos. and Jud.

1. *The sons of Israel* (Gen. 32—38).—Traditionally these have been supposed to be the individual ancestors of the Hebrews, but the names are used tribally in other books of the Old Testament, and all that is said about them here demands a tribal interpretation. When in Gen. 34 25 we read, "Simeon and Levi, Dinah's brothers, took each man his sword, and came upon the city unawares, and slew all the males," there is no difference from Jud. 1 3, "And Judah said unto Simeon his

brother, Come up with me into my lot, that we may fight against the Canaanites." In the Blessing of Jacob (Gen. 49) there is not one statement that can naturally be referred to the individual sons of Jacob. Of Simeon and Levi it is said, "I will divide them in Jacob and scatter them in Israel" (v. 7), "Zebulun dwells at the haven of the sea" (v. 13), "May Dan judge his people as one of the tribes of Israel" (v. 16).

Kittel, König and Burney admit that these stories must be given a tribal interpretation, but insist that they belong to an earlier age than the narratives in Jos. and Jud. All that can be said in favor of this view is that there are some episodes in Gen. that are not found in Jos. and Jud.

Against this theory is the parallelism of these stories of Gen. with the narratives of Num., Jos., and Jud. 1. When Jacob wishes to enter Canaan, he fears his brother Esau, and sends ambassadors to him (Gen. 32 3—33 16); so Israel sends ambassadors to Edom, and goes around its territory (Num. 20 14-22). Jacob enters Canaan from the east (Gen. 32—33); so also Israel, according to Jos. and Jud. 1. Jacob comes to Shalem (Gen. 33 18a), so Judah and Simeon first encounter the king of Jerusalem (Jud. 1 4-7). Simeon and Levi attack the people of Shechem (Gen. 34), so Simeon and Judah go up first against the Canaanites (Jud. 1 8). Because of the treacherous attack on Shechem, Simeon and Levi are cursed to be scattered in Israel (Gen. 49 7), so in Jud. 1 3.17 Simeon is attached to Judah, and in Jos. 19 1.9 receives his inheritance "in the midst of the children of Judah." Levi is not mentioned in Jud. 1, and in Jud. 17 1f.; 19 1 the Levites appear as wanderers without tribal inheritance. Simeon and Levi are not mentioned in the Song of Deborah, in the lists of southern clans I Sam. 27 10; 30 26-31, in the "Blessing of Moses" (Deut. 33), nor in the Books of Samuel and Kings. Jacob goes up to Bethel and builds an altar there (Gen. 35 6f.), so the tribe of Joseph captures Bethel (Jud. 1 22-26) and offers sacrifice there (Jud. 2 1a. 5b).

The "oak of weeping" is named at Bethel (Gen. 35 8), so Bethel is called Bochim, "Weeping" (Jud. 2 5). At Shechem Jacob bids his people to put away their idols (Gen. 35 2-4); so Joshua holds an assembly at Shechem, in which he adjures the

people to forsake the strange gods (Jos. 24). Judah separates from his brethren and goes down into the South, where he establishes relations with the Canaanites (Gen. 38); so Judah moves southward (Jud. 1 8 ff.). Simeon marries a Canaanite woman (Gen. 46 10), and the Book of Jubilees which preserves many a fragment of ancient tradition says (44 13) that Simeon's wife was a woman of Şephath; so Simeon captures Şephath (Jud. 1 17).

The order of birth of the sons of Israel in Gen. is the order in which, according to the later narratives of the Hexateuch, the tribes of Israel settled in Canaan. Reuben is the firstborn (Gen. 29 32; 49 3), because this tribe first occupied the region east of the Jordan (Num. 32). Simeon, Levi, and Judah come next, because they were the first to invade the land west of the Jordan (Jud. 1 3 ff.). Joseph is last, because his settlement was the latest (Jud. 1 22 ff.). Benjamin, "the son of the south," alone of all the sons of Israel, is born in the land of Canaan (Gen. 35 18). This indicates that this tribe originated after the conquest as an offshoot from the Rachel tribes, and this view is confirmed by the fact that Benjamin is not mentioned among the tribes that invaded Canaan in Jud. 1 (the correct text of Jud. 1 21 is preserved in Jos. 15 63), although it was already in existence in the time of Deborah (Jud. 5 14).

In view of this parallelism it seems impossible to deny that the stories of Israel and his sons in Gen. refer to the same events that are narrated in Jos. and Jud. 1. This conclusion is not shaken by the fact that some incidents are found in Gen. that are not found in Jos. and Jud. 1. Levi is associated with Simeon in Gen. 34, but not in Jud. 1; we know, however, that Levi belonged originally to the southern group of tribes (Jud. 17 7, 19 1) and the genealogies of Levi contain many names that indicate residence in the South (Cook, *Notes*, p. 86). The attack of Simeon and Levi on Shechem is not found in Jos. or Jud. 1, but the scattering of these tribes that was a result of this expedition is attested in the period of the Judges. Reuben's violation of Bilhah (Gen. 35 22; 49 4) must refer to conquests of the tribe of Reuben west of the Jordan. These are not narrated in Jos. or Jud. 1; but in Jos. 15 6; 18 17 mention is made of the "stone of Bohan the son of Reuben," which indicates that

Reuben once gained a foothold west of the Jordan. These differences from Jos. and Jud. 1 are not a sufficient reason for assigning the stories of the sons of Jacob to a different period from the stories of the conquest (so Kuenen, Wellhausen, Meyer, Budde, P. H. Smith, Cook).

2. *Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob and their wives.*—The traditional view among Jews and Christians has been that these Patriarchs were the individual forefathers of Israel. The difficulties with this view are, first, that no such small group of persons could have penetrated Canaan successfully and have maintained itself there under the warlike conditions depicted in the Egyptian inscriptions and the Amarna letters. Second, history shows that tribes and nations do not arise by natural descent from single ancestors, but that common ancestry is a legal fiction designed to bind heterogeneous races together. Third, in the genealogies of Gen. the names of the Patriarchs are mingled with names that are certainly tribal in their meaning. Fourth, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and Israel, appear in the later books of the Old Testament as names for the nation. Fifth, many of the stories about these Patriarchs admit only a tribal interpretation.

These considerations lead many modern critics to hold that, while there may have been individuals named Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, these names were also applied to the clans of which they were leaders. The question then rises, To what period of history did these clans belong?

From the fact that they appear in the Book of Genesis as forefathers of the tribes of Israel it has commonly been assumed that they were more ancient than the tribes that we meet in Ex.-Jud. Ewald, Delitzsch, Dillmann, Kittel, König, Klostermann, Cornill, Prášek, Proksch, Burney, Ottley, Wade, tell us about an Abraham people that united with a Sarah people, and entered Canaan as early as 2000 B.C. Isaac and Rebekah were later waves of Aramaean migration into which the Abraham and Sara people were absorbed. Jacob was a third wave, and Israel a fourth. Leah and Rachel were smaller tribes that were absorbed by Jacob, or, as Proksch and Kittel think, Leah belonged to Israel and Rachel to Jacob.

The difficulties with this theory are (1) that Israel had no memory of the events of the sojourn in Egypt, and it is improbable that it retained the memory of a still earlier period. (2) No traces of these hypothetical Hebrew tribes survive in the later history of Israel, in the genealogies of the other Old Testament books, or in archaeology. Jacob, Israel, and some of the "sons" of Israel are known to us archaeologically, but Abraham, Sarah, Isaac, Rebekah, Leah and Rachel are unknown. (3) Jacob-Israel is not older than his sons. If, as we have just seen, the tribes conquered Canaan separately, there is no probability that the inclusive names Jacob and Israel originated before their unification in Canaan. (4) Leah and Rachel are merely collective names for the two main groups of tribes that entered Canaan from the south and the east respectively. Levi is connected etymologically with Leah, and the children of Leah are the tribes which tradition connects with Kadesh. Haupt's suggestion (*ZATW.* 1909, p. 284) that Leah means "cow" and Rachel means "sheep"; and that the "sons of Leah" are the "cowboys," and the "sons of Rachel" the "shepherds," is plausible, and points to conditions that existed after the occupation of Canaan. (5) Zilpah and Bilhah, the mothers of four of the later tribes of Israel, are regarded as concubines, which shows that these tribes were of alien origin. This is more easily explained as an absorption of Canaanite, or earlier Hebraic elements, after the conquest than as an absorption of such elements in the desert. Influenced by these considerations Kuenen, Wellhausen, Stade, Meyer, Guthe, Cook, H. P. Smith, Winckler, Cheyne, Kent, Budde, hold that the traditions of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob originated after the conquest.

In the case of Jacob and Esau it is obvious that they reflect the history of the nations of Israel and Edom down into the period of the monarchy. Gen. 25 23 refers to David's conquest of Edom (I Chr. 18 12). Gen. 27 40 refers to the successful revolt of Edom (II Ki. 8 22). It is probable also that Jacob's dealings with Esau refer to the relations between Israel and the Aramaeans of Damascus in the period of the kings. It appears accordingly, as Wellhausen says, that Jacob is younger than his sons, i. e., the traditions concerning united Israel did not

arise until the originally independent tribes were welded into a nation.

Following out this idea, Wellhausen attempts to show that Abraham and Isaac also personify the national history of Israel. Abraham, like Israel, is a stranger in Canaan, who derives his title from the gift of Yahweh. He waits many years before the promise of a numerous posterity begins to realize itself. He does not take possession of his heritage at once, but lives in faith of a future ownership. Isaac is a child of his father's old age, just as Israel is the last-born of a group of nations. He comes near to losing his life in childhood, just as Israel runs the risk of extinction soon after the occupation of Canaan. He loves peace, just as Israel cherishes the ideal of "dwelling each under his own vine and fig-tree with none to disturb."

These parallels to the history of Israel are not very striking, and there is a lack of specific allusions to late events. Accordingly, in the cases of Abraham and Isaac the theory of personification of the nation of Israel is not wholly satisfactory.

It seems more likely that we have here traditions borrowed from the Canaanites, for the following reasons:—(1) The Canaanites were not exterminated, but they dwelt in the midst of Israel and eventually mingled with the Israelites. In this process Canaanite traditions must have been learned by the Hebrews and blended with their own traditions. This has actually happened in the case of the Babylonian traditions of Gen. 1—11, which must have come to Israel by way of the Canaanites. It would be surprising, if some of the Patriarchal traditions did not come from the same source.

(2) The traditions of Abraham and Isaac, and some of the traditions of Jacob, bear marks of this origin in the fact that they are designed to explain the origin of the holy trees, holy stones, altars, and sepulchers of the land of Canaan. These were ancient sanctuaries that were in existence long before the arrival of the Hebrews, and they were adopted by Israel after the conquest, as we know from the later historical books. The Patriarchs, who are connected with these sanctuaries must have belonged originally to Canaanite tradition, and have been adopted later by Israel.

(3) Eerdmans (*Expos.* 1908, p. 118) has called attention to the fact that the Patriarchs often appear as Fellâhîn rather than as Bedawîn, e. g., Isaac sows and reaps (Gen. 26 12); and from this fact he draws the conclusion that the agricultural legislation of the Pentateuch was adapted to the life of Israel before the conquest. A juster conclusion would be, that the Patriarchs were not the heroes of a nomadic people like Israel, but of an agricultural people like the Canaanites.

(4) Our documents agree that Israel belonged to the Aramaean race. The testimony of archaeology is that this race did not migrate out of the desert before 1500 B.C. But there are some elements in the patriarchal tradition that point to a higher antiquity. In Gen. 14 1 Abram is a contemporary of 'Amraphel, who is generally conceded to be the same as Hammurabi, king of Babylon, who reigned 1958—1916 B.C. The name Abram was not in use in ancient Israel, but it was common in Babylonia during the Amorite period. This suggests that Abram belongs to the Canaanite rather than the Hebrew strand of tradition. In like manner Jacob appears in contract-tablets of the Hammurabi period, and in Egypt during the Hyksos period, but it was not used as a personal name by Israel.

(5) Gen. 11 31 represents Abram as migrating from Ur of the Chaldees. This is quite irreconcilable with the Aramaean origin of Israel, but accords with the fact that the Amorites settled simultaneously in Babylonia and in Canaan.

(6) The double names borne by so many of the Patriarchs suggest a blending of Canaanite with Hebrew tradition. Abram = Abraham, Lot = Moab and Ammon, Jacob = Israel, Esau = Edom, Joseph = Ephraim and Manasseh. In all these pairs the first name shows an early, pre-Aramaean type, and is monumentally attested before 1500 B.C.; the second name is of a later, Aramaean type. It looks as though the identification of the names were due to a blending of the Hebraic peoples with an earlier population.

These considerations have led Meyer, Guthe, Winckler, Erbt, Peters, and others to the conclusion that Abram, Isaac and Jacob were the heroes of the sanctuaries of Canaan that were adopted by Israel after the conquest. If this be so, the trad-

itions about them throw no light upon the Hebrew conquest, however valuable they may be for reconstructing the history of ancient Canaan.

h. *The narratives of the wandering in the desert.*—The Books of Exodus and Numbers, apart from the passages already considered, contain no direct information in regard to the conquest, but they throw so much indirect light upon it that a consideration of them at this point is unavoidable.

One of the most remarkable features of the story of the wanderings is the inability of the documents to combine the stay at Kadesh with the stay at Sinai. In Ex. 15 25b (E), immediately after the crossing of the Red Sea, there is a fragment that explains the origin of the name Massah. Massah, "testing," is the same as Meribah, "trying" (Deut. 33 8; Ex. 17 7); and Meribah is identical with Kadesh (Num. 27 14; Deut. 33 2, read "and he came unto Meribath-Kadesh"). After this isolated mention of Kadesh the march to Sinai is resumed, but in 15 4-6 (E) Moses strikes water from the rock, and in v. 7 the spring is called Massah and Meribah. Here we are back at Kadesh again, and the incident is repeated in Num. 20 1-13 (JP). In Ex. 17 8-16 (E) Israel fights with Amalek, but Amalek is the foe encountered at Kadesh (Nu. 14 45). In Ex. 18 (mainly E) Moses appoints judges, but this happened at Kadesh according to Nu. 11 16f. (E).

From these facts Wellhausen, Smend, Meyer, Luther, Cook infer that the Sinai episode in Ex. 19—Num. 10 is a late and unauthentic intrusion in the tradition. According to the original J and E, Israel went straight from Egypt to Kadesh, and remained there until the invasion of Canaan. This is unlikely on account of the prominence of Sinai in the tradition of the exodus. A more natural explanation of the facts is that J and E held different views in regard to the relation of Kadesh and Sinai, and that in the process of composition these views have been confused. In Num. 10 33; 11 35; 12 16 J represents the Israelites as journeying directly from Sinai to Kadesh. Deut. 1 19, which depends on J, makes Kadesh follow Sinai (cf. 33 8), and Deut. knows no earlier visit to Kadesh. E, on the other hand, seems to have placed Kadesh immediately after the crossing of the Red Sea.

E and D make the forty-years wandering follow Kadesh (Num. 14²⁵ E; Deut. 1⁴⁶—2¹), but P omits Kadesh after Hazeroth in the list of stations (Num. 33¹⁷; cf. Num. 12¹⁶ J; Deut. 33²), and does not insert Kadesh until the end of the forty-years wandering (Num. 33³⁶ 37; cf. v. 39). J mentions no wandering in the desert, but makes the tribes stay at Kadesh until the generation that came out of Egypt had perished (Num. 14³¹).

Kittel, Guthe, Bönhoff, Jeremias, Benzinger and McNeile attempt to remove the difficulty by assuming that Sinai was situated in the vicinity of Kadesh; but Sinai lay in the land of Midian (Ex. 2¹⁵), and we know of no Midian in the neighborhood of Kadesh. In Num. 10³³; 11³⁵; 12¹⁶ J narrates that Israel journeyed three days from Sinai, and then three other stages before coming to Kadesh. Horeb also is remote from Kadesh according to E. Ex. 13¹⁷ (E) shows that Israel went from Egypt in an opposite direction to Kadesh, and Deut. 1², depending on E, says that it is eleven days journey from Horeb to Kadesh. Horeb in Ex. 17⁶ must be a gloss, since, according to the narrative of E, Israel had not yet reached Horeb.

Kadesh is undoubtedly 'Ain Ḳadis on the southern border of Canaan. Sinai is traditionally identified with Jebel Mûsa at the southern end of the so-called Sinaitic Peninsula, and this is still the view of König, Petrie, Duncan, Hoskins; but there is little to be said in favor of this location. The proposed identifications of the stations of the exodus with places in the Sinaitic Peninsula are unconvincing. The tradition that Sinai is Jebel Mûsa cannot be traced back farther than the fourth century of our era. It is improbable that the Hebrews, who were intending to invade Canaan, should have taken the circuitous route around the Sinaitic Peninsula, through an arid region incapable of sustaining a large population, when they might take the easy and natural caravan-route straight across the peninsula to Elâth at the head of the Gulf of 'Aqaba, where there were copious springs. From the time of the first dynasty onward the Sinaitic Peninsula was occupied by garrisons of Egyptian troops that protected the copper-mines. If the Hebrews had gone that way, they would have marched straight into an Egyptian stronghold.

Sinai lay in the land of Midian (Ex. 2 15; 4 19 J), and the only Midian known to history was on the eastern side of the Gulf of 'Aqaba. According to J (Ex. 15 22-24. 27), Israel journeyed three days through the desert of Shur, "the wall," so called from the wall of Egypt that guarded the Isthmus; and came first to Marah, and then to Elim, where there were twelve springs of water. Elim is a masculine plural of the same word of which Elâth, or Elôth, is the feminine plural. Elâth, at the head of the Gulf of 'Aqaba, was famous in antiquity for its springs and its palm-trees. The description of Sinai by J in Ex. 19 shows that at the time of the exodus it was an active volcano. The traditional Sinai is not a volcano; but on the other hand, the mountain-chain that skirts the western coast of Arabia is the seat of intense volcanic activity, and eruptions have taken place within historic times. Later allusions to Sinai also indicate that it lay south of Seir, or Edom, e. g., Jud. 5 4; Deut. 33 2; Hab. 3 3. These facts show that we are to look for Sinai in northwestern Arabia east of Elâth (so Beke, Greene, von Gall, Wellhausen, Meyer, Cheyne, Haupt, Cook).

Von Gall and Meyer think that the Horeb of E and D was distinct from Sinai and lay in the traditional location. This opinion is based upon Ex. 13 17 f., where E says that Israel did not go from Egypt "by the way of the land of the Philistines" but "by the way of the wilderness by the Red Sea." This is supposed to show that they followed a route along the shore of the Gulf of Suez, but "Red Sea" means the Gulf of 'Aqaba as well as the Gulf of Suez (e. g., I Ki. 9 26). The "way of the Philistines" means the road that leads to Philistia, i. e., the regular caravan-route along the Mediterranean. The "way of the Red Sea" means naturally the road that leads to the port of Elâth on the Red Sea, the other main caravan-route out of Egypt. If Horeb had lain in the Sinaitic Peninsula, the route to it would have been called "the way of Horeb." E, accordingly, takes us in the same direction as J. Moreover, in Ex. 19 E describes Horeb as a volcano which shows that he has the same mountain in mind as J. The name **הַרְב**, "devastator," is probably only an epithet of Sinai derived from its volcanic character.

Accordingly, Sinai-Horeb and Kadesh lay in entirely different regions, so that we are still confronted with the problem of the relation of these places in the tradition of the Exodus. When we remember that our previous investigations have led us to recognize that the Leah tribes invaded Canaan directly from Kadesh, while the Rachel tribes entered from the east, the most natural hypothesis seems to be that the documents of the Pentateuch cannot combine Kadesh and Sinai successfully because these centers belonged originally to different groups of tribes that were independent of one another until after the conquest.

Kadesh is certainly connected with the Leah tribes, since, according to Num. 21 1-3 and the genealogies of Chronicles, these tribes invaded Canaan from the south. Sinai must then belong to the Rachel tribes that conquered their possessions from the east. In the Song of Deborah (Jud. 5 3-5), which belongs to the northern tribes, Yahweh comes from Sinai to help his people, even though the words "that is Sinai" in v. 5 may be a gloss. Elijah also, the prophet of the northern kingdom, seeks Yahweh at Horeb (I Ki. 19 8). In the traditions of the stay at Kadesh we find the Leah tribes specially mentioned, e. g., Reuben and Levi (Num. 16 1; Deut. 33 8), but never Joseph. Joshua, the leader of Ephraim, although inserted by P, is conspicuous by his absence from the story of the sending of the spies from Kadesh in J, E, and D.

It seems, therefore, as if the division of the tribes that we have discovered at the time of the conquest extended backward into the period of the sojourn in the desert. The Leah tribes were at Kadesh; the Rachel tribes were at Sinai, and these two sojourns may have been widely separated in point of time, just as the two conquests of Canaan. After the founding of the monarchy, when the tribes were united into one people, the same tendencies that led them to combine their separate conquests into a single conquest under the leadership of Joshua led them also to combine their separate sojourns in the desert into one sojourn under the leadership of Moses. The various positions that Kadesh occupies in the tradition of the wanderings are due, accordingly, to various attempts to combine the

originally distinct cycles of tradition that clustered about Kadesh and Sinai. This conclusion leads us to inquire whether the division of the Hebrew tribes into two groups may not have extended back still further into the period of the sojourn in Egypt.

i. *The narratives of the sojourn in Egypt.*

1. *Was Israel in Egypt?*—According to J (Gen. 45 10; 46 28; 47 27; Ex. 8 22; 9 26) the Hebrews dwelt in the land of Goshen, and lived there a nomadic life with their flocks and their herds (Gen. 46 32-34; 47 1; 50 8; Ex. 10 9. 24; 12 32. 38). Gen. 46 32 states expressly that they could not enter Egypt proper because they were "shepherds." The land of Goshen has been certainly identified through the excavations of Naville as the district about the Egyptian town of *G-s-m* on the site of the modern Saft el-Henneh. This region belongs physically to the desert rather than to Egypt, and is occupied today chiefly by nomadic Arabs. It is well adapted to the breeding of sheep and goats. On the other hand, E and P state that the Hebrews were settled in Egypt proper, on the banks of the Nile, among the Egyptians (Gen. 45 18 E; 47 11 P; Ex. 2 15 E; 2 3-5 E; 3 22 E; 11 2 E).

Of these two representations that of J is unquestionably preferable. The Hebrews were nomads at the time of the exodus, and this could not have been the case unless they had remained nomads during their stay in Egypt. This was possible in Goshen, but not on the banks of the Nile. The only question then is, Whether the stay in Goshen is credible. Against its credibility it has been argued that the Egyptian monuments contain no mention of the Hebrews. This is not quite certain; but even if it be true, it proves nothing. Another objection is the absence of Egyptian influence in the religion of Israel. This is not surprising, if the Hebrews continued to lead a nomadic life in Goshen, practically untouched by Egyptian civilization.

Within the last few years objections have been raised to the sojourn in Egypt on the basis of the discovery of a North Arabian land called Muşri, which, it is thought, is often confused in the Old Testament with Mişraim, Egypt. Winckler and Cheyne

hold that the Egypt of the exodus is an instance of this confusion, and that the Hebrews really migrated out of North Arabia. Similar is the view of Stade, Schiele, and Gemoll, based upon Jos. 10 41; 11 16, that the land of Goshen extended from the border of Egypt to southern Palestine. According to Gemoll the exodus was merely the movement of some Hebrew tribes from the south to the north of Canaan.

Against these theories it may be said (1) that the proof of the existence of a North Arabian land of Muşri is not a disproof of the existence of Mişraim, Egypt.

(2) The fact that there was a Goshen in Egypt and a Goshen in Canaan does not prove that the land of Goshen occupied the entire region between these places. The Greek for Goshen in Egypt is Γέσρευ, and for Goshen in Canaan, Γόσορ.

(3) From the earliest times Asiatics were admitted into Egypt. We have records of such admissions in the reign of Sesostriis II (1900 B.C.) (Breasted, *Anc. Rec.* i, p. 281), in the reign of Harmhab (1350 B.C.) (Breasted, iii, p. 7), and the reign of Merneptah (1225 B.C.) (Breasted, iii, p. 273), where the people admitted are Edomites.

(4) There is a strong Egyptian color in the stories of Joseph and of the bondage, for instance, the dependence of the land upon the Nile, the etiquette of the Egyptian court, the process of embalming, the building of store-cities for grain, the use of sun-dried bricks, and the employment of forced labor. The burden of proof rests upon those who hold that this Egyptian color is interpolated in the tradition of the bondage. There is general agreement that the name Moses is of Egyptian origin, being the same as the element *môsé* "child," in the names of so many of the Pharaohs. Phinehas, the grandson of Aaron (Ex. 6 25) is also an Egyptian name, and so is Putiel, his maternal grandfather (Ex. 6 25). These names are found in P, but they seem to rest on ancient tradition, since Phinehas reappears in the high priestly family of Eli (I Sam. 4 11; cf. Jos. 24 33 E). According to Ex. 1 11 J, the Hebrews built for Pharaoh the store-cities of Pithom and Ramses. Pithom has been identified in the land of Goshen by the excavations of Naville, and Ramses is evidently the royal name Ramses. When Cheyne

seeks to invalidate this testimony by claiming that Moses is a corruption of Ishmael, Ramses a corruption of Aram-Ishmael, and Pithom a corruption of 'Arab-Ishmael, his argument is scarcely convincing.

(5) The ancient song of victory, a fragment of which has been preserved by J in Ex. 15 1, and by E in Ex. 15 21, presupposes an exodus from Egypt and a crossing of the Red Sea.

(6) The conception of Yahweh as a God who had redeemed his people that underlies the whole later religion of Israel is inexplicable except on the basis of a historic exodus, not from North Arabia, but from the mighty empire of the Pharaohs.

In view of these facts there is general agreement among recent critics that part at least of the tribes that made up later Israel sojourned for a time within the borders of Egypt.

2. *Was all of Israel in Egypt?*—In their present form our documents assume that all the sons of Jacob went down to Egypt, and that all the tribes took part in the exodus, but there are a number of facts that suggest that only a part of the tribes was there. According to J, the Hebrews formed a small community in the district of Goshen, that could easily be gathered by Moses to receive a message. They built the two granaries of Pithom and Ramses, which suggests that there were not more than two clans. In Ex. 1 10 the Pharaoh says, "Come let us deal wisely with them lest they multiply." According to E, the Hebrews were so few that two midwives sufficed for their needs (Ex. 1 15). This also suggests that there were not more than two clans. Even P holds that only seventy persons went down to Egypt, although he sets the number that went out at 600,000. Goshen had but little room, and could sustain only a small population. The march through the desert also would have been impossible for a large body of people on account of the limited water-supply. Moreover, the genealogies in I Chr. 1—8 ignore the exodus, and thus suggest that there were parts of Israel that were never in Egypt. The same is true of some of the stories of Genesis which assume an unbroken residence of certain tribes in Canaan (e. g. Gen. 38). The con-

clusions that we have reached already in regard to the conquest and the sojourn in the desert point in the same direction. If the Hebrew tribes conquered Canaan separately, and were divided in their residence in the desert, there is a strong probability that only a part of them was in Egypt.

3. *Which part of Israel was in Egypt?*—Weinheimer holds that it was the Hebrews in distinction from the tribes of Israel. "Hebrew" is a wider term than "Israelite," as appears from Gen. 10²¹ J; 11¹⁴ P. Num. 24²⁴ J also distinguishes Heber from Israel. In I Sam. 14²¹, and possibly 13³, the Hebrews seem to be discriminated from Israel. Now the name Hebrew occurs with peculiar frequency in the story of the sojourn in Egypt (Gen. 39^{14, 17}; 40¹⁵; 41¹²; Ex. 1^{16, 19}; 2⁶; 3¹⁸; 5³; 7¹⁶; 9^{1, 13}; 10³), and from this Weinheimer infers that only the Hebrews were in Egypt, and that subsequently they united with Israel in Canaan. This is far too slender a basis on which to build so large an hypothesis. In I Sam. 13³ and 14²¹ the Greek has "slaves" instead of Hebrews, showing that it read עבדים instead of עברים, which makes quite as good sense. We have no other evidence of Hebrews in Canaan distinct from Israel, and there is no reason to suspect a cleavage of the nation along this line.

Spiegelberg and H. P. Smith suggest that the tribe of Jacob was in Egypt, but not the tribe of Israel. The union of these two peoples was first effected in Canaan; but we find no trace of a distinction between Jacob and Israel in the stories of the wandering, in the conquest, or in the later history of the nation.

Kittel holds that all the tribes were settled in Canaan in the Patriarchal age, and that fragments of all of them went down to Egypt under the leadership of Joseph. This theory assumes that the stories of the Patriarchs can be assigned to a different age from the stories of the conquest in Jos. and Jud., a view that we have already seen to be untenable. The splitting of tribes that it postulates is improbable, and the stories of the conquest know nothing of the half-tribes that are supposed to have remained in Canaan. The only division of Israel that is known in later times is that between the Leah tribes and the Rachel tribes. The question then is, whether the people who

left Egypt belonged to the Kadesh-Leah group, or to the Sinai-Rachel group.

Meyer, Luther, Schiele and Haupt connect the exodus traditions with the Kadesh-Leah group. Wellhausen, Guthe, Bennett, Asmussen, Toy, Prášek, Benzinger, Steuernagel and Cook connect them with the Sinai-Rachel group. In attempting to decide between these theories we must investigate the testimony of tradition on the following points:

(1) *Which tribes are most prominent in the tradition of the sojourn in Egypt?* To this question only one answer can be given: Joseph alone is conspicuous. Joseph is sold into Egypt by his brothers, and he is the center of interest in Gen. 37—49. It is true that the other brothers also are brought down to Egypt, in accordance with the theory that Israel was a unit from the beginning, but nothing is told about their history. This seems to indicate that only the two Joseph tribes, Ephraim and Manasseh, the original representatives of the Rachel group, sojourned in Egypt. This tradition advocates of the Leah group are compelled to discount as a late invention.

(2) *To which tribe did Moses belong?* If Moses was the leader in the Exodus, it is probable that the tribe to which he belonged was settled in Egypt. On this point the traditions differ. According to E (Ex. 21) and P (Ex. 6 16-20), Moses belonged to the tribe of Levi. Corresponding to this P knows a clan of Levites called Mushi, "Mosaic" (Ex. 6 19), and Moses' sons Gershom and Eliezer are regarded as Levitical clans. Jud. 17 7 mentions a Levite from Bethlehem-Judah, and 18 30 says of him, "Jonathan, the son of Gershom, the son of Moses, he and his sons were priests to the tribe of the Danites unto the day of the captivity of the land." The reference to the captivity shows, as Meyer and Luther admit, that this verse is a late addition to the narrative, still it is witness to a tradition that the Levites of Dan were descended from Moses. Meyer claims also the Blessing of Moses (Deut. 33 8) where it is said, "Thy Urim and thy Thummim be for the man, thy godly one, whom thou didst prove at Massah, with whom thou contendedst at the waters of Meribah." This Meyer thinks refers to Moses, and shows that he belonged to Levi and to Kadesh; but there

is nothing to prove this view. In all the other blessings the tribes are addressed, and it is probable that here the "godly one" is Levi rather than Moses.

On the other hand, J never calls Moses a Levite, and Luther (in Meyer's *Israeliten*, pp. 118—120) has collected a convincing body of evidence that J regarded Moses as an Ephraimite.

Between these conflicting traditions Meyer, Luther, Cornill, and Haupt decide in favor of the Levitical origin of Moses. According to Meyer, Levi, as it appears in Gen. 34 and Gen. 49, was originally a secular tribe that lived in the vicinity of Kadesh. It was only through its connection with Moses that it was transformed into a tribe of priests that devoted itself to the dissemination of the Mosaic religion. The view of J that Moses was an Ephraimite Meyer explains as a falsification of the tradition designed to commend the religion of the southern tribes to Ephraim. It may well be questioned whether this alteration of tradition is so likely as the transformation of Moses from an Ephraimite into a Levite. The powerful guild of the Levites would naturally wish to have the great lawgiver on its side, and might easily claim him, and name clans after him. We have a similar case in the transformation of Samuel from an Ephraimite (I Sam. 1 1) into a Levite (I Chr. 6 28).

(3) *Is Moses connected chiefly with Kadesh or with Sinai?* If tradition connects him with Kadesh, the probability is that he belonged to the Leah tribes; if with Sinai, the probability is that he belonged to the Rachel tribes. According to J (Ex. 2 15 f.), Moses fled from Egypt to the land of Midian (where Sinai was) and lived with the priest of Midian. This is followed by the revelation of Yahweh in the burning bush (Ex. 3 2). According to E (Ex. 3 1), Moses was keeping the flock of his father-in-law in Horeb when the divine revelation came to him. After the exodus both documents represent Moses as leading Israel to Sinai to make the covenant with Yahweh. This looks as if Moses were associated with the Sinai-Rachel group rather than with the Kadesh-Leah group.

Meyer, however, points out that Ex. 2 23, "the king of Egypt died," joins on naturally to Ex. 4 19, "and Yahweh said unto Moses in Midian, Go return unto Egypt," from which he infers

that the revelation of Yahweh to Moses in J (Ex. 3) did not occur at Sinai, but on the way from Midian to Egypt. The burning bush was a thorn-bush at Kadesh that glowed in the light of burning gas that issued from the earth. This view he attempts to back up by Deut. 33 16, "the good will of him that dwelt in a bush," which he connects with the reference to Kadesh in v. 8; but the indefinite expression "a bush" is surprising, and the statement that Yahweh "dwelt" in it has no parallel in Ex. 2, or elsewhere in the Old Testament. Wellhausen long since suggested (*Prolegomena*³, p. 354) that we should read here *sinai*, "Sinai," instead of *sēnē*, "bush." This correlates naturally with Deut. 33 2, where Yahweh comes from Sinai, his proper residence, to Kadesh. Apart from this passage the "bush" is mentioned only in Ex. 3 2-4. It plays no part whatever in later Old Testament tradition, and it may well be questioned whether Sinai is not the correct reading in Ex. 3 2-4, corresponding to Horeb in E.

Even if *sēnē* be right, there is an indubitable connection between this name and Sinai. Meyer's theory that the bush was called this to express the dependent relation of the cult at Kadesh to that at Sinai, is most artificial. Furthermore the flame in the bush, as Haupt has very properly pointed out, suggests connection with the volcanic phenomena at Sinai. Kadesh did not lie in the volcanic belt, and we have no record of other volcanic phenomena there. The pillar of cloud also is part of the original J narrative (Ex. 14 19b). Meyer explains this as the flame from the bush at Kadesh, which was believed to accompany Israel, but it is far more naturally regarded as the column of smoke by day and fire by night that hung over the top of Sinai and guided Israel from afar.

Moses' father-in-law, according to J, is the priest of Midian (Ex. 2 16). This indicates Moses' residence at Sinai, for we know of no Midianites near Kadesh. Meyer's explanation that this tradition indicates merely the dependent relation of the cult at Kadesh to that at Sinai is extremely artificial.

Finally, if, as Meyer thinks, Moses was the tribal hero of the Levites, we should expect to find his grave at Kadesh; instead of which Miriam is buried at Kadesh (Num. 20 1b E), and

Moses is buried in Mount Pisgah, east of the Jordan, on the route taken by the Joseph tribes in their invasion of Canaan (Deut. 34 J, E, P). Tradition, accordingly, is unanimous that Moses is more closely related to Sinai than to Kadesh.

(4) *Was the Mosaic religion more closely connected with the Kadesh-Leah tribes or with the Sinai-Rachel tribes?* Meyer, Luther, Asmussen, and Haupt think that it was connected with the Leah tribes, and that the Rachel tribes were converted to Mosaism by the Levites after the time of David. Meyer holds that the northern tribes had originally a pre-Mosaic Yahweh-cult, Haupt denies that they worshiped Yahweh at all (*ZDMG.* 1909, pp. 507—516).

This view derives some support from the fact that Moses' father-in-law, according to J, was Hobab ben Reuel, the Kenite, or Midianite (Num. 10 29; Jud. 1 16), and that the Kenites settled with Judah in the south of the land (Jud. 1 16). It has long been recognized that the Kenites bear a peculiarly intimate relation to the religion of Yahweh, hence it is inferred that Moses must have belonged to the Leah group with which the Kenites were affiliated. In the tradition of J, however, the Kenites are associated, not with Kadesh, but with Midian and Sinai; and they stand as representatives, not of the Mosaic religion, but of a *pre-Mosaic* Yahwism. With this corresponds the fact that J regards the name Yahweh as in use from the beginning (Gen. 4 26). The Leah tribes, that were never in Egypt, had learned to worship Yahweh at Kadesh long before Moses (cf. Deut. 33 2 where Yahweh comes from Sinai to Kadesh).

E, on the other hand, represents the name Yahweh as first introduced in the time of Moses (Ex. 3 13-15); and consistently with this, avoids the use of this name in the pre-Mosaic period. This shows that the Rachel tribes made their first acquaintance with the god of Sinai at the time of the exodus. The worship of Yahweh, accordingly, was possessed by Judah and the Kenites before the exodus, but the distinctly Mosaic conception of Yahweh was first learned by the Joseph tribes in consequence of the exodus.

The following names compounded with Yahweh in the pre-

Davidic period are at least sufficient to show that Yahweh was not unknown to the Rachel tribes: Joshua, of the tribe of Ephraim; Joash, the father of Gideon, of the tribe of Manasseh; Jotham, the son of Gideon; Abijah, the son of Samuel, of Ephraim; and Joel, the son of Samuel. Names compounded with Yahweh are rare in the northern tribes, as we should expect, if the name was first introduced by Moses; still they exist.

The Song of Deborah (Jud. 5) proves not only that Yahweh was the God of the Rachel tribes, but also that they connected him with Sinai. The word Sinai may be an interpolation in v. 5, still vv. 4-5 unquestionably refer to Sinai. Haupt (*ZATW.* 1909, p. 286) pronounces these verses an interpolation, and adds, "Zur Zeit Deborahs war der Gott Israels nicht Yahwe." This view demands, the excision of Yahweh not merely in vv. 4-5, but also in vv. 2. 3. 9. 11. 13. 23. 31. Meyer feels this to be impossible, and therefore claims that the northern tribes had a pre-Mosaic worship of Yahweh that they had brought from Sinai. If, as we have just seen, the Rachel tribes were in Egypt, and if Moses brought them to Sinai, there is no reason to assume that Deborah's connection of Yahweh with Sinai dates from the pre-Mosaic period.

All the traditions connect the ark with Sinai. According to J (Ex. 33 2), Yahweh would not leave Sinai, but sent his angel, the ark, to be his visible representative (cf. Jud. 2 1. 5). The ark accompanied Israel on its march from Sinai (Num. 10 33. 35). Here and always the ark is called the "ark of Yahweh." In later times it was the possession of the tribe of Ephraim, and was kept at Shiloh (I Sam. 3 3 E; 4 3 J). This indicates clearly that Ephraim was at Sinai. The priesthood at Shiloh that had the custody of the ark claimed a forefather (Moses, or Aaron?) who had taken part in the exodus (I Sam. 2 27). One of the members of this priesthood bore the Egyptian name Phinehas (I Sam. 4 11), doubtless inherited from his forefather of the period of the exodus (Ex. 6 25).

Finally, attention should be called to the way in which Ps. 80 1. 2. 8 connects the exodus with the tribes of Joseph: "Thou that ledest Joseph like a flock; thou that sittest upon

the cherubim, shine forth. Before Ephraim, Benjamin, and Manasseh, stir up thy might . . . Thou broughtest a vine out of Egypt: thou didst drive out the nations, and plantedst it."

4. *When was Israel in Egypt?*—I Ki. 6 1 states that the building of the Temple was begun in the fourth year of Solomon, 480 years after the going out from Egypt. Following the larger figures given for the kings of Judah, Ussher reached 1011 B.C. as the date of the building of the Temple, and adding 480, reached 1491 B.C. as the date of the exodus. Following the shorter chronology demanded by the reigns of the kings of Israel and the Assyrian data, we obtain 967 as the date of the Temple and 1447 as the date of the exodus. On the other hand, if we follow the chronology of the Book of Judges, we reach at least 1520 as the year of the exodus. This difference from the date of Kings can perhaps be removed by recognizing that the Minor Judges formed no part of the Deuteronomic Book of Judges, and that therefore the years of their rule are not to be counted in making up totals.

The 480 years of I Ki. 6 1 seems to come from the hand of the Deuteronomic editor of Kings, and it is doubtful whether it embodies any ancient tradition. The number itself is suspicious, being composed of 12×40 . This seems to show that there was a tradition of twelve generations from the exodus to the Temple, and this is confirmed by the genealogies in Gen. 36 31-39 and I Chr. 6 4-9; but forty years is too large an estimate for a generation. The average of the kings of Judah and of the kings of Babylon during the first three dynasties is twenty years. Assuming twelve generations of twenty years each, we should obtain $967 + 240 = 1207$ as the date of the exodus.

Another method of computing the date is to reckon downward from Abram. In Gen. 14, a chapter of uncertain origin and doubtful historical value, Abram is made a contemporary of 'Amraphel, who is commonly believed to be identical with Hammurabi, King of Babylon, who reigned 1958—1916 B.C. (Meyer). If we assume that Abram's migration (Gen. 12 4) was synchronous with the beginning of Hammurabi's reign, we obtain 1958 minus 25 (Gen. 21 5), minus 60 (Gen. 25 26), minus 130 (Gen. 47 9), minus 430 (Ex. 12 40) = 1313 as the date of the

exodus; or, if we follow the text of the LXX. in Ex. 12 40, which gives 430 years from Abram's coming into Canaan to the going out from Egypt, we get 1528 as the date of the exodus. These figures are all derived from P, and it is doubtful whether they have any historical value. In Gen. 15 13 the sojourn in Egypt is estimated at 400 years. In Gen. 15 16 E says that the Hebrews shall return from Egypt in the fourth generation. Similarly in Ex. 2 1 (E) Moses' father marries the own daughter of Levi, and in Ex. 1 6. 8 (J) the Pharaoh of the oppression lived in the next generation after Joseph. The older sources, accordingly, seem to have assumed a much shorter period for the sojourn in Egypt than is assumed by P. The genealogies of the different tribes allow from four to eight generations.

A new basis for the chronology has been found in recent times in Naville's identification of Pithom, the store-city that the Hebrews built for Pharaoh according to Ex. 1 11 (J). In 1883 in excavating the mound of Tell el-Maskhuta Naville found the name of the place Pi-Tum and the cartouche of Ramses II. This together with Ramses, the name of the other store-city built by the Hebrews, seems to indicate that Ramses II (1292—1225) was the Pharaoh of the oppression. The Pharaoh of the exodus was then one of his successors, either his son Merneptah (1225—1215), or a still later monarch.

It will be noted that the Biblical chronological data point in two directions. Part of them place the exodus in the eighteenth dynasty, and part in the nineteenth. It is an interesting question whether this difference has anything to do with the two groups in which, according to our older sources, the Hebrews entered Canaan.

II. The Extra-Biblical Sources.

a. *The classical writers.*—Manetho, as cited by Josephus (*Cont. Apionem*, i, 26. 27), assigned the exodus to the reign of a certain Amenophis. Since his father was Ramses, and his son Sethos, who was also called Ramses; it has generally been supposed that by Amenophis Manetho meant Merneptah. Others think that Amenophis IV was meant. The same view is found in Chaeremon of Naucratis and Lysimachus of Alexandria, who

also are quoted by Josephus (*Cont. Ap.* i, 32. 34); and in Hecataeus of Abdera (Müller, *Frag. Hist. Graec.*, frag. 13), who also depends on Manetho.

Josephus himself and Ptolemaeus Mendesius held that the exodus was to be identified with the expulsion of the Hyksos by Amosis, the first king of the eighteenth dynasty (1580—1557 B.C.), and this view was general among the Alexandrian Jews and the Alexandrian Church Fathers. It is doubtful whether any historical value attaches to these legends. It is noteworthy, however, that they point in the same directions as the Biblical data, namely, to an exodus under the eighteenth dynasty, or under the nineteenth.

b. *The evidence of archaeology.*—The facts in outline are as follows:

About 1780 Egypt was conquered by the Hyksos, a nomadic people from the north, who ruled for two centuries. One of the Hyksos Pharaohs bore the name *Jacob-her*, or possibly *Jacob-el* (Breasted, *Hist.* p. 220). The Hyksos were finally expelled by Ahmose I, the founder of the glorious eighteenth dynasty (1580 B.C.). Under his successors Palestine and Syria were conquered and made Egyptian provinces, and the Egyptian arms were carried far into Mesopotamia. Thutmose III (c. 1500 B.C.) in his list of conquered tribes mentions *Y(a)-^ʿq(e)-b-^ʿâ-ra* and *Y(a)-ša-p-^ʿ(e)-ra*. There is general agreement that the first represents יַעֲקֹב־אֵל, Jacob-el; and competent authorities, such as Groff, Meyer, Müller, Maspero, Sayce, Kittel and Prášek, hold that the second represents יוֹסֵף־אֵל, Joseph-el. Here apparently are the Hebrew tribes Jacob and Joseph in Canaan as early as 1500. Whether Simeon is to be found in *Sha-ma-na* (No. 35 in the list of Thutmose) is very doubtful.

In the fifteenth century the Aramaean migration began. The Amarna letters show that about 1400, during the reigns of the Pharaohs Amenhotep III and Amenhotep IV, Canaan was invaded by a people called the Ḫabiru (Ḫabiru is the nominative, Ḫabiri the oblique case; Knudtzon, p. 45). Sayce, Halévy, Müller and Obbink regard the name as a denominative from *ḫabar*, "bind," and think that it means only "allies." Sayce (*Exp. Times*, 1904, p. 282) holds that the Ḫabiru were Hittites;

Halévy (*J. Asiat.* 1891, p. 547), that they were Cassites. This view is precluded by the fact that in two cases the determinative *KI* for "land" is appended to the name (Knudtzon, p. 46; Böhl, p. 89), which shows that the Ḫabiru were a race. Eerdmans thinks that Ḫabiru = Ḫawiru = Ḫâru, or Canaan, as it was called by the Egyptians; but *b* never represents *w* in the Amarna letters, and the Ḫabiru are evidently invaders. Phonetically Ḫabiru may be Ḫeber, a clan of Asher (Gen. 46 17); or 'Ēpher, a Midianite clan (Gen. 25 4); or Ḫēpher (I Ki. 4 10); or 'Ēber, 'Ibrî, "Hebrew."

So long as the Ḫabiru were named only in the letters from Jerusalem and it was doubtful whether they were to be identified with the people mentioned in the other letters under the ideographic designation *SA.GAZ*, it might be questioned which of these identifications was correct. Now, however, Winckler has shown (*MDOG.* No. 35, Dec. 1907, p. 25, note; cf. Böhl, p. 89) that in the recently discovered tablets of Boghazkiöi the terms "gods of the Ḫabiru" and gods of the *SA.GAZ* alternate. This identification shows that in the case of the Ḫabiru we are dealing with a great racial migration. The Ḫabiru, therefore, cannot be a minor clan of Asher or Midian, but can only be Hebrews (so Conder, Hommel, Zimmern, Winckler, Meyer, Knudtzon, Gemoll, Böhl, Weinheimer, Benzinger, Kittel, König, Guthe, Trampe, Haupt, Spiegelberg, Prášek, Erbt, Miketta, Lehmann-Haupt).

It must be remembered, however, that Hebrew is a wider term than Israelite. The Ḫabiru of the Amarna letters, though they may be Hebrews, are not all Israelites, for they conquer the Amorites in Lebanon, and attack the Phoenician cities, and their gods play an important part in the treaty of the Hittites with Mitanni.

On the other hand, Hebrews in Canaan are most likely Israelites, for we know no other Hebrews there; and this conclusion is confirmed by the fact that two centuries later Merneptah mentions Israel in the same region where in the Amarna letters we find the Ḫabiru (so Conder, Hommel, Meyer, Jastrow, Spiegelberg, Erbt, Miketta, Haynes, Knudtzon, Gemoll, Toffteen). Numerous efforts have been made to identify the conquests of

the Ḫabiru with the conquests narrated in Jos. and Jud., but they have not been successful. Conder thought that he found Adonisedeq, king of Jerusalem; Japhia, king of Gezer; and Jabin, king of Hazor, in the letters; but his readings have not been confirmed. The supposed mention of Judah also rests upon a misreading in the text of Winckler. Labaya can hardly equal Levi (Jastrow, p. 121), and Toffteen's identifications of Joshua, Ehud and Deborah are unconvincing. Milk-ili may be Malkiel, a clan of Asher, and Shamḫuna may be Simeon, but both are doubtful. It is a striking fact, however, that no letters come from cities that the older sources of Jos. and Jud. say expressly were captured by Israel, e. g., Jericho, Bethel, Gibeon, Shiloh and Hebron, but all come from cities that are expressly said not to have been captured. It is possible, therefore, that the Amarna letters contain the Canaanite version of Israel's conquest.

A word should be said in regard to the personal name Aḫiyami, or Aḫi-yawi in the letter found at Taanach (Sellin, *Tell Ta'annek*, p. 115). In Neo-Babylonian documents from Nippur final *Yah* or *Yahu* is represented by *Yama* = *Yawa*. This suggests that in the letter from Taanach we have a name compounded with Yahweh. If so, this favors the theory that the Ḫabiru in Canaan were Israelites.

As a result of the Ḫabiru invasion and internal disorders in Egypt, Canaan threw off Egyptian rule during the period from the death of Amenhotep IV (1358 B.C.) to the accession of Seti I of the nineteenth dynasty (1313 B.C.). The condition of Canaan at the beginning of Seti's reign is thus described in one of his inscriptions: "The vanquished Shasu (\check{S} '-sw), they plan rebellion. Their tribal chiefs are gathered together, rising against the Asiatics of Kharu (\check{H} '-rw). They have taken to quarreling and cursing, each of them slaying his neighbor, and they disregard the laws of the palace" (Breasted, *Anc. Rec.*, iii, p. 52). In this description it is impossible not to recognize the same state of affairs that is depicted in the Amarna letters. Shasu means Bedawin, and the ideogram *SA.GAZ* that is applied to the Ḫabiru is given in the syllabaries as denoting *habatum*, "robber." If the Ḫabiru are Hebrews, the Shasu of Seti I must be Hebrews also.

In the inscriptions of Seti I and Ramses II a land 'Isr' is mentioned, which Müller, Kittel, Prášek, Miketta and Meyer identify with Asher.

In the famous stele of Merneptah (1225—1215), discovered by Petrie at Thebes in 1896, occurs the first and only mention of Israel found as yet in the Egyptian records. The closing lines of the inscription are thus translated by Breasted (*Anc. Rec.* iii, p. 263): "Wasted is Tehenu (Libya), Kheta (the Hittites) are pacified, plundered is Pekanan (Canaan) with every evil, carried off is Askalon, seized upon is Gezer, Yenoam is made as a thing not existing, Israel is desolated, his seed is not; Palestine has become a widow for Egypt." There is no doubt as to the correctness of the reading "Israel." The proposal to read "Jezreel" is precluded by the determinative for "people," instead of for "city." Merneptah's campaign in Palestine is also well attested (Breasted, *o. c.*, pp. 258 ff.). Von Calice (*OLZ.* 1903, col. 224) has ingeniously suggested that the Fountain of Mineptôah (*Jos.* 15 9; 18 15) contains the name of this king and is another evidence of his conquest. From the order in which the captured towns are named in the inscription it seems as if the Israel that Merneptah encountered was settled in Central Palestine.

In a number of Egyptian texts a people called 'pw-r' are mentioned sometimes with the determinative of the Egyptian verb 'pr, "work," sometimes with the determinative for "foreign people." Chabas first suggested that this was the phonetic equivalent of 'Ibri, Hebrew. Brugsch, Wiedemann, Meyer and Müller oppose this view, claiming that the word means only "workmen"; but Heyes (pp. 146 ff.) has shown that while this translation applies to the word with the determinative for "work," it does not apply to it with the determinative for "foreign people"; and Burchardt (*Altkan. Fremdw.* II, No. 252) adds that the "syllabic" spelling indicates the adoption of a foreign name. Accordingly, there has been a tendency of late to return to the view that the 'pw-r' with foreign determinative are Hebrews (so Heyes, Hommel, König, Kittel, Eerdmans, Obbink, Driver). These people are mentioned under Thutmose III, Ramses II, Ramses III and Ramses IV as a foreign

population that executed forced labor for the Pharaohs on their public works (see Eerdmans, *A.T. Studien*, ii, pp. 52 ff.).

The archaeological facts, accordingly, point in the same two directions as the chronological indications in the Old Testament, namely, that there were Hebrews in Canaan under the eighteenth dynasty, and that Hebrews remained in Egypt as late as the nineteenth dynasty.

III. The Historical Results.

We have now gathered the pieces of our puzzle from the Old Testament and from archaeological sources, and the problem is, how to arrange them in a consistent picture.

There are three main types of theory: the first one emphasizes the data of the Bible and of archaeology that point to a conquest of Canaan under the eighteenth dynasty; the second emphasizes the data that point to a conquest under the nineteenth dynasty, and the third assumes a divided conquest, partly under the eighteenth, and partly under the nineteenth dynasty.

a. *The theory of a united conquest under the eighteenth dynasty.*—Urquhart and Hollingworth, following the chronology of the Book of Judges and of Acts 13 19 ff., reach the reigns of Thutmose II or III (1501—1447), as the date of the exodus. The Jacob-el and Joseph-el that Thutmose III found in Canaan they hold to be Israel.

Most of the advocates of an early conquest follow the 480 years of I Ki. 6 1, and assume that the exodus occurred under Amenhotep II (1448—1420), or one of his immediate successors. This is the view of Hommel, Orr, Haynes, Lieblein, Klostermann, König, Köhler, Conder, Vogel, Obbink, Miketta, Böhl. On this theory the identity of Israel with Jacob-el and Joseph-el in Thutmose III has to be denied, but Israel is equated with the Ḥabiru, the Shasu, Asher and Israel in the Amarna letters and the Egyptian inscriptions.

The chief difficulty with this hypothesis is that it is compelled to deny the testimony of Pithom and Ramses that Israel was still in Egypt as late as the reign of Ramses II. These names in Ex. 1 11 are pronounced an erroneous gloss: but Ramses is known to J also in Ex. 12 37, and it is hard to see

how a late glossator could have gained access to the information that the obscure store-city of Pithom was built at the same time as a city named after one of the Ramesids.

Moreover, the identification of the Pharaoh of the oppression with Ramses II fits well with Egyptian history. Ex. 223 says that the Pharaoh of the oppression lived long. Ramses II reigned 67 years. Throughout the eighteenth dynasty there was no fear of Semites in Egypt, for Canaan stood under Egyptian rule. Under the nineteenth dynasty, however, the Egyptian power in Palestine began to break up. Ramses II was glad to conclude a treaty of peace with the king of the Hittites for mutual defense. At this time, when Egypt's foreign possessions were menaced by other Semites, the presence of the Hebrews in Egypt might be felt to be dangerous, and repressive measures might be adopted. Ramses II is known to have been a great builder, and multitudes of Semitic slaves were employed in his works. Under his successor Merneptah the very existence of Egypt was threatened by an invasion of Libyans and Sea-Peoples, and this gave a favorable opportunity for the exodus of the Hebrews. With this accords the fact that the southward movement of the Amorites under pressure of the Hittites is first recorded by Ramses III, and that Israel found Amorite kingdoms east of the Jordan at the time of its advance upon Canaan. It is not clear, therefore, that Pithom and Ramses in Ex. 111 are an erroneous gloss.

This theory is also compelled to deny that the '*pw-r*' are Hebrews, but this denial is far from certain.

Still another formidable difficulty is that Egyptian rule in Canaan continued throughout the eighteenth dynasty, and under the first kings of the nineteenth dynasty. If Israel was settled in Canaan as early as the fifteenth century, it is surprising that no traditions of Egyptian rule in that country have survived in the Old Testament. The only Egyptian oppression that Israel remembered was the one in Egypt itself. The explanation of Haynes, that the Egyptians carried on their wars with the use of mercenaries, so that the foes of the Book of Judges were really Egyptian hirelings, is not true to the facts of Egyptian history. The attempt of Hollingworth to prove that the Book

of Judges shows knowledge of Egyptian intervention in Canaan cannot be pronounced successful.

b. *The theory of a united conquest under the nineteenth dynasty.*—Influenced by the considerations that have just been enumerated, another group of critics place the exodus under Merneptah, or one of his successors, and date the conquest somewhere about 1200. To this group belong Wellhausen, Guthe, Kautzsch, G. A. Smith, Cornill, Driver, Breasted, Ball, Fotheringham, Duncan, Hervey, McNeile, Montet, McCurdy, Sayce, Price, Wade, Oettli, Ottley, Lehmann-Haupt. Some of these critics hold that only part of Israel was in Egypt; but all think that the conquests by the Hebrew tribes were contemporaneous, or nearly so.

This theory is compelled to throw overboard the 480 years from the exodus to the Temple. Only Beecher saves it by dating Ramses II 1550 B.C., which, of course, is impossible. This theory is compelled also to get rid of Jacob-el, Joseph-el, the Ḥabiru, Shasu, Asher, and Israel in Merneptah as witnesses for an early conquest. This is accomplished in two ways:—

1. *The denial that Israel is found in Canaan before 1200.*—Jacob-el and Joseph-el in Thutmose III, it is said, have nothing to do with Israel. This is probably correct. As we saw above, Jacob and Joseph are apparently Canaanite names that were adopted by Israel after the conquest (so Guthe, Schiele, Meyer, Peters).

The denial that the Ḥabiru have anything to do with Israel is more difficult. When we meet the Ḥabiru about 1400, the Shasu and Asher about 1300, and Israel in Merneptah's inscription about 1220, it is hard to believe that there is no connection between them. Arguments may be brought against each of them individually, but these do not recognize the cumulative force of the combination. It is difficult to escape the conclusion that in the Ḥabiru migration we see the first efforts of the Hebrew tribes to gain a foothold in Canaan.

In the case of the Merneptah inscription the effort is made to show that the Israel there mentioned was settled in Egypt (Naville, Prášek, Hummelauer, Price, Fotheringham), or in the desert to the south of Canaan (Petrie, Lehmann-Haupt), but a

fair interpretation of the text does not warrant either of these opinions. The connection of Israel with Ascalon, Gezer, Yenoam and Palestine in the inscription indicates that Israel was settled in central Canaan. Schiele and Stade (*Bib. Theol.* p. 58) escape the difficulty by asserting that Israel was a Canaanite name that was not adopted by the Hebrews until after the Conquest. For this there is no proof.

2. *The identification of the early Hebrews with the Patriarchs.*—Recognizing the difficulty of explaining away the traces of Hebrews in Canaan under the eighteenth dynasty, several critics have suggested that these early Hebrews were the Patriarchs. On this theory Jacob-el, the Ḥabiru, Shasu, Asher, and Israel in Merneptah correspond with the Book of Genesis rather than with the Books of Joshua and Judges (so Kittel, Hommel, Prášek, Cornill, Burney, Driver, Haynes).

The chief objection to this view, as we saw above, is that the Book of Genesis cannot be shown to refer to an earlier period than the Books of Jos. and Jud. A further objection is, that this theory assumes that the Patriarchs were in Canaan at a time when, according to the Old Testament chronology, they were in bondage in Egypt. This difficulty is met with the assumption that only parts of the Patriarchal families went down to Egypt, while the other parts remained in Canaan; but, as we saw before, such a splitting of tribes is unnatural; we find no trace of the half-tribes in Canaan at the time of the conquest; and the only division of Israel that is known to Old Testament tradition is between Leah tribes and Rachel tribes.

In order to escape this difficulty Eerdmans assumes that the descent into Egypt did not occur until after Merneptah's mention of Israel. The Israel encountered by him was the Israel of Genesis, not that of Joshua. The Syrian usurper at the end of the nineteenth dynasty was Joseph. The exodus did not occur until the end of the twentieth dynasty, about 1100 B.C. With Israel there went out of Egypt the 'p^w-r', Hebrews, the "mixed multitude" of Ex. 12 38; hence the double tradition of the length of the stay in Egypt.

This theory is open to the same objection as the one just mentioned, that there is no satisfactory evidence of a Patri-

archal period of Hebrew history. It is compelled also to reject the testimony of Pithom and Ramses that Ramses II was the Pharaoh of the oppression. It reduces the period of the stay in Egypt to one hundred years, and it leaves only one hundred years for the period of the Judges. The non-mention of Philistines in the early part of the Book of Judges shows that the conquest cannot be placed as late as 1100, since the Philistine settlement in Canaan began in the reign of Ramses III (1198—1167 B.C.).

c. *The theory of a divided conquest.*—Since it is impossible to hold that all Israel entered Canaan under the eighteenth dynasty, or all Israel under the nineteenth dynasty, it seems necessary to think that part of the tribes effected a settlement under the eighteenth dynasty, and part later, under the nineteenth or twentieth dynasty. This theory assumes a variety of forms.

1. *The theory of Gemoll.*—Gemoll holds that the Hexateuchal traditions are of mixed origin, partly Canaanite and partly Hebrew. Only a few of the tribes of later Israel were of pure Hebrew stock, the others were Canaanites and Amorites. The Kenites, Dan, Simeon, and Levi belonged to the Hyksos population that settled in Canaan after their expulsion from Egypt. They were identical with the Ḥarri, or Aryans, of the Boghazkiöi tablets. Their god was Yahweh, who is identical with the Sanskrit fire-god Yama. The first genuine Hebrew tribes to enter Canaan were Ephraim and Manasseh, who came about 1500. They were followed about 1400 by the Zilpah tribes, who are identical with the Ḥabiru. Judah belonged to the Amorite wave of migration that entered Canaan about 1200.

This theory rests upon a fantastic combination of place-names and personal names, and is intrinsically improbable. That these heterogeneous elements, Hyksos, Hebrew and Amorite should have been fused so successfully by the time of David as to regard themselves as descended from a common ancestor; and that an Aryan god should have been adopted by Semites, and served with a purely Semitic ritual, transcends all probability.

2. *Toffteen's theory of two exodi.*—According to this the first exodus was identical with the invasion of Canaan by the Ḥabiru about 1400 B.C.; the second exodus occurred 1144 B.C. This second exodus included only Reuben, Simeon and Levi. Eli, the priest of Shiloh, and Eliezer, the son of Aaron were the same person. The two lines of priests that we find in the time of David were the descendents of the high priests of the two exodi.

This theory depends upon the assumption that the P document was written in the time of Samuel, and is just as trustworthy as J and E. Its divergences from JE are explained as due to the fact that it narrates a different exodus. Modern scholarship does not agree with Toffteen's ideas of the antiquity of P, and therefore is not likely to accept the theory that there were two exodi, that were parallel in all their main features, and that were both led by a prophet called Moses.

3. *The theory of Weinheimer.*—The theory of Weinheimer, that the Hebrews were in Egypt, but not Israel; and the kindred theory of Spiegelberg that Jacob was in Egypt, but not Israel, so that the conquest by Israel may have been earlier than the conquest by the Hebrews or by Jacob; we have already considered in connection with the sojourn in Egypt and found unsatisfactory. If the Hebrew tribes were divided in their conquest of Canaan, it can only have been along the line indicated by all the Old Testament documents, that between the Leah tribes and the Rachel tribes.

4. *The theory that the Rachel tribes settled first in Canaan.*—Those critics who hold that only the Leah tribes were in Egypt are obliged in consistency to think that the Rachel tribes were first settled in Canaan. The Pharaoh of the oppression was almost certainly Ramses II, and the exodus did not occur until the reign of Merneptah, or one of his successors; if Hebrews are found in Canaan before this time, they must have belonged to the tribes that were not in Egypt. Accordingly, Meyer, Luther, Schiele, and Haupt claim that the Rachel tribes were settled in Canaan long before the Leah tribes, and that they are to be identified with the Ḥabiru, Shasu, and Israel of Merneptah. The only support for this view, apart from theories

of the sojourn in Egypt, lies in Merneptah's use of the name "Israel." In later times this name was applied to the northern tribes in distinction from Judah, and from this it is inferred that Merneptah must have found the Rachel tribes in Canaan rather than the Leah tribes. The name "Israel" was broad enough, however, to include the northern Leah tribes, and it has not yet been proved that in early times it was not applied to the other Leah tribes also.

5. *The theory that the Leah tribes settled first in Canaan.*—Those critics who think that the weight of evidence is in favor of a sojourn of the Rachel tribes in Egypt hold that the Leah tribes made the first settlements in Canaan. In support of this opinion several arguments may be urged:—

(1) Our oldest narrative of the conquest (Jud. 1 2) declares expressly that the Leah tribes Judah and Simeon were the first to invade Canaan. Advocates of the Rachel-first theory are obliged to pronounce this a late invention designed to glorify Judah.

(2) Gen. 34 places the attack of Simeon and Levi on Shechem immediately after the arrival of Israel in Canaan.

(3) The genealogies of Genesis regard the sons of Leah as the firstborn of Israel. This can only mean that these tribes were settled first.

(4) The geographical location of the Leah tribes in two divisions, separated by the Rachel tribes, indicates most naturally a later intrusion of the Rachel tribes into Canaan.

(5) The episode of the attack of Simeon and Levi on Shechem (Gen. 34) would have been impossible after the district of Shechem had been occupied by the Rachel tribes. On the other hand, the attack on Shechem and the subsequent rising of the Canaanites against Simeon and Levi that resulted in their scattering in Israel (Gen. 34 30; 49 7) explains why the Leah tribes were split into two sections, and why the Rachel tribes were able later to gain a foothold in this region.

(6) Asher, as we have seen, is mentioned in the inscriptions of Seti I and Ramses II, Gad is spoken of in the Mesha Inscription (line 10) as the aboriginal inhabitant of the region east of the Jordan, but Asher and Gad belong to Zilpah, the

maid of Leah (Gen. 30 9-13), which indicates that the Leah tribes settled among the Asherites and Gadites before the Rachel tribes.

(7) Leah means "cow" and Rachel means "sheep." The people that breed the cow are those that have abandoned the nomadic life and have become Fellâhîn. The people that still breed the sheep are those that stand nearest to the nomadic life of the desert. The division of Israel into these two main groups suggests that the Leah tribes were the first to settle down. Haupt, who holds that the Rachel tribes settled first, is compelled to assume that the names of the mothers have been exchanged by tradition. Leah was really the mother of the Joseph tribes, and Rachel the mother of Reuben, Simeon and Levi. Rachel was represented as the mother of Joseph and Benjamin to further the political ambitions of the dynasty of David (*ZATW*. 1909, pp. 284f.). Against this hypothesis is the fact that Levi and Leah are etymologically connected, so that we cannot assign Levi to any other than the Leah group.

For these reasons it seems probable that the Leah tribes were the first to settle in Canaan. Taking all the data into consideration, one might formulate tentatively some such hypothesis as this:—Reuben, Simeon, Levi, and Judah, the older Leah tribes of the genealogies, were identical with the Ḥabiru migration. Gad and Asher, the children of Leah's handmaid Zilpah, were Canaanites, or other alien clans, that amalgamated with the Leah tribes. The younger Leah tribes, Issachar and Zebulon, were a later wave of the Ḥabiru migration, or an offshoot from the older Leah tribes. The Rachel tribes came out of Egypt under the leadership of Moses and Joshua, and about 1200 B.C. forced their way into Canaan between the two divisions of the Leah tribes. Dan and Naphtali, the children of Rachel's handmaid Bilhah, were Canaanites, or other alien clans, that were annexed by the Rachel tribes.

List of authors consulted.

- Addis, W. E., *The Documents of the Hexateuch*, 1893.
 Asmussen, P., "Die Leastämme," *ZWT*, 1893, pp. 378—415
 Bacon, B. W., *The Triple Tradition of the Exodus*, 1894.

- Baentsch, B., *Numeri*, in *Handkommentar zum Alten Testament*, 1903.
- Ball, C. J., *Light from the East*, 1899.
- Barber, J. T., "When was the Exodus," *Biblia*, 1892, pp. 65—9.
- Barnes, W. E., *The Books of Chronicles*, 1899.
- Baudissin, W. G., *Einleitung in die Bücher des Alten Testaments*, 1901.
- Beecher, W. J., *Dated Events of the Old Testament*, 1907.
- Bennett, W. H., *Joshua and the Conquest of Palestine*, n. d.
— *The Book of Joshua*, in *SBOT*, 1899.
— *Exodus*, in *New Century Bible*, 1908.
- Benzinger, I., *Geschichte Israels*, 1908.
— *Die Bücher der Chronik*, 1901.
- Bertheau, E. *Die Bücher der Chronik*,² 1873.
- Blaikie, W. G., "The Part of Judah in the Conquest of Canaan," *Exp.T.* 1894, pp. 521—22.
- Bleek, F., *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*,⁶ 1893.
- Böhl, F., *Kanaanäer und Hebräer*, 1911.
- Bönhoff, "Die Wanderung Israels in der Wüste," *Theol. Stud. u. Krit.*, 1907, pp. 159—217.
- Breasted, J. H., *Ancient Records of Egypt*, 1906—1907.
— *A History of Egypt*, 1905.
- Burney, C. F., "A Theory of the Development of Israelite Religion in Early Times," *JTS.* 1908, pp. 321—352.
- Budde, K., *Das Buch der Richter*, 1897.
- von Calice, F., "König Menephtes im Buche Josua?" *OLZ.* 1903, col. 224.
- Carpenter, J. E., *The Hexateuch*, 1900.
- Cheyne, T. K., *Traditions and Beliefs of Ancient Israel*, 1907.
— *The Two Religions of Israel*, 1911.
— *Joshua and Judges*, 1904.
- Conder, C. R., *The Tell Amarna Tablets*,² 1894.
— "The Date of the Exodus," *PEFQ.* 1896, pp. 255—258.
- Cook, S. A., *Critical Notes on Old Testament History*, 1907.
— "Simeon and Levi: the Problem of the Old Testament," *AJT.* 1909, pp. 370—88.
- Cornill, C. H., *Einleitung in die kanonischen Bücher des Alten Testaments*, 1905.

- Cornill, C. H., *History of the People of Israel*, 1898.
- Curtis, E. L., *The Books of Chronicles*, 1910.
- Delitzsch, F., *Neuer Commentar über die Genesis*, 1887.
- Dillmann, A., *Die Genesis*, 1886.
- Driver, S. R., *The Book of Genesis*,³ 1904.
 — *The Book of Exodus*, 1911.
 — *An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*, 1910.
- Duncan, J. V., *The Exploration of Egypt and the Old Testament*, 1908.
- Eerdmans, B. D., "The Hebrews in Egypt," *Expos.* 1908, pp. 193—207.
 — *Alttestamentliche Studien*, 1908—1912.
 — "Have the Hebrews been Nomads?" *Expos.* 1908, pp. 118—131.
- Encyclopaedia Biblica*, 1899—1903.
- Erbt, W., *Die Hebräer*, 1906.
 — *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Hebräer*, 1907.
- Ewald, H., *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, 1853—1865.
- Fotheringham, D. R., *Chronology of the Old Testament*, 1906.
 — "The Date of the Exodus," *Expos.* 1908, pp. 438—45.
- Fowler, H. T., *History of the Literature of Ancient Israel*, 1912.
- von Gall, A. F., *Altisraelitische Kultstätten*, 1898.
- Gemoll, M., *Grundsteine zur Geschichte Israels*, 1911.
- Glover, A. K., "Testimony of Chinese Jews as to the Date of the Exodus," *Biblia* 1894, pp. 154—5.
- Gressmann, H., "Sage und Geschichte in den Patriarchenerzählungen," *ZATW.* 1910, p. 1.
- Gray, G. B., "The List of the Twelve Tribes," *Expos.* 1905, pp. 225—40.
 — *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Numbers*, 1903.
- Greene, J. B., *The Hebrew Migration from Egypt*, 1883.
- Gunkel, H., "Agyptische Parallelen zum Alten Testament," *ZDMG.* 1909, p. 531.
 — *Handkommentar zum Alten Testament: Genesis*, 1901.
- Gustavs, A., "Abd-hiba = Put-i-Hepa," *Or. Lit.* 1911, col. 341—343.

- Guthe, D. H., *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, 1899.
- Hastings, J., *Dictionary of the Bible*, 1899—1904.
- Haupt, P., "The Burning Bush and the Origin of Judaism," *Proc. Am. Phil. Ass.* 1909, p. 368.
- "Die Posaunen von Jericho," *WZKM.* 1909, pp. 355—65.
- "Der Durchzug der Hebräer durch das Rote Meer," *OLZ.* 1909, col. 245—48.
- "Der Palmenhain am Roten Meer," *OLZ.* 1909, col. 248.
- "Midian und Sinai," *ZDMG.* 1909, pp. 506—30.
- "Lea und Rahel," *ZATW.* 1909, pp. 281—86.
- Haynes, A. E., "The Date of the Exodus," *PEFQ.* 1896, pp. 245—58.
- Hervey, A. C., "The Sojourn of the Israelites in Egypt," *Expos.* 1893, pp. 446—55.
- Heyes, *Bibel und Ägypten*, 1904.
- Hollingsworth, E. W., "The Date of the Exodus," *P. S. Bibl. Arch.* 1911, pp. 46—50.
- Holzinger, H., *Das Buch Josua*, 1901.
- *Genesis*, 1898.
- *Einleitung in den Hexateuch*, 1893.
- Hommel, F., *The Ancient Hebrew Tradition*, 1897.
- "The True Date of Abraham and Moses," *Exp.T.* 1899, pp. 210—12, 278.
- Jastrow, M., "Egypt and Palestine 1400 B.C.," *JBL.* 1892, pp. 95—124; "The 'Men of Judah' in the Amarna Letters," *JBL.* 1893, pp. 61—72.
- Jeremias, A., *Das Alte Testament im Lichte des Alten Orients*, 1906.
- Kautzsch, E., *Die Heilige Schrift des Alten Testaments*, 1896.
- Keil, C., *Biblischer Commentar über Josua, Richter*, 1863.
- Kent, C. F., *Narratives of the Beginnings of Hebrew History*, 1904.
- Kittel, R., *Die Bücher der Chronik*, 1902.
- *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*,² 1909—1912.
- Klostermann, A., *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, 1896.
- Knudtzon, J. A., *Die El-Amarna Tafeln*, 1907—1912.
- König, E., *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, 1893.
- *Geschichte des Reiches Gottes*, 1908.

- Kuenen, A., *Historisch-Critisch Onderzoek*, 1887.
- Lehmann-Haupt, C. F., *Israel, seine Entwicklung im Rahmen der Weltgeschichte*, 1911.
- Lewis, A. L., "The Place of the Exodus in the History of Egypt," *Scrib.* 1894, pp. 109—17; cf. *PSBA.* 1893, pp. 423f.
- Lieblein, J., "L'exode des Hébreux," *SBA.* 1898, pp. 277—88.
- Macclear, G. H., *The Book of Joshua*, 1885.
- McCurdy, J. F., *History, Prophecy and the Monuments*, 1896—1901.
- McNeile, A. H., *The Book of Exodus*, 1908.
- Maspero, G., *Histoire Ancienne des Peuples de l'Orient Classique*, 1897—99.
- Matthes, J. C., "Israëls nedersetting in Kanaän," *Theol. Tijd.* 1902, pp. 517—540.
- Meyer, E., "Kritik der Berichte über die Eroberung Palästinas," *ZATW.* 1881, pp. 117—146.
- *Aegyptische Chronologie*, 1904.
- *Nachträge zur ägyptischen Chronologie*, 1908.
- *Die Israeliten und ihre Nachbarstämme*, 1906.
- *Geschichte des Altertums*, 1907—1909.
- Miketta, K., *Der Pharaoh des Auszuges*, 1903.
- Montet, É., "Les Israélites en Égypte," in *Mélanges Hartwig Derenbourg*, 1909.
- Moore, G. F., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Judges*, 1895.
- *The Book of Judges*, 1898.
- Müller, W. M., "Aegyptologisch-Biblisches," *OLZ.* 1900, col. 325.
- Naville, E., *The Store City of Pithom and the Route of the Exodus*, 1885.
- Niebuhr, C., *Studien und Bemerkungen zur Geschichte des alten Orients*, 1894.
- *Geschichte des Ebräischen Zeitalters*, 1894.
- Obbink, H. T., "Het Exodus-Vraagstuk," *Th.T.* 1909, pp. 238—58; 1910, pp. 127—61.
- Oettli, D. S., *Geschichte Israels*, 1905.
- Orr, J., "Israel in Egypt and the Exodus," *Expositor*, 1897, pp. 161—177.

- Ottley, R. L., *A Short History of the Hebrews*, 1905.
- Palmer, E. H., *The Desert of the Exodus*, 1871.
- Paton, L. B., *The Early History of Syria and Palestine*, 1902.
- Peters, J. P., *Early Hebrew Story*, 1904.
- Petrie, W. M. F., "The Date of the Exodus," *PEFQ*. 1896, pp. 335—7.
- Prášek, "The Question of the Exodus," *ET*. 1900, pp. 205—208, 251—254, 319—322, 400—403, 503—507.
- Price, I. M., *The Monuments and the Old Testament*, 1899.
- Reuss, E., *Die Geschichte der Heiligen Schriften Alten Testaments*, 1890.
- Sachsse, E., *Die Bedeutung des Namens Israel*, 1910.
- Sayce, A. H., *The "Higher Criticism" and the Verdict of the Monuments*, 1894.
- "The Pharaoh of the Exodus," *Exp.T.* 1899, pp. 172, 303.
- Schiele, F., "War Israel in Aegypten?" *ZWTh*. 1898, pp. 1—20.
- Schmidt, N., "Kadesh Barnea," *JBL*. 1910, pp. 61—83.
- Schrader, E., *Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament*,³ 1903.
- Segond, A., "La conquête de Canaan d'après les documents bibliques," *RThQR*. 1904, pp. 350—366.
- Skinner, J., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Genesis*, 1910.
- Skipwith, G. H., "Hebrew Tribal Names and the Primitive Traditions of Israel," *JQR*. 1899, pp. 239—65.
- Smith, G. A., *Historical Geography of the Holy Land*, 1898.
- "Have the Hebrews been Nomads?" *Expos*. 1908, pp. 254—72.
- *Jerusalem*, 1908.
- Smith, H. P., *Old Testament History*, 1903.
- Spiegelberg, W., *Der Aufenthalt Israels in Aegypten*, 1904.
- Stade, B., "Lea und Rahel," *ZATW*. 1881, pp. 112—116.
- *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, 1881—1888.
- *Die Entstehung des Volkes Israel*, 1899.
- Staerk, W., *Studien zur Religions- und Sprachgeschichte des Alten Testaments*, 1899.
- Steuernagel, C., *Die Einwanderung der israelitischen Stämme in Kanaan*, 1901.

- Strack, H. L., *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, 1898.
- Toffteen, O. A., *The Historic Exodus*, 1909.
- Toy, C. H., "Israel in Egypt," *The New World*, ii, 1893, pp. 121—141.
- Trampe, E., *Syrien vor dem Eindringen der Israeliten*, 1898.
- Trumbull, *Kadesh-Barnea*, 1883.
- Völter, D., *Aegypten und die Bibel*, 1907.
- Wade, G. W., *Old Testament History*, 1908.
- Weill, R., *Le Séjour des Israélites au Désert et le Sinai*, 1909.
- "Les Hyksôs et la restauration nationale," *J. Asiat.* 1910, pp. 247—339, 507—579; 1911, pp. 5—53.
- Weinheimer, H., "Hebräer und Israeliten," *ZATW.* 1909, pp. 275—280.
- "Die Einwanderung der Hebräer und der Israeliten in Kanaan," *ZDMG.* 1912, pp. 365—388.
- Wellhausen, J., *De gentibus et familiis Judaeis*, 1870.
- *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels*, 1886.
- *Die Composition des Hexateuchs*, 1889.
- *Israelitische und Jüdische Geschichte*, 1895.
- Whitehouse, C., "Where was the Land of Goshen," *Expos.*, 1893, pp. 337—348.
- Wiedemann, N., *Geschichte von Alt-Ägypten*, 1891.
- Wildeboer, G., *Die Litteratur des Alten Testaments*, 1895.
- Winckler, H., *Geschichte Israels in Einzeldarstellungen*, 1895—1900.
- *Die Thontafeln von Tell-el-Amarna*, 1896.
- "North Arabia and the Bible a Defence," *Hibbert Jour.* 1904, pp. 571—590.
- Wright, G. H. B., *Was Israel Ever in Egypt?* 1895.