

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Expositor* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php

THE BOOK OF JUDGES.¹

My object in these lectures is, firstly, to explain the general structure, and the character, of the Book of Judges, and to distinguish the different elements of which it consists; secondly, to point out the main principles, exegetical, historical, and critical, which should regulate our study of it; and, thirdly, to apply these principles to one or two of the leading narratives of the book. The principles which I shall make use of are such as, *mutatis mutandis*, apply to other books of the Old Testament, especially the historical books: so I hope that what I say may be of use to some of those who hear me, when their studies take them beyond the limits of the particular book with which I am now dealing.

Exegesis, including the settlement and interpretation of the text, comes first. Those not conversant with Hebrew must take as their basis the Revised Version. In using the Revised Version, the first point to attend to, not only in Judges but in every other book, is to ascertain, where there is a marginal rendering, whether the text or the margin deserves to be preferred. Sometimes the margin is inferior to the text, sometimes it is much superior, sometimes there is a real ambiguity in the original, and either rendering is possible. The plan to be followed is to ascertain from a trustworthy Commentary which is preferable, to put a

¹ This and the following articles on the same subject are based on some lectures given in December, 1906, in the Jerusalem Chamber, Westminster, for the Central Society of Sacred Study, and in part repeated (though not *verbatim*) at a meeting of clergy in Oxford, July, 1911.

line for future use against the margins which deserve the preference, and to strike through those which may be neglected. I must not say more to-day upon the margins : I have discussed them more fully in the Introduction to my edition of *Job in the Revised Version*, published in 1906, pp. xxiv.-xxxiii. In the paper which is in your hands,¹ which I hope may be useful to some of those studying the book, I have divided the margins in the Book of Judges into classes, distinguishing those which have a claim to be adopted in preference to the renderings of the text.

But there is one thing that must not be forgotten. The reader who wishes to know what the Old Testament really says and means must get behind even the Revised Version. Superior as the Revised Version is to the Authorized Version, the circumstances under which it was produced prevented it from being as complete and satisfactory as it might be. There is much in the Old Testament which even in the Revised Version is obscure and difficult to the ordinary reader ; and nothing would contribute more to make the Bible, especially in its poetical parts, more readable and intelligible, and in consequence more generally read, than, it is to be feared, it often now is, than an accurate and clear translation, free from obsolete and misleading archaisms, and made from the best text available—whether the current Hebrew text, or from a text emended from the Versions, or even sometimes from conjecture. Of course in emendation, judgement must be employed ; but while it is true that sometimes the Old Testament has been emended upon insufficient or arbitrary grounds, it is also true that there are undoubtedly in the Old Testament a large number of corrupt passages, and that very many of these can be emended satisfactorily with both certainty and safety, and with manifest improvement to the sense. People dread

¹ Reprinted in the *Expository Times*, xviii. (April, 1907), p. 331 f.

disturbing the English of the Authorized Version ; and yet, if the Bible is to be understood, as it should be understood, the English of the Authorized Version must be disturbed. It is, however, undoubtedly true that, if the English Bible is to be a national Bible worthy of its place in the national literature, the purity and beauty of its idiom should be jealously guarded. But there is no reason whatever why an accurate and clear translation of the Old Testament should not be made, as flowing, and rhythmical, and idiomatic, and dignified, as the language of the Authorized Version itself. Churchmen have a claim that the translation of the Bible placed in their hands by the Church should be the clearest and the most accurate, consistently with classical idiom, that can be made ; and to produce such a translation is one of the most pressing duties which lie upon the Biblical scholar of the present day. I have made an attempt to do this for a single book in the translation in my *Book of Jeremiah*, to the Preface of which I venture to refer those who desire a fuller discussion of the subject. In the paper to which I have already referred I have given specimens—not, be it observed, an exhaustive list—partly of improved renderings, and partly of improved readings, in the Book of Judges, which are really essential if the passages in question are to be understood. Meanwhile, till such a translation as I have spoken of is available, I recommend the plan of taking an edition of the Revised Version with a wide margin, striking out the margins which may be disregarded, marking those which should be adopted, and inserting the improved renderings and readings recommended in a good Commentary.

The Book of Judges cannot in many parts be properly understood without a constant reference to the *map* ; and though all places mentioned in it are not certain, a sufficient number are so for great light to be thrown upon many

narratives by the use of the map. Dean Stanley in his *Sinai and Palestine*, written for a former generation, and George Adam Smith, in his *Historical Geography of the Holy Land*, written more recently, both illustrate brilliantly the bearings of the geography upon the history, and teach the need of habitually referring to the map, if an Old Testament narrative—such as that of Barak, or Gideon, or Samson, or David—is to be intelligently followed. The best map of Modern Palestine is, of course, the inch to the mile one, published by the Palestine Exploration Fund. This, however, is in a number of sheets, and expensive. G. A. Smith's large "Topographical and Physical Map of Palestine" (4 miles to an inch) is to be much recommended. It is on a sufficiently large scale, and has the great advantage of showing the elevations by different shading, so that heights and depressions are at once discernible to the eye. The separate maps of Judah, Samaria and Galilee in the *Historical Geography of the Holy Land* are on the same scale; but they do not include the whole country, or extend to East Jordan. A convenient map for ordinary use is the 1s. one in Murray's "Classical Maps": this also shows the elevations, though the scale is of course smaller. But in mentioning this map, I must add a caution. It abounds in imaginary sites; and except in well known places, such as Bethlehem or Hebron, you must never adopt a single site without ascertaining from a good Commentary,¹ or the *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, whether the identification rests upon a sound basis. This is sometimes a laborious process: but it is indispensable. The P. E. F. maps of *modern* Palestine are of the highest excellence; and where the old names have been preserved, or Eusebius

¹ The best English Commentary on the Book of Judges is the masterly one by G. F. Moore (T. & T. Clark). Those who desire a shorter and simpler commentary will find the one in the *Century Bible*, by G. W. Thatcher, useful.

has given trustworthy statements in his *Onomasticon*, there is no difficulty: but where this is not the case, the site can only be recovered, if it can be recovered at all, by conjecture. The conjecture which is mostly resorted to takes as its starting point a superficial similarity between the ancient name, and the name of a modern place; and unsound philology plays a large part in evolving the result. Men who are good surveyors, it must be remembered, are not necessarily good scholars.¹ Hence most current maps of Palestine include many most questionable and uncertain sites. Maps said to be "according to the P. E. F. Survey" are no better than others: the "Survey" relates only to the physical geography and topography of the country, and is admirable: the *ancient* sites marked on such a map are no part of the "Survey"; they are *added* to what is strictly determined by the survey, and often, as I have just said, rest on a most precarious basis. Those who desire illustrations of this I may refer to two articles in the *Expository Times* for August and September, 1910, where, starting with Luhith and Jazer in Isaiah xv.-xvi., I have taken a number of names, and shown how uncertain and contradictory the proposed identifications are. From some inscrutable cause, though presumably through the fault of the engraver, such identifications have even found their way into G. A. Smith's map (e.g. Luhith). I append in a footnote a list of various questionable or uncertain sites of places mentioned in the Book of Judges.² The maps in the *Encyclopaedia Biblica* are above reproach.

¹ On the principles which should regulate the identification of modern Arabic with ancient Hebrew place-names, the scholarly articles of Kampffmeyer in *ZDPV*, xv. 1-33, 65-116, xvi. 1-71, should be consulted.

² Ibleam (i. 27; identical with *Bileam*, a little N.E. of Dothan); Kitron (i. 30); Nahalol [=Nahallal, Josh. xix. 15 A.V.] (i. 30); Ahlab and Rehob (i. 31); Beth-shemesh (i. 33); Shaalhim (i. 35); ascent of Akrabim (i. 36); Timnath-heres (in Josh. xxiv. 30 Timnath-serah) (ii. 9; probably the Tibneh 10 miles N.W. of Bethel); Gaash (ii. 9); Ophrah

One more point remains to be considered. In studying any history, our first aim must be to determine, as far as we can, the nature and value of our sources, and especially to remember that the greatest importance is to be attached to the older sources, to those which, if not contemporary (which is the ideal of a historical document), are the nearest that we can get to the events described. We must endeavour in the same way to discover which are the oldest parts of the Book of Judges.

The period of history with which the Book of Judges deals was an important one. It was the formative period of the nation's history, when it was settling down in Canaan, developing its civilization, and acquiring its social, political, and religious characteristics. The period of migration, and of the first conquests, was over, the more settled organization of the monarchy was not yet begun. The book opens (i. 1–ii. 5) with an account of the occupation of the interior of W. Palestine by the several tribes, their successes and failures to get command of the country: then (ii. 6–ch. xvi.) it gives a picture of the period following, by describing the exploits of the twelve "Judges" from whom the book derives its name: it closes (chs. xvii.–xxi.) with an appendix, describing not the exploits of any judge, but two incidents of interest belonging to the period. The book

(vi. 11); Beth-shittah and Abel-meholah (vii. 22: at *'Ain Helweh*; but *helweh*, "sweet," has no connexion with *meholah*, "dance"); Beth-barah (vii. 24); the Rock Oreb (vii. 25); Succoth and Penuel (viii. 14, 17: see my *Genesis*, p. 301 *sq.*); Arumah (ix. 41); Zalmon (ix. 48); Mizpeh (xi. 29); Zaphon (xii. 1 R.V. m.); Etam (xv. 8; in spite of "went down," *Beit 'Atab*, the site marked, is many hundred feet *above* either Timnah or Zorah); Kiriath-jearim (xviii. 12: far more probably *Karyet el-'Enab* than *'Erma*; the Arabic *'Erma*, with radical *m*, has nothing to do with the Hebrew *ye'arim*, in which *m* is the mark of the plural); Beth-Rehob (xviii. 28); Gibeah (distinct from *Geba*, as Isa. x. 29 clearly shows: should be marked at *Tell el-Fil*, 2½ miles N. of Jerusalem); Baal Tamar (xx. 33). On Jabesh in Gilead (xxi. 8) see *DB.* and *Enc. Bibl.*, s.v. In some maps some of these places are marked with a (?); but in others any such warning as this is deemed superfluous.

then falls into three clearly defined parts ; and I propose to say something about each of these.

I. The conquests and settlements of the tribes in Canaan (i. 1-ii. 5). We read here first of successes in the *south* (*vv.* 1-21). Judah and Simeon make a united attempt to acquire a territory, and gain various successes ; in particular, Caleb takes Hebron for Judah, and Othniel Debir, both on the high central ground of Judah. But they only gain the hill-country ; they cannot gain possession of the plains on the West, because the Canaanites have chariots of iron ; and (*vv.* 29, 35) Canaanite or Amorite strongholds (Gezer, Mount Heres, Aijalon. and Shaalbim) separate Judah from the tribes on its North. Then we pass to the *centre* of Palestine (*vv.* 22-9), where, however, we have only fragments of tradition ; Beth-el is conquered, but not Gezer (13 miles W.N.W. of Jerusalem) : Joshua xvii. 14-18, narrating the expansion of the " House of Joseph," seems evidently the sequel to this (see p. 400). Verse 27 is historically important : the Canaanites retain a belt of fortresses on the South of the Great Plain (of Megiddo), Beth-shean, Ibleam, Taanach, Megiddo, and Dor, and cut off the Central tribes from those of the North. Then we pass to the *North* of Canaan (*vv.* 30-33) ; and learn how Zebulun, Asher, and Naphtali fail to expel the Canaanites, though they oblige them to do forced labour. Verses 34-5 show how on the West the Amorites forced the Danites up into the hill-country, and retained Aijalon (13 miles N.W. of Jerusalem). Jerusalem, as is well known, remained Jebusite till David's time. ii. 1*a* and 5*b* describe how Israel's official centre was now transferred from Gilgal in the Jordan-valley to Bethel (10 miles N. of Jerusalem). In forming a picture of Israel at this period, we should not neglect the Blessing attributed to Jacob in Genesis xlix. : for this reflects the character, and geographical position, of the various tribes in (at least

mostly) this period. The history of Israel thus starts with three isolated groups of tribes, all imperfectly masters of the country, in the South, the Centre, and the North of Palestine, respectively.

By Judges i. 1a all this is assigned to the age *after* Joshua. But there is no reasonable doubt that i. 1a is an editorial addition, and that in reality the whole section is an account of the conquest of Canaan, *parallel to that in* Joshua vii.—xxi. The Israelites are still in the Jordan-valley (i. 16), at Gilgal (ii. 1), whence they “go up” (i. 1b) into the high central ground of Palestine, to effect its conquest. Then, as the following synoptic table will show, several parts of Judges i. are identical with parts of Joshua: in particular, the conquest of Hebron and Debir, which is here, by i. 1, assigned to the period after the death of Joshua, is there placed during his lifetime. We may therefore take it that Judges i. 1b—ii. 5 relates in fact to what happened during the lifetime of Joshua.

Early Account of the Occupation of Canaan by the Israelites.

JUDGES I.

JOSHUA.

¹ *And * it came to pass, after the death of Joshua, and the children of Israel asked of Yahweh, saying, Who shall go up for us first against the Canaanites, to fight against them? * And Yahweh said, Judah shall go up: behold, I have delivered the land into his hand. * And Judah said unto Simeon his brother, Come up with me into my lot, that we may fight against the Canaanites; and I likewise will go with thee into thy lot. So Simeon went with him.*

* Passages in italics, there are reasons to suppose (see the Commentaries of Moore or Thatcher), are editorial additions, or (Judges i. 21) alterations. Comp. G. A. Smith, in *Hastings' D.B.* ii. 784b, *note*.

4 And Judah went up: and Yahweh delivered the Canaanites and the Perizzites into their hand: and they smote of them in Bezek ten thousand men. 5 And they found Adoni-bezek in Bezek: and they fought against him, and they smote the Canaanites and the Perizzites. 6 But Adoni-bezek fled; and they pursued after him, and caught him, and cut off his thumbs and his great toes. 7 And Adoni-bezek said, Threescore and ten kings, having their thumbs and their great toes cut off, picked up (their food) under my table: as I have done, so God hath requited me. And they ^a brought him to Jerusalem, and he died there. 8 And the children of Judah fought against Jerusalem, and took it, and smote it with the edge of the sword, and set the city on fire. 9 And afterwards the children of Judah went down to fight against the Canaanites that dwelt in the hill-country, and in the South, and in the lowland.^b 10 And Yahweh was with Judah; and he dispossessed (the inhabitants of) the hill country; for there was no dispossessing^c the inhabitants of the vale,^d because they had

^a I.e. Adoni-bezek's men.

^b Districts of Judah. See the enumeration of cities belonging to each in Joshua xv. 48-60, 21-32, 33-44, respectively. On the "South," or Negeb, of Judah, comp. Genesis xii. 9 R.V. m.; and see Cheyne's art. NEGBE in the *Encycl. Bibl.* (with Map). On the "lowland," or Shephélah, see the writer's art. PLAIN, § 7, in Hastings' *Dict. of the Bible* (iii. 893 f.).

^c The Hebrew is unusual, and against the analogy of early prose (*Tenses*, § 202. 2; GK. § 114 m). Probably כָּלָה has dropped out; and we should read (as Josh. xv. 63, xvii. 17), *he could not dispossess*.

^d The Philistine plain, on the West of Judah.

chariots of iron. ²¹ And the Jebusites that inhabited Jerusalem the children of *Benjamin* ^a did not dispossess: but the Jebusites dwelt with the children of *Benjamin* ^a in Jerusalem, unto this day.

²⁰ And they gave to Caleb Hebron, as Moses had bidden; ^b

and he dispossessed the three sons of the Anak from thence, ¹⁰ [*And Judah went against the Canaanites who dwell in Hebron (now the name of Hebron beforetime was Kiriath-Arba)* ^c; and they smote]

Sheshai, and Ahiman, and Talmai. ^f

¹¹ And he went thence against the inhabitants of Debir (now the name of Debir beforetime was Kiriath-sepher).

¹⁵ ⁶³ And as for the Jebusites that inhabited Jerusalem, the children of Judah could not dispossess them: but the Jebusites dwelt with the children of Judah in Jerusalem, unto this day.

¹⁵ ¹³ And unto Caleb the son of Jephunneh ^c he gave a *portion among the children of Judah, according to the commandment of Yahweh to Joshua, even Kiriath (i.e. the city of) -Arba, the father of the Anak* ^d (the same is Hebron). ^e ¹⁴ And Caleb dispossessed the three sons of the Anak from thence,

Sheshai, and Ahiman, and Talmai, ^f the children of the Anak

¹⁵ And he went up thence against the inhabitants of Debir (now the name of Debir beforetime was Kiriath-sepher).

^a An alteration, made doubtless by a later hand, to bring the passage into agreement with Joshua xv. 8, xviii. 16, 28 (all P), according to which the boundary between Benjamin and Judah ran *south* of Jerusalem, and Jerusalem belonged consequently to Benjamin.

^b See Joshua xiv. 9 (comparing Numb. xiv. 24, Deut. i. 36).

^c Originally, 'he gave Hebron' (with, or without, as *Moses had bidden*), as in Judges i. 20. Comp. Joshua xiv. 13 (in the Deuteronomizing account of the request made by Caleb to Joshua, *vv.* 6-15): "And Joshua blessed him; and he gave Hebron unto Caleb the son of Jephunneh for an inheritance." The words italicized have strong marks of the style of P; and will be the introduction to verses 14-19, written by the compiler who united P with JE.

^d The name in the Hebrew has the *article*, showing it to be a *collective* term, denoting not an individual, but a *tribe* or *people*.

^e Comp. Joshua xiv. 15: Now the name of Hebron beforetime was Kiriath-Arba (see on this name Burney, *Journ. Theol. Stud.* xii. 118 f.).

^f Contrast Joshua x. 36, 37 (the conquest effected by "Joshua and all Israel"); cf. xi. 20.

¹² And Caleb said, He that smiteth Kiriath-sepher, and taketh it, to him will I give Achsah my daughter to wife. ¹³ And Othniel the son of Kenaz, Caleb's younger brother, took it :^a and he gave him Achsah his daughter to wife. ¹⁴ And it came to pass, when she came (unto him), that she moved him to ask of her father a field : and she lighted down from off her ass ; and Caleb said unto her, ¹⁴ What wouldest thou ? And she said unto him, Give me a present :^b since thou hast set me in the land of the South, give me springs of water. And Caleb gave her the upper springs and the nether springs.

¹⁵ And the children of ° Hovab,° the Kenite, Moses' father in law, went up out of the city of palm trees^c with the children of Judah into the wilderness of Judah, which is in the South of Arad ° ; and they went and dwelt with the ° Amalekites.° ¹⁶ And the border of the^d Edomites^e was from the Ascent of Scorpions, from the cliff, and upwards.

¹⁷ And Judah went with Simeon his brother, and they

¹⁶ And Caleb said, He that smiteth Kiriath-sepher, and taketh it, to him will I give Achsah my daughter to wife. ¹⁷ And Othniel the son of Kenaz, Caleb's brother, took it :^a and he gave him Achsah his daughter to wife. ¹⁸ And it came to pass, when she came (unto him), that she moved him to ask of her father a field : and she lighted down from off her ass ; and Caleb said unto her, What wouldest thou ? ¹⁹ And she said, Give me a present :^b since thou hast set me in the land of the South, give me springs of water. And he gave her the upper springs and the nether springs.

Comp. Numb. xxi. 3b : And

^a Contrast Joshua x. 38, 39 ; xi. 20 (the conquest effected by "Joshua and all Israel").

^b Heb. *a blessing*, a "present" being so called from the good wishes of which it is the expression. So in 1 Sam. xxx. 26 A.V. ; and in R.V. 1 Sam. xxv. 27, 2 Kings v. 15 (with "Heb. *blessing*" on the margin). In Gen. xxxiii. 11 R.V. has *gift* (with *blessing* on the margin).

^c So LXX (MSS.).

^d Jericho. See Deuteronomy xxxiv. 3 ; 2 Chronicles xxviii. 15 ; and cf. ch. iii. 13.

^e Or the *Negeb of Arad*. Comp. 1 Samuel xxvii. 10, xxx. 14 (which show that different districts of the Negeb went by different names).

^f So after MSS. of the LXX.

smote the Canaanites that inhabited Zephath, and banned it. And the name of the city was called Hormah.* ¹⁸ *And Judah took Gaza with the border thereof, and Ashkelon with the border thereof, and Ekron with the border thereof.*

²² And the house of Joseph, they also went up against Beth-el: and Yahweh was with them. ²³ And the house of Joseph sent to spy out Beth-el. (Now the name of the city beforetime was Luz.) ²⁴ And the watchers saw a man come forth out of the city, and they said unto him, Shew us, we pray thee, the entrance into the city, and we will deal kindly with thee. ²⁵ And he showed them the entrance into the city, and they smote the city with the edge of the sword; but they let the man go and all his family. ²⁶ And the man went into the land of the Hittites, and built a city, and called the name thereof Luz: which is the name thereof unto this day.

²⁷ And Manasseh did not dispossess (the inhabitants of) Beth-shean and her daughters,^o or (of) Taanach and her daughters, or the inhabitants of Dor and her daughters, or the inhabitants of Ibleam and her daughters, or the inhabitants of Megiddo and her daughters;

they banned them (the Canaanites of Arad) and their cities; and the name of the place was called Hormah.^b

17 ¹¹ And there belonged to Manasseh in Issachar and in Asher Beth-shean and her daughters,^o and Ibleam and her daughters, and the (אנני) inhabitants of Dor and her daughters, *and the inhabitants of En-dor and her daughters*, and the inhabitants of Taanach and her daughters

* i.e. *Banning*. See Hastings' *D.B.* i. 534.

^b A good example of a double tradition of the origin of a name. Cf. p. 398, n.*.

^o Fig. for *dependent villages*. So Numbers xxi. 25, 32, Joshua xv. 28 (read, with LXX, *and her daughters for and Biziothiah*), 45, 47, Judges xi. 26, and elsewhere.

but the Canaanites would dwell in this land.

²⁸ And it came to pass, when

Israel was waxen strong, that they set the Canaanites to taskwork, and did not utterly dispossess them.

²⁹ And Ephraim dispossessed not the Canaanites that dwelt in Gezer ; but the Canaanites dwelt in the midst of them, in Gezer.

ters, and the inhabitants of Megiddo and her daughters, (even) the three heights. ¹³ Yet the children of Manasseh could not dispossess (the inhabitants of) these cities ; but the Canaanites would dwell in this land.

¹³ And it came to pass, when the children of Israel were waxen strong, that they put the Canaanites to taskwork, and did not utterly dispossess them.

¹⁶ ¹⁰ And they dispossessed not the Canaanites that dwelt in Gezer : but the Canaanites dwelt in the midst of Ephraim, unto this day, and became servants to do taskwork.

¹⁷ ¹⁴ And the children of Joseph spake unto Joshua, saying, Why hast thou given me but one lot and one line for an inheritance, seeing I am a great people, forasmuch as hitherto Yahweh hath blessed me ?

¹⁵ And Joshua said unto them, If thou be a great people, get thee up to the forest, and cut down for thyself there in the land of the Perizzites and of the Rephaim ; since the hill country of Ephraim crampeth * thee. ¹⁶ And the children of Joseph said, The hill country is not enough for us : and all the Canaanites that dwell in the land of the vale have chariots of iron, both they who are in Beth-shean and her daughters, and they who are in the vale of Jezreel. ¹⁷ And Joshua spake unto the house of Joseph, to Ephraim and to Manasseh, saying, Thou art a great people, and hast great

* The Hebrew is unusual.

power : thou shalt not have one lot only : ¹⁸ but the hill country [? *insert* : of Gilead] shall be thine ; for it is a forest, and thou shalt cut it down, and the goings out thereof shall be thine : for thou wilt dispossess the Canaanites, though they have chariots of iron, seeing they be strong. [? Numb. xxxii. 39. And the children of Machir, the son of Manasseh, went to Gilead, and took it, and dispossessed the Amorites which were therein. ⁴⁰ *And Moses gave Gilead to Machir, the son of Manasseh ; and he dwelt therein.* ⁴¹ And Jair, the son of Manasseh, went and took their tent - villages, and called them the Tent-villages of Jair.* ⁴² And Nobah went, and took Kenath, and her daughters, and called it Nobah, after his own name.] Joshua 13.¹³ Yet the children of Israel dispossessed not the Geshurites, or the Maacathites ; ^b but Geshur and Maacah dwelt in the midst of Israel, unto this day.

³⁰ Zebulun dispossessed not the inhabitants of Kitron, or the inhabitants of Nahalol ; but the Cananites dwelt among them, and became subject to task-work.

³¹ Asher dispossessed not the inhabitants of Acco, or the inhabitants of Zidon, or of Mahleb,^c or Achzib, or Helbah,

* In Judges x. 4 these Tent-villages are said to have been named after the *judge* Jair, because his sons lived in them.

^b On the E. of the upper Jordan : see Joshua xiii. 11 ; 2 Samuel x. 6, 8, xv. 8 ; and cf. 2 Samuel iii. 3 (Maacah, the home of Absalom's mother), xiii. 37, xiv. 23, 32.

^c See the note of Budde (in his Commentary on Judges), or Kittel (*Bibl. Hebr.*, both here and on Joshua xix. 29).

or Aphik, or Rehob;³² but the Asherites dwelt among the Canaanites, the inhabitants of the land: for they did not dispossess them.

³³ Naphtali dispossessed not the inhabitants of Beth-shemesh, or the inhabitants of Beth-anath; but he dwelt among the Canaanites, the inhabitants of the land: nevertheless the inhabitants of Beth-shemesh and of Beth-anath became subject to them for taskwork.

³⁴ And the Amorites forced the children of Dan into the hill country: for they did not suffer them to come down to the vale,

19 ⁴⁷ And the border of the children of Dan was too narrow for ^a them; and the children of Dan went up and fought against Leshem,^b and took it, and smote it with the edge of the sword, and possessed it, and dwelt therein, and called Leshem, Dan, after the name of Dan their father.^c

³⁵ But the Amorites would dwell in mount Heres, in Aijalon, and in Shaalbim: yet the hand of the house of Joseph prevailed, and they became subject to taskwork.

2 ^{1a} And the angel of Yahweh came up from Gilgal to Beth-el,^d
^{5b} and they sacrificed there unto Yahweh.^e

^a So after LXX (one letter different).

^b In Judges xviii. 7, 14, 27, 29 Laish. With this verse comp. the whole of Judges xviii.

^c Comp. Judges xviii. 29.

^d So after MSS. of LXX.

^e Verses 1b-5a appear to be an addition of the compiler's. With the preceding synopsis, comp. Budde, *Richter und Samuel* (1890), p. 84 ff.

Let us consider these passages somewhat more closely. As the synopsis will have shown, some are all but verbally the same in both Joshua and Judges, or only slightly altered, or adjusted, chiefly at the beginning, to fit the different places : there are also in Joshua several passages of very similar character, though not excerpted in Judges. Putting all these facts together, modern scholars generally agree that there must once have existed a *continuous account of the early achievements and failures of the various tribes*, of which parts were fitted into his narrative by the compiler of Joshua, parts excerpted by the compiler of Judges to form an introduction to his book, and parts excerpted in both books. Joshua xvii. 14–18 evidently supplements Judges i. 22–29 (both relating to the “ House of Joseph ”); and the other passages could evidently be easily worked into Judges i. It is a bold, but not improbable, conjecture of Budde’s that Numbers xxxii. 39–42 originally formed part of this account, though it has now been removed to the chapter (Numb. xxxii.), which describes the occupation of the land East of Jordan by Israel in the Mosaic age : if this conjecture is correct, the conquests mentioned will be ante-dated in Numbers xxxii.

These notices give a very different picture of the occupation of Canaan by the Israelites from that which a reader carries away from the Book of Joshua. In Joshua united Israel, under the command of Joshua, after their success at Ai (ch. viii.), in two campaigns (chs. x. xi.) conquer all Canaan from Lebanon to the southern desert, and exterminate the entire population. Joshua x. 40 describes how the population of Judah was exterminated : “ So Joshua smote all the land, the hill-country, and the South, and the lowland, and the slopes, and all their kings ; he left no survivor ; but he utterly destroyed *all that breathed*, as Yahweh, the God of Israel, had commanded ” (see Deut.

xx. 16 f.: "Thou shalt save alive nothing that breatheth, but thou shalt utterly destroy them"; cf. vii. 2); and in Joshua xi. 16 f. it is stated that from the Negeb in the far south to Baal-Gad in Lebanon all the cities, except Gibeon, were taken by Joshua, all their kings slain, their people (v. 20) utterly destroyed, and the "whole land" (v. 23) taken by him (cf. xxi. 44). The Israelites had nothing more to do, but to divide among themselves the depopulated country.

This representation contradicts all that we learn from other sources, which show that the subjugation of the land by Israel was gradual, that it was accomplished by the separate efforts of the individual tribes, and that not only were the Canaanites not extirpated, but many cities and districts remained in their hands—in Judges ix., for instance, Canaanites and Israelites are living side by side in the very heart of the land, in Shechem,—and that in fact the conquest was not complete till the age of David and Solomon (cf. 1 Kings ix. 20 f., where Solomon is said to have imposed the *corvée* upon those of the Amorites and other tribes, whom the Israelites had been "not able utterly to destroy"). The view arose in fact in an age far later than that of Joshua, when the actual historical facts had been forgotten, and when the Israelite conquest was pictured as having been completed, in the course of a couple of campaigns, by Joshua himself. The explanation of these discrepant representations, as they figure in different parts of the book of Joshua, at once appears, when the book is examined attentively. It is then seen to consist of different layers, or strata, representing different views of the history—the older narrative, commonly called JE, the Deuteronomic additions, and the sections belonging to the priestly source, P. The facts which I have just referred to, as attributing the entire conquest to Joshua, belong, not to the older narratives, but to the *Deuteronomic summaries*, which

represent Joshua's victories as having far more extensive consequences than the subsequent history shows can have been the case. The Deuteronomic writers—i.e. the writers who wrote in the spirit and from the point of view of Deuteronomy—were not, in the strict sense of the term, historians; their method was to take the older histories, and exhibit them in a new light, by making additions to them, sometimes in the form of speeches, sometimes in the form of generalizations or reflections, in which they judged the past from their own standpoint, and represented the ideas and principles which had acquired importance in their own day, as already recognized and enforced in the very beginnings of the national life. Thus the Deuteronomic additions in the Book of Joshua sometimes represent Joshua as carrying out with great zeal supposed Mosaic ordinances; sometimes, as in the cases before us, they generalize very considerably the results of his successes. Joshua x. 40 occurs in a generalizing Deuteronomic summary (x. 28-43) of the consequences of the victory at Beth-horon; and Joshua xi. 16 f. in a similar summary of the consequences, partly of the victory at the waters of Merom (xi. 10-15), and partly (xi. 16-23) of both these victories. There happens to be a peculiarly clear and instructive instance, in which we may see the original story growing under our very eyes. In Joshua xv. 14 *Caleb* smites the Anakim of Hebron; but in Judges i. 10 (see the synopsis above) *Judah* smites them, the compiler of Judges i. effecting this change of representation by removing the words of the original narrative, stating how Caleb dispossessed the three sons of the Anak, which now stand as Joshua xv. 13, to verse 20 of his own narrative, and substituting a new introduction of his own: "And *Judah* went against the Canaanites in Hebron, and *they* smote Sheshai, and Ahiman, and Talmai." What is a *personal* exploit in Joshua xv. 13 thus becomes

a tribal exploit in Judges i. 10. Then, thirdly, in Joshua x. 36 f. "Joshua and all Israel" take Hebron, and kill *every soul in it* (he "smote with the sword the king thereof, and *all the souls that were therein, he left no survivor*"). Nor is this all. In Joshua xi. 21 f. Joshua cuts off the Anakim not only from Hebron, but from "all the hill-country of Judah, and from all the hill-country of Israel." The area inhabited by the Anakim, and the exploit itself, are thus both greatly magnified: Caleb's personal exploit in Hebron is generalized, and becomes one performed by "Joshua and all Israel," not only in Hebron, but also over the entire hill-country of Canaan. Joshua x. 36 f. and xi. 21 f., it will be observed, both occur in the same generalizing summaries spoken of above.

If, however, we strip off from the Book of Joshua the *generalizing Deuteronomic additions*,¹ and disregard P's *ideal partition* of the land between the tribes² (which also presupposes the unhistorical complete conquest of the land by Joshua), then we get a narrative which is not incapable of being harmonized with Judges i. The initial stages in the conquest were taken under Joshua as leader: the capture of Ai and the victory of Beth-horon are examples. Then the action of the individual tribes begins—no doubt, in some cases (Josh. xvii. 14–18 above) under Joshua's direction. As described in Judges i., "the tribes invade the land singly or as they are united by common interest; they fight for their own hand with varying success, or settle peaceably

¹ The following is a list of the principal Deuteronomic additions in Joshua x.–xxiv. :—x. 8, 25, 28–43; xi. 2–3, 8b (from *and they smote*), 10–23; xii.; xiii. 2–6, 8–12, 14; xiv. 6–15; xviii. 7; xx. [cf. LXX] 3 ("unawares"), 4–5, 6 (from *then*); xxi. 43–5; xxiii.; xxiv. 11 ("the Amorite . . . the Jebusite"), 13, 31 [in v. 12 read *twelve* for *two*, with LXX]. See further the writer's *Introduction*, p. 104 ff. Dillmann, in his Commentary on Joshua, often calls attention to these generalizing summaries.

² Joshua xiv. 1–5; and the greater part of chs. xv.–xxi.

among the older population. Many of the larger cities, the fertile valleys, and the seaboard plain remain in the hand of the Canaanites. For long the Israelites were really masters only in the mountains of Central and Southern Canaan. Joseph was separated from Judah by the cities of the Gibeonite confederation (Josh. ix. 17), by the Amorite strongholds mentioned in Judges i. 35, and by Jerusalem; and from the Northern tribes by the belt of Canaanite fortresses, on the South of the Great Plain." But the historical sequence of events has been partly obscured, and partly transformed, by the idealizing conceptions of the past, which began in a later age, viz. "by the ascription of the doings of the several tribes to all Israel, by attributing a conquest which was really gradual and the work of many successive generations, to Joshua himself, and by the substitution of the theological ideal of a complete conquest of the country by the people of Yahweh for the sober reality."¹

We are now in a position to understand the historical importance of Judges i. Taken in conjunction with the kindred sections of the Book of Joshua, it gives us the older, more historical account of the occupation of Canaan by Israel; and it teaches us how to estimate the generalizing summaries, and ideal pictures of the partition of the conquered country, which form such a prominent feature in the existing Book of Joshua, and which are in fact the source of the ordinary popular conception of the conquest of Canaan by the Israelites. There was in reality no such "extermination of the Canaanites" as is popularly supposed.²

S. R. DRIVER.

¹ Moore, *Judges*, pp. 7-8, 10.

² On all the points discussed above, the same view, in all essentials, is maintained by G. A. Smith, in his art. JOSHUA in Hastings' *D.B.* ii. 284-7. Even Prof. Sayce, adverse as he usually is to the methods and conclusions of critics, agrees with them here: "When we come to examine