Israel and Canaan:
The Origins of a Fictitious Antagonism

The biblical picture of Israel's early history is determined by the religious and ethnic antagonism between the people of God and the other inhabitants of the country. According to this presentation, when the Israelites entered the country, they found a people already living there who were fundamentally different in their social organization, their self-understanding, and their religion.

However, this picture contains a profound contradiction. On the one hand Yahweh is supposed to have given the previous inhabitants completely and wholly into the hands of the Israelites. The immigrants are supposed to have conquered and destroyed them so that in the end the country was inhabited solely by the Israelites (Josh 11:16–23; 21:43–45). On the other hand there is a strict prohibition against having anything to do with the previous population (Exod 23:32–33; 34:12–16; Deut 7:2–5; Judg 2:2). As soon as the apartheid between Israel and Canaan threatens to break down through integration or assimilation, the unique character of God's people and its ties with the God Yahweh is in danger. This warning presupposes that non-Israelites were still resident in the country.[1]

The contradiction has not prevented the opposition between Israel and Canaan from counting for a long time as a fundamental fact, in Old Testament exegesis too, as a way of understanding the unique character of God's people and its history. If we follow Albrecht Alt, "Israel's national self-consciousness rests essentially on the conviction … that it was not indigenous in Palestine, and was completely alien to the peoples there, and indeed to the earlier native peoples in general."[2] Or in the words of Franz Böhl: "The religion of Sinai, the culture of Canaan – these were the two conflicting factors which deter-

---

[1] See Rudolf Smend, "Das Gesetz und die Völker. Ein Beitrag zur deuteronomistischen Redaktionsgeschichte," in *Probleme biblischer Theologie: Gerhard von Rad zum 70. Geburtstag* (ed. H. W. Wolff; München: Chr. Kaiser, 1971), 494–509, repr. in *Die Mitte des Alten Testaments: Exegetische Aufsätze* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002), 148–61; and idem, "Das uneroberte Land," in *Das Land Israel in biblischer Zeit* (ed. G. Strecker; GTA 25; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1983), 91–102, repr. in *Die Mitte des Alten Testaments*, 162–73.

[2] Albrecht Alt, "Israel, politische Geschichte," *RGG* (2d ed., 1929), 3:437–442, esp. 437; (3d ed., 1959), 3:936–942, esp. 936.

mine the religious history of ancient Israel … They act together in the complicated play of historical forces."[3]

In recent years there have been increasing indications that the historical reality was different. The findings of settlement archaeology exclude the complete exchange of the population.[4] The continuity in cultural history between the Late Bronze era and the Iron Age is so determinative that we are bound to conclude that the inhabitants of the kingdoms of Israel and Judah did not immigrate, but emerged from the indigenous population. The ethnic contrast which the Old Testament asserts cannot be verified. "A simple distinction into Canaanites (city dwellers belonging to the Late Bronze period) and Israelites (rural dwellers belonging to the early Iron Age) cannot be an adequate reflection of historical reality."[5]

This does not necessarily mean that the contrast between Israel and Canaan was fictitious. Without a genuine reason there would hardly have been such an emphatic warning against mixing with the country's inhabitants. But these conditions were not a historical reality in the early period before the formation of the state. It was only in the Persian epoch and afterwards, when the Jews both in Jehud and in the world wide diaspora took form as a religious community that conditions enjoined a strict demarcation from the "people of the land" for the first time. "The observant community around the Temple in Jerusalem held only a fraction of the promised land … We find the most important clues to the relationship with the surrounding 'peoples' in the measures of Ezra and Nehemiah against mixed marriages."[6] It is not by chance that the tradition that it was Ezra and Nehemiah who imposed the strict segregation from the rest of the population on the Jews has been brought forward to the fifth century (Ezra 9–10; Neh 10:30; 13:28). The distinction from "the Canaanites" is a back-projection which shifts the relationships obtaining in post-state Judaism into the fictitious formative early period of the people of God, before the monarchy was established. The antagonism between Israel and Canaan is not ethnic and social. It is primarily an ecclesiological phenomenon.

In order to see this we are not dependent on archaeology. It can be deduced from the literary history of the Old Testament.

---

[3] Franz Böhl, *Kanaanäer und Hebräer: Untersuchungen zur Vorgeschichte des Volkstums und der Religion Israels auf dem Boden Kanaans* (BWAT 9; Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1911), V.

[4] See esp. Israel Finkelstein, *The Archaeology of the Israelite Settlement* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1988); Jens Kamlah, *Der Zeraqōn-Survey 1989–1994* (ADPV 27,1; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2000).

[5] Kamlah, *Der Zeraqōn-Survey*, 175. In saying this he goes beyond Finkelstein, who initially retained the distinction between "Canaanite" city culture and "Israelite" rural settlement.

[6] Smend, "Das uneroberte Land," 96 (= 168).

Conditions in the Period of the Monarchy

The extant historical sources which date from the period of the monarchy are not aware of a distinction between Israelites and Canaanites. The population was certainly not a unity; but the dividing line ran not between members of God's people and the Canaanites but right across the country. The settlement areas of the southern Levant show a wide variety. The Ephraimitic hill country as Israel's heartland – the Jezreel plain north of it – again north of that, Galilee – in the west the coastal plain, in the east the rift valley of the Jordan, and beyond that the land of Gilead: each has its own particular character. Judah, again, was divided into the hill country, the Shephelah and the south (see Jer 32:44). Economically and in their living conditions they differ greatly, and accordingly the local form of the religion probably did so too. The topography does not permit anything other than a development within small regions. There were different dialects. Even warlike disputes are reported, such as the one between Gilead and Ephraim (Judg 12:1–6). Even the late tradition about the tribes into which the people of God was divided, preserves in its own way the recollection of an absent unity.

The only overriding factor was the monarchy. But this "umbrella" was not rooted in local conditions; it overrode them. In addition, for the longest period it was divided into the monarchies of Israel and Judah. And these two also shifted even in extent. It was only temporarily that the kings of Israel were powerful enough to control the Jezreel plain and Galilee. Judah's extension to the south and into the Shephelah to the west shifted similarly. Under these circumstances, the simple two-part division into Israel, as members of the people of God, and the Canaanites is obviously fictitious.

From the beginning Canaan was the name given to the country.[7] The earliest evidence derives from the eighteenth century B.C.E. in Mari.[8] In the fifteenth century the name is found in Alalach.[9] Originally it seems to have been the name for Phoenicia and was then transferred, *pars pro toto*, to the hinterland – similarly to the way the name of the Philistine coastal area came to be used for the whole of Palestine in Roman times. The frontiers of Canaan are not distinctly drawn. The earliest Egyptian evidence comes from a booty list of Amenophis II (1427–1401), which mentions 640 Canaanite prisoners.[10] In the fourteenth century Amarna letters, the term [matu]*ki-na-aḫ-ḫi* "land of

---

[7]   See Hans-Jürgen Zobel, "כְּנַעַן *kᵉnaʿan*; כְּנַעֲנִי *kᵉnaʿᵃnî*," *TDOT* 7:211–28; Manfred Weippert, "Kanaan," *RLA* 5:352–55; Manfred Görg, "Kanaan," *NBL* 2:438–39.

[8]   Georges Dossin, "Une mention de Cananéens dans une lettre de Mari," *Syr.* 50 (1973): 277–82.

[9]   In the autobiography of the king Idrimi, lines 18–19. See *COS* 1.148 (Tremper Longman III); *TUAT* I/5, 501–4 (Manfried Dietrich and Oswald Loretz).

[10]   *ANET*, 246 (John A. Wilson); *COS* 2.3 (James K. Hoffmeier).

Canaan" is used 12 times for the Egyptian province in the southern Levant. In the Old Testament too "the word *kᵉnaʿan* was inherently a geographical term."[11] That is shown by pre-redactional mentions: the table of the nations in Gen 10:6, 15[12] and the story of Joseph, which talks in Gen 42:7 and 45:25 about אֶרֶץ כְּנַעַן.[13] It is only later instances which are aware of the ethnic meaning, and use the gentilicium כְּנַעֲנִי. This sees the population under the aspect of its dwelling place: whoever lives in Canaan is a Canaanite.

It is wellknown that the counterpart, the name "Israel," is found for the first time on the victory stele of the Pharaoh Mer-en-ptah (1213–1203 B.C.E.), where it is used for a group of people in the southern Levant whom the Pharaoh claims to have conquered.[14] The synchronistic annals-excerpt on which the books of Kings are based provide undoubtedly early instances for "Israel" in the Old Testament. There the kingdom of Jeroboam and his successors is called Israel throughout. According to this, the kingdom established in the hill country of Ephraim took over the traditional name. We are told that the kingdom of Saul and his successors already comprised "Israel in its full extent" (יִשְׂרָאֵל כֻּלֹּה, 2 Sam 2:9). The Iron Age kingdom, however, extended beyond the heartland from the outset. Saul's rule begins with his incursion beyond the Jordan (1 Sam 11:15). This Israel was therefore a heterogeneous formation which could be defined only by listing the parts of the country which it comprised: Ephraim on the hills west of Jordan, Gilead in East Jordan, Asher in West Galilee, the plain of Jezreel, and Benjamin in the south (2 Sam 2:9). According to the credible note in 2 Sam 5:3, it was "all the elders of Israel" (כָּל־זִקְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל), who offered rule over the north to David in Hebron. But it must be remembered that information of this kind was subsequently formulated, and that the name "Israel," applied to the monarchy, designated an entity which can only have developed in the tenth century, as a result of these events. We are on more secure ground with the non-Israelite testimonies: in the ninth century "Israel" (*kurSir-ʾi-la-a-a*) is named by Shalmanesar III of Assyria in his account of the battle of Qarqar in 853 B.C.E. as the territory ruled by the Omridic kings,[15] and we find the same a few years later on the stele of Mesha of Moab.[16]

---

[11] Zobel, *TDOT* 7:216.

[12] For the original shape of the table of the nations see Christoph Levin, *Der Jahwist* (FRLANT 157; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993), 123–24.

[13] For the original shape of the story of Joseph in Gen 42 and 45 see Levin, *Der Jahwist*, 288–89 and 303.

[14] *COS* 2:6 (James K. Hoffmeier); *ANET*, 378 (John A. Wilson).

[15] *ANET*, 279 (A. Leo Oppenheim); *COS* 2.113A (K. Lawson Younger, Jr.).

[16] *ANET*, 320 (W. F. Albright); *COS* 2.23 (K. A. D. Smelik).

The earliest prophetic instances can be found in Amos, Hosea and Isaiah, in the last third of the eighth century. They also understand Israel as being the kingdom, as Leonhard Rost especially has shown.[17] The political meaning of the term emerges clearly from the phrase בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל "the house of Israel" (Hos 1:6; Isa 5:7) which is comparable with formations such as *bīt Ḥumrî* "the house of Omri," the name given by the Assyrians to the Northern kingdom, after the ruling dynasty. The vineyard poem in Isaiah presents the parallelism בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל וְאִישׁ יְהוּדָה "the house of Israel and the men of Judah" (Isa 5:7). It thereby "explicitly connects for the first time both political designations for the Northern and Southern Kingdoms into a unity."[18] The book of Amos suggests that the name was now beginning to be transferred to the population. Sayings which possibly go back to the prophet himself talk about the "Israelites" (בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל, Amos 3:12), and the "my people Israel" (עַמִּי יִשְׂרָאֵל, Amos 8:2), as well as the "virgin Israel" (בְּתוּלַת יִשְׂרָאֵל, Amos 5:2). Just as "Canaanites" subsumes the population under the aspect of its area of settlement, so "Israelites" is a designation under the aspect of its political order.[19]

Earlier exegesis believed that the ethnical interpretation of the term Israel is already evidenced in the early sources of the Old Testament, as is also the opposition between Israel and Canaan. The most prominent adherent of this view was Albrecht Alt. In his opinion, the "division which dominated the political life of Palestine in the period leading up to the formation of the Israelite states," can be found in the lists of Solomon's administrators and administrative districts 1 Kgs 4:7–19. These lists, he believes, are "the latest document testifying to the ancient dualism between tribes and cities."[20] From this Alt deduced that in the kingdom of David and Solomon "almost half of its territory and population was Canaanite, and the culturally more developed half at that. With this the old distinction between Israel and Canaan became a fundamental problem for internal politics, and in the long run it was almost

---

[17] Leonhard Rost, *Israel bei den Propheten* (BWANT 71; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1937), 105.

[18] Reinhard G. Kratz, "Israel in the Book of Isaiah," *JSOT* 31 (2006): 103–28, esp. 126. The basic component of the song consists of only vv. 1b-2 and v. 7. See Uwe Becker, *Jesaja – von der Botschaft zum Buch* (FRLANT 178; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1997), 127–34, who however sees v. 7b as a later addition, thereby depriving the parable of its point. The difficult "change of subject from 7a to 7b" (p. 129) can be explained as an explanatory link with v. 2b. There is no reason for ascribing a late date to the nucleus of the vineyard song. This is made clear by the thematic agreement with Amos 5:7, see Christoph Levin, "Das Amosbuch der Anawim," *ZTK* 94 (1997): 407–36, esp. 426–27, repr. in *Fortschreibungen: Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament* (BZAW 316; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2003), 263–90, esp. 281–82. The problem is the placing of the vineyard song before the call of Isaiah in ch. 6.

[19] See Reinhard G. Kratz, "Israel als Staat und als Volk," *ZTK* 97 (2000): 1–17.

[20] Albrecht Alt, "Israels Gaue unter Salomo" (1913), in *Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, vol. 2 (3d ed.; München: C. H. Beck, 1964), 76–89, esp. 84 and 89.

inevitable that dangerous tensions should have resulted."[21] But it can be shown that Alt read the dualism between tribes and cities into the lists.[22] And the fact that in 1 Kgs 4 "a document of great historical value has come down to us"[23] is by no means certain, in view of the lack of literary homogeneity.

Yet another instance proves to have been misinterpreted. According to Martin Noth and Albrecht Alt, the reign of Abimelech over Arumah and Shechem, about which the story in Judg 9 tells, was "a hybrid and inorganic structure."[24] For the text gives the impression that Shechem was Canaanite. They deduced from this that Abimelech's rule endured only briefly because as an Israelite he wanted to bridge the ethnic antagonism towards the Canaanites. This was "conceived on lines so remote from Israelite ideas and betraying such an overwhelmingly large Canaanite influence," that the germ of failure was inherent in it from the very beginning.[25] What speaks against such an interpretation is that in the sixth century the Deuteronomistic editor still unhesitatingly interpreted Abimelech's kingdom as being a rule "over Israel" (Judg 9:22).[26] He was aware of no ethnic antagonism.

This antagonism was interpolated into the story for the first time through a later revision, which goes back to the episode about Dinah and Shechem in Gen 34, which is set in the era of the patriarchs.[27] Here we really do find a sharper opposition between the inhabitants of the land and the forefathers of the people of Israel and their families. But it has meanwhile been shown that the Dinah story is a fictitious paradigm related to the living conditions in the Jewish community during the Second Temple period.[28] It was only the late overall view of the stories of Dinah and Abimelech that could lead to the strange impression that Shechem, the place that was so important for the

---

[21] Albrecht Alt, "Der Stadtstaat Samaria" (1954), in *Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, vol. 3 (München: C. H. Beck, 1959), 258–302, esp. 266.

[22] See Jens Kamlah's detailed discussion: "Die Liste der Regionalfürsten in 1 Kön 4,7–19 als historische Quelle für die Zeit Salomos," *BN* 106 (2001): 57–78.

[23] Alt, "Israels Gaue," 76.

[24] Martin Noth, *The History of Israel* (trans. S. Godman and P. R. Ackroyd; 2d ed.; London: Black, 1960; German original 2d ed., 1955), 153.

[25] Albrecht Alt, "The Formation of the Israelite State in Palestine," in *Essays on Old Testament History and Religion* (trans. R. A. Wilson; Oxford: Blackwell, 1966; German original 1930), 171–237, esp. 178.

[26] See Timo Veijola, *Das Königtum in der Beurteilung der deuteronomistischen Historiographie* (AASF B 198; Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1977), 107–8.

[27] The insertions of this revision, which may be described as belonging to theology of election, are to be found in Judg 9:1bβ [without לֵאמֹר], 2b, 3, 18bβ, 27bα, 28aα [only וּמִי שְׁכֶם], 28aβb, 29aβ, 45.

[28] For the late post-exilic presuppositions of Gen 34, see Christoph Levin, "Dina: Wenn die Schrift wider sich selbst lautet," in *Schriftauslegung in der Schrift: Festschrift für Odil Hannes Steck zum 65. Geburtstag* (ed. Reinhard G. Kratz et al.; BZAW 300: Berlin: de Gruyter, 2000), 61–72, repr. in *Fortschreibungen*, 49–59.

history of the Northern kingdom of Israel (see Josh 24; 1 Kgs 12), was a "Canaanite city."[29]

The idea that Israel already constituted itself as the people of God of the twelve tribes in the period before the monarchy, and as a consequence developed a self-awareness which was independent of the monarchy, and indeed opposed to it, is a biblical fiction. The most plausible attempt to make this tribal association probable by way of a historical analogy was the hypothesis about the ancient Israelite amphictyony developed by Albrecht Alt and Martin Noth.[30] But it must be viewed as having failed. For the failure there are three reasons: (1) There was no pre-deuteronomic central sanctuary. The basic precondition for an amphictyony is lacking.[31] (2) The number twelve for the tribes involved is not as constitutive in the case of the non-Israelite analogies as Noth assumed, so that the most important point of comparison falls to the ground.[32] (3) The Old Testament evidence points without exception to the later years of the Persian and Hellenistic era.[33] In spite of these obvious weaknesses, for a long time Old Testament exegesis found it hard to renounce the amphictyony hypothesis. And for good reason. We cannot expect that a comparably viable hypothesis will ever emerge. We no longer know anything about pre-state Israel.

If an institutional framework of this kind can no longer be upheld, we can only conclude that it was the monarchy which created an effective unity out of the regionally so disparate population. It is *sub specie regis* that the inhabitants which go under the name of Israel become a unified entity. The earlier view which saw Israel's unity *sub specie Dei* can well go together with this; for the Yahweh religion of the Israelites as it has been passed down by the ancient sources was the religion of the courts in Samaria and Jerusalem.

----

[29] That was the presupposition of Ernst Sellin, *Wie wurde Sichem eine israelitische Stadt?* (Leipzig: Deichert, 1922).

[30] Martin Noth, *Das System der zwölf Stämme Israels* (BWANT IV,1; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1930); see A. Graeme Auld, "Amphictyony, Question of," in *Dictionary of the Old Testament: Historical Books* (ed. B. T. Arnold and H. G. M. Williamson; Downers Grove, Ill., and Leicester: InterVarsity Press, 2005), 26–32.

[31] See Rudolf Smend, *Yahweh War and Tribal Confederation: Reflections upon Israels Earliest History* (trans. M. G. Rogers; Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1970; German original 1963).

[32] Roland de Vaux, *The Early History of Israel*, vol. 2 (trans. D. Smith; London: Darton, Longman & Todd 1978; French Original 1973), 695–715.

[33] See Christoph Levin, "Das System der zwölf Stämme Israels," in *Congress Volume Paris 1992* (ed. John A. Emerton; VTSup 61; Leiden: Brill, 1995), 163–78, repr. in *Fortschreibungen*, 111–23. Noth already saw this, but wanted to adhere to the early age of the three lists of tribes in Gen 49; Num 1 and Num 26. See his excursus pp. 122–32 in which he attempted to confute the opinion of Bruno Baentsch, *Exodus–Leviticus–Numeri* (HKAT I,1; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Rprecht, 1903), 629, and Otto Procksch, *Die Genesis* (KAT 1; Leipzig: Deichert, 1913), 501, about Num 26:5–51.

"Israel" as the Subject of the Pre-State Narrative

Even when the Israelites come forward without the king as a jointly acting subject in history, the account is still orientated towards the monarchy. The relevant accounts derive from the era of foreign rule, after Israel's monarchy had been lost. The upper class belonging to the court (from whose hands we have our literary sources) still defined itself by way of the monarchy. Its self-understanding was based on a retrospect into past conditions, and was nourished by the hope of restoring the monarchy. The link between retrospect and future expectation led to a picture of history which saw the past as the fulfilment of its own hope. This eschatologization was the most important impetus for writing history at all. A pre-monarchical epoch preceding the historical monarchy was conceived, in which the post-monarchical present was reflected. No less than seven of the nine books describing the history of God's people are set in the era before the monarchy.

The loss of the monarchy initially affected the Northern kingdom of Israel in the eighth century. We have some rudimentary knowledge of the events because there was a general flight to the south before the Assyrian deportations. Archaeology has established that there was an increase in settlement in and round about Jerusalem. Literary studies also provide evidence for the influence of the north, because the remains of the literary tradition of the Northern kingdom which have been preserved in the Old Testament were probably incorporated into the archives of the kings of Judah at this time. The refugees felt that they were strangers among the resident Judeans, and became all the more consciously "Israelite." It is conceivable that it was in these groups that the foundation for the stories about the patriarchs in the book of Genesis came into being. The stories describe the patriarchs and their families as strangers who cut themselves off from the population of the country.

In the course of time the cultural import led to a new direction in Judean politics. When the Assyrian empire collapsed in the last third of the seventh century, the king of Judah proceeded to unite the tradition of the Israelite and the Judean monarchies, avowedly on the pattern of the personal union which had existed (or was supposed to have existed) in the tenth century under David and Solomon. As soon as the previous Assyrian province of Samerina had lost its overlord, the claim may in part have become political reality. Direct sources are certainly lacking; but it is probable that Judah's expansion to the north, which we find in the Persian and Hellenistic period, began under king Josiah. That is the simplest way of explaining Deuteronomy's programme, which forbade practice of the official Yahweh cult outside Jerusalem. The pronouncement was primarily directed against the Bethel sanctuary, which at that time was on Judean territory.

On the religious level, this policy found expression in an "all-Israel ideology." It was programmatically asserted that Israel's Yahweh tradition was

identical with Judah's Yahweh tradition: "Hear, O Israel, Yahweh is our God, Yahweh as a single God" (Deut 6:4). The familiar *Sh^ema< Yiśrā<el*, read in its exact literal sense, asserts the unified identity of the God Yahweh in the sense of an all-Israelite mono-Yahwism. In this way a new All-Israel grew up on Judean foundations.

Once the Judean monarchy was also lost in the sixth century, the – now Judean – "Israelites" became the subject of the history; they were represented by the regional elders, but more especially by the court upper class, the priests and theologians. It was among these people that the beginnings of the Old Testament came into being; and their theological-political programme was all the more determined by the hope of regaining the monarchy as soon as possible. The literary expression of their hope was the first version of the so-called Deuteronomistic History. The authors shifted the conditions of their own post-monarchical present into the early period, before the monarchy had begun, so as in this way to define it as being pre-monarchical. What consequently emerged as a literary fiction was the era which we call the period of the Judges. In this section of history the Israelites are the sustaining subject; for as yet they have no king.[34] The term בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל undoubtedly means the whole population, which as such is distinguished from its surrounding enemies (אוֹיְבֵיהֶם מִסָּבִיב, Judg 2:14), by whom it is continually harried.

Among these external enemies is Jabin, the king of Canaan, whose general Sisera is supposed to have fought against the Israelites, losing the battle miserably (Judg 4:2).[35] The conflict between Israel and Canaan is (still) not seen as being an internal one. That was afterwards to change. We can meanwhile trace the foundation on which this change came about.

Israelites under Canaanites: the Era of the Patriarchs

The Yahwist's History, which also came into being soon after the violent end of the Judean monarchy, sees the Israelites as the subject of the early history. In the itinerary which leads from Egypt to the promised land, the בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל are the main actors (Exod 12:37; 14:10; 16:15, 31[Greek text]; Num 10:12). They can also simply be called יִשְׂרָאֵל (Exod 14:25; 19:2; Num 24:5). The Redaction takes over this usage and expands it (Exod 1:9, 12; 3:16, 18; 12:35; 14:10; Num 22:1).

---

[34] The records of the first redaction are Judg 2:11; 3:8, 9, 12, 14, 15, 27; 4:1, 3, 24; 6:1, 6; 10:6, 8, 10; 13:1.

[35] In Josh 11:1–14 this same Jabin of Hazor is supposed to have mustered a coalition of the kings of northern Palestine. The basic tradition, which can be found in vv. 1–8*, anticipates Judges 4 and transfers Baraks victory to the warlike occupation of the country under Joshua.

The historical position of this work can best be deduced from the fact that following the primeval history, which outlines the universal framework, all the essential events take place in a foreign land. At the beginning is the expulsion from paradise (Gen 3), which is followed almost immediately by Cain's expulsion from cultivated land (Gen 4). Abraham has to leave his father's house and his own country (Gen 12). Hagar is driven into the desert (Gen 16). Lot, as a stranger, is exposed in Sodom to the enmity of the city dwellers (Gen 19). Abraham's servant travels to Mesopotamia in order to woo a wife for Isaac (Gen 24). Because of a famine, Isaac moves to the land of the Philistines (Gen 26). Jacob flees from his brother Esau to Laban in Haran (Gen 29–35). Joseph is sold into Egypt by his brothers (Gen 39–50). There, later on, Jacob and his other sons follow him. In Egypt the people of Israel increases (Gen 46–50; Exod 1). Moses, again, has to flee to Midian because of the Pharaoh's persecution (Exod 2). The rest of the story, down to Moses's death, depicts the people in the wilderness, or before the gates to the promised land (Exod 12–Num 24; 25:1a; Deut 34). Because most of the pre-redactional sources are extant only as fragments, the work must rest on a deliberate selection. And it is clear what determined that selection: the Yahwist is writing in the situation of the exile and the diaspora.

The fate of the stranger without any rights involves many dangers. The inhabitants of Sodom surround Lot's house and seriously threaten first his guests and then himself (Gen 19). Isaac is afraid that he will be murdered by the Philistines for his wife's sake (Gen 26). Joseph is thrown into prison because of the false accusation of the Egyptian woman (Gen 39). Pharaoh wants to destroy the Israelites through the imposition of forced labour. When the attempt fails, he commands the midwives to kill the newly born sons of the Hebrews (Exod 1).

The editor's message is a reaction to this. The Yahwist liberates the God Yahweh from the fetters which have tied him to the territory of the kings of Israel and Judah. Yahweh demonstratively accompanies his adherents wherever they are. Again and again, the stories show that Yahweh as "the God of heaven" (Gen 24:3, 7) as he is now called, also has the power to support his people even outside the sphere of activity to which he had previously been restricted (see esp. Gen 26:28; 28:16; 39:2, 21, 23).

As universal God of heaven, Yahweh is the creator of the world (Gen 2). The primeval history tells that all the peoples in the world owe their origin to him (Gen 10). But soon a division develops between the people who belongs to Yahweh and the great majority of those who are far from him. The particular election already begins with the two sons of the first human beings: Yahweh accepts only Abel's sacrifice. When as a result Cain becomes a murderer, Yahweh curses him (Gen 4). The antithesis is unsurpassably heightened in the Flood: Yahweh drowns the whole of mankind; only Noah "found favor in the

eyes of Yahweh" (Gen 6:8). The wicked inhabitants of Sodom are subjected to a similar punishment when Yahweh destroys them in a rain of fire (Gen 19); and when the Egyptians pursue the Israelites Yahweh throws them into the Reed Sea (Exod 14).

In this antithesis we can again easily perceive the situation of the exile; and the Yahwistic editor also introduces it into the Abraham narratives, which are the only ones which are set throughout in Canaan. For this he invents a hitherto unknown ethnic difference. As soon as Abraham arrived in Shechem, the editor asserts that "at that time the Canaanites were in the land" (Gen 12:6) – as if the Israelites, according to the place they lived in, were not Canaanites themselves. This parenthesis has long been recognized as an addition.[36] "A later redactor – … no other than J – enlightens his readers about ownership conditions at the time."[37] The comment corresponds to the promise which immediately follows:[38] "To your descendants I will give this land" (Gen 12:7). This too was written by the Yahwist, as the introduction "then Yahweh appeared to Abraham" shows (see Gen 18:1a; 26:2aα; Exod 3:2a). The anachronistic fiction shifts into the early period the conditions under which the Jewish Temple community has lived ever since the Persian era.[39] Contrary to the narrative tradition as he received it, the patriarchs are declared to be strangers in their own country.

Here the gentilicium כְּנַעֲנִי occurs for the first time – not only in the Old Testament narrative but in the context of literary history too.[40] Here the editor could pick up the arrangement in the table of the nations, which assigns Canaan to Ham, the son of Noah (Gen 10:6), together with Kush (Ethiopia), Egypt and Put (Lybia), and declares him to be the father of Sidon and Heth (v. 15). This is entirely in line with the earlier meaning of "Canaan". The editor picks up this guideline and generalizes it: "Afterward the families of the Canaanites spread abroad" (Gen 10:18). In this way he prepares for the situation in which the patriarchs are forced to live among a foreign, indigenous majority. In the person of Shem, the oldest of Noah's sons, the "father of all the children of Eber" (Gen 10:21), the group of people who belong to Yahweh stands over against the sons of Ham. It is here that the antagonism between Israel and Canaan has its beginning.

From the very outset the contrast is drawn with relentless rigor – in exemplary fashion in the scene about Noah's drunkenness after the Flood

---

[36] Hermann Gunkel, *Genesis* (trans. M. E. Biddle; Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press, 1997; German original 3d ed., 1910), 163: "V 6b … is a gloss."

[37] Rudolf Kilian, *Die vorpriesterlichen Abrahamsüberlieferungen literarkritisch und traditionsgeschichtlich untersucht* (BBB 24; Bonn: Hanstein, 1966), 3–4.

[38] See August Dillmann, *Die Genesis* (6th ed.; KEH 11; Leipzig: Hirzel, 1892), 225.

[39] See Levin, *Der Jahwist*, 415–17.

[40] See Levin, *Der Jahwist*, 403.

(Gen 9:20–27),[41] in which Canaan is cursed: "Cursed be Canaan; a slave of slaves shall he be to his brothers." The brief story is a complete invention on the part of the editor, and is among other things an imitation of the tradition about Lot's daughters (Gen 19). Although it is directed at Canaan, in the previously given framework Ham, Noah's son, is the main actor. This gross inconsistency is an indication that the goal of the editor does not fit the context. The editor has sought the reason for the curse in the sexual sector: he accuses Ham of seeing "the nakedness of his father" (v. 22a). The phrase ראה עֶרְוָה „see the nakedness" has to be read as a euphemism, like the phrase גלה עֶרְוָה „uncover the nakedness" (see Lev 20:17). It is not restricted to mere observation, but means that Ham-Canaan sexually assaulted his drunken father. The counter-example of the brothers underlines the wickedness. When Ham tells them about it, they immediately go and cover their father up, carefully avoiding looking at his nakedness as they do so. The behaviour of Shem, the forefather of the Israelites, contrasts completely with that of Ham, "the father of Canaan." Consequently Shem's descendants inherit the blessing which has been manifest ever since Abraham; but Canaan is to be subjected to a curse. The enslavement of Canaan[42] is a contrasting picture, reflecting the fate which the Israelites were forced to suffer in exile – for which their time in Egypt is a further paradigm.

The historical picture which is set in this way determines the whole of the narrative about the patriarchs. The Priestly Code has established the patriarchs in "the foreign land" (אֶרֶץ מְגֻרֵיהֶם) most distinctly.[43] „The emphasis is note-worthy with which the Priestly Code always insists on the fact that the patriarchs sojourned in a strange land, that they were *Gerim*. … It is hardly possible to reject the idea that the circumstances of the exile had some influence".[44] Had the patriarchs not been foreigners, the promise of the land would be meaningless.[45]

When Abraham and Lot's shepherds begin to quarrel about pasture, the reason given is that "at that time the Canaanites and the Perizzites dwelt in the land" (Gen 13:7). The parenthesis has also been introduced into the story sub-sequently.[46] Here we already find ourselves at a later stage than Gen. 12:6.[47] Now the non-Israelite population is no longer seen as a unity made up only of Canaanites. Abraham, being a stranger and without any civil rights, purchases

---

[41] See Levin, *Der Jahwist*, 118–20.

[42] This is further underlined in Gen 9:26–27 in two later expansions.

[43] Gen 17:8; 28:4; 36:7; 37:1; Exod 6:4.

[44] Julius Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Israel* (trans. J. S. Black and A. Menzies; Edinburgh: Black, 1885; German original 2nd ed., 1883), 341–42.

[45] Gen 13:15, 17; 15:7, 18; 17:8; 24:7; 26:3, 4; 28:4, 13; 35:12; 48:4; 50:24.

[46] Gunkel, *Genesis*, 173: "V 7b, like 12:6b, is probably a gloss and stands at the wrong place." See also Kilian, *Abrahamsüberlieferungen*, 19.

[47] See Levin, *Der Jahwist*, 145.

the cave for Sarah's burial place from the Hittites (Gen 23 P[S]). Hivites (Gen 34:2; 36:2) and Horites (Gen 36:20) are mentioned too. This is the foundation for the stereotype lists of the foreign peoples.

In the conditions of the exile, segregation from the people of the country becomes the precondition for a distinct identity. Abraham strictly forbids his servant to take a daughter of the Canaanites as wife for his son. The explicit prohibition has been interpolated both into Gen. 24:3b J and into v. 37b J, as is evident from the syntax.[48] Isaac repeats this prohibition to Jacob, when he sends him to Mesopotamia, to Laban (Gen 28:2–3, 6 P). Esau serves as a warning counter-example. He marries Hittite women belonging to the daughters of the country (Gen 26:34; 27:46 P). When Judah takes as wife a Canaanite woman, the daughter of Shua (Gen 38:2 R[S]), Yahweh disapproves of the son of the marriage, ʿEr, and lets him die (v. 7).[49] There is another case of a mixed marriage when Shechem, the son of the Hivite Hamor, the country's ruling prince, wants to marry Dinah, Jacob's daughter (Gen 34 R[S]). Simeon and Levi, as Jacob's sons, take a bloody revenge for the offence, which contravenes the prohibition against mixed marriage Exod 34:15–16; Deut 7:2–3.[50] During the whole era of the patriarchs, the Canaanites count as being the country's inhabitants.

Yahwist and Deuteronomist

The fiction of a patriarchal era, then, maintains that Abraham and his descendents immigrated into the country, and lived there as aliens; and in a similar way the Deuteronomistic History also precedes the monarchy and the pre-monarchical era of the Judges by the period during which the land was conquered. Since the Deuteronomistic History – in accordance with the historical reality in the time of the monarchies – presupposes that all inhabitants of the country were considered as Israelites, the outcome of the description had to be that the immigrating Israelites drove out the previous inhabitants. "The conquest of the promised land … had to be national, total and radical. That is to say, it had to take in the whole country and the hitherto

---

[48] The introductory כִּי (not כִּי־אָם!) in v. 4, which the Masoretic text has preserved, follows וְאַשְׁבִּיעֶךָ v. 3aα. The same is true of אִם־לֹא (not כִּי אָם!) in v. 38 following v. 37a. See Levin, *Jahwist*, 186.

[49] See Christoph Levin, "Tamar erhält ihr Recht (Genesis 38)," in *Diasynchron. Beiträge zur Exegese, Theologie und Rezeption der Hebräischen Bibel. Walter Dietrich zum 65. Geburtstag* (ed. R. Hunziker-Rodewald and Th. Naumann; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2009), 279–98, repr. in *Verheißung und Rechtfertigung: Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament*, vol. 2 (BZAW 431; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2013), 124–43.

[50] The story itself is ambivalent, cf. Levin, "Dina" (see n. 28).

existing population had to be got rid of."[51] This is the way the older version which one reads in the first half of the book of Joshua tells the story. Under Joshua's leadership, the cities of Jericho (Josh 2 and 6) and Ai (Josh 8) are conquered and destroyed, and their inhabitants slain. These examples are followed by the conquest of the whole of the south (Josh 10) and the whole of the north (Josh 11). The accounts show signs of having been greatly expanded at a later point.[52] In its original form, the history probably contained little more than the narrative nucleus of Josh 2; 6; and 8. At the end it is established in Josh 11:16–23 that Joshua took possession of the whole country: "And the land had rest from war" (Josh 11:23b). With this sentence "Dtr. has already … mentioned the distribution of the conquered area among the tribes – briefly, to be sure, but in terms suggesting that he has finished with the topic."[53] The sequel follows in Josh 24:28:[54] "And Joshua sent the people away, every man to his inheritance." After that we are told of Joshua's death, and with that the period of the Judges begins: "And the people served Yahweh all the days of Joshua. … And Joshua the son of Nun … died at the age of one hundred and ten years. And they buried him within the bounds of his inheritance in Timnath-heres, in the hill country of Ephraim, north of the mountain of Gaash. … And the people of Israel did what was evil in the sight of Yahweh …" (Judg 2:7a, 8*, 9, 11a).[55]

Today the allocation of the the country has been interpolated in Josh 13–22, between the end of the conquest and the dismissal of the people. As Martin Noth clearly saw, it is as a whole a later interpolation.[56] The beginning in Josh 13:1 sees the death of Joshua as being immediately imminent, and wishes to delay it in the interests of sharing out the country. The model is the aged Abraham in Gen 24:1. This shows that on this level the literary horizon already includes the Tetrateuch. Joshua's farewell speech in Josh 23 picks up what is said in 13:1, thus showing itself to be later. The parallel scene in 24:1–27 cannot be part of the earliest material either. The same is true of the account of the conquest of the country in Judges 1, which picks up the death

---

[51] Albrecht Alt according to the account of Smend, "Das uneroberte Land," 93 (= 164–65).

[52] Among the expansions is the curious tradition Josh 9:3–27 that through a compact with the Israelites Gibeon escaped death. It is obvious that this story is told as an anticipation of the prohibition in Judg 2:1–5.

[53] Martin Noth, *The Deuteronomistic History* (trans. J. Doull et al.; JSOTSup 15; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1981; German original 1943), 40.

[54] The summary in Josh 21:43–45 may be an early interpolation between 11:23 and 24:28. It does not belong to the earliest thread.

[55] Today the note is repeated in anticipation in Josh 24:29–31, as a close to the book of Joshua or to the Hexateuch. The original sequence emerges from the resumptive repetition of Josh 24:28 in Judg 2:6.

[56] Loc. cit.

of Joshua (Josh 1:1 → Judg 1:1) and hence presupposes the secondary division of the books of Joshua and Judges. In these interpolations the concept about the occupation of the country changes, step by step. Now we are no longer told that the whole of the country was conquered. "The redactional texts about the unconquered land do not derive from the author of the Deuteronomistic History, but are the work of later hands."[57]

This change has to do with both actual experiences in the post-exilic period and with the literary composition. The purposes of the two redactions which are behind the nucleus of the Enneateuch's historical narrative contradict each other diametrically. The foundation of the books Genesis to Numbers, which derives from the Yahwistic redaction, preaches the omnipresence of the God Yahweh, who can be worshipped in any given place (see Exod 20:24). This redaction was writing for the diaspora, which was now beginning. The books of Joshua to Kings, which form the Deuteronomistic History, on the other hand, zealously promote the centralization of the cult, according to Deut 12. This redaction was writing in Judah, and propagates the restoration of the monarchy and the rebuilding of the Temple. Just how deep the contrast between these two different purposes is, is best shown by the curious compromise which the Priestly Code later hit upon, when it transformed the central sanctuary into a tent, in order to move it into the diaspora.

This finally confutes the opinion, which is occasionally voiced, that the Yahwist and the Deuteronomist are identical, or built on one another. The Enneateuch is a structure consisting of two parts, standing on two separate foundations. According to Wellhausen, the Yahwist's work ends in Num 24, and possibly included the death of Moses in Deut 34: "It is worth mentioning that after Balaam's blessing J suddenly breaks off. It is only in 25:1–5 and Deut 34 that we might perhaps find some traces of this glorious narrative book."[58] Recent investigations confirm this observation. The Yahwist's last great narrative unit is Num 22–24.[59] The itinerary of the journeyings through the wilderness, the traces of which can be found in Num 20:1, ends in Num 25:1a, which can be continued through Deut 34:5*, 6*:[60] "And the people stayed in Kadesh; and Miriam died there, and was buried there. And Israel dwelt in Shittim; and Moses died there, and was buried."[61] Reinhard Kratz has drawn attention to the fact that it is precisely at this point that the account

---

[57] Smend, "Das uneroberte Land," 94 (= 165).

[58] Julius Wellhausen, *Die Composition des Hexateuchs* (4th ed.; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1963; orig. pub. 1876–78), 116.

[59] See Levin, *Der Jahwist*, 50 and 372–73; and idem, "The Yahwist: The Earliest Editor in the Pentateuch," above 1–23.

[60] See Reinhard G. Kratz, *The Composition of the Narrative Books of the Old Testament* (trans. J. Bowden; London: T&T Clark, 2005; German original 2000), 125.

[61] From Num 20:1b emerges that the narrative thread continues in Num 25:1a; Deut 34:5*, 6*.

about the settlement in Josh 2:1 joins on. The episode in Shittim takes up the account of the journey in the wilderness in Num 25:1a in order to continue it.[62] It is probable that this represents the literary "join" between the Yahwistic and the Deuteronomistic redactions. This also means that Deuteronomy only intervened at a later point.

The link between the Yahwist and Deuteronomist now brings about the clash we have already described between the two opposing ideas about the country's population. That means that "a new active entity appears: the inhabitants of the country who have remained in Canaan *side by side* with Israel."[63] The first text to react to this is probably the speech of Yahweh's angel in Judg 2:1–5. Erhard Blum has here rightly perceived a crucial text which knots together the Tetrateuch and the historical books. The scene does not join on to the preceding text Judg 1, where Joshua is already dead; it links up with Josh 24:28. That is shown by the cast back in v. 6: "Joshua dismissed the people, and the people of Israel went each to his inheritance to take possession of the land." The heart of the speech comprises only the remembrance of the promise, and the commandment in no case to associate with the inhabitants of the country: "The angel of Yahweh went up from Gilgal … and he said: I brought you up from Egypt, and brought you in the land which I swore to give to your fathers. … And you shall make no covenant with the inhabitants of his land; you shall break down their altars" (Judg 2:1a*, bα, 2a).[64] This is a pointer to the Yahwist's version of the story about the Exodus. The angel, as a figure in which Yahweh manifests himself, is characteristic of the Yahwist (Gen 16:9, 10; 24:7; Exod 3:2).[65] The most important manifestation of this kind is at the burning bush (Exod 3), and it is precisely this to which the angel's speech refers. It begins with the quotation from Exod 3:17: "I will bring you up out of the affliction of Egypt." The reminiscence is so close that even the Hebrew imperfect (= future) has been retained, although the promise is not repeated – only its fulfilment is established; but that as much word for word as possible.

The reminder of the saving act which has taken place is followed by the admonition not to enter into any alliance with the people of the country, indeed to destroy their cultic places. Just as in the Yahwist's stories about the

---

[62] Reinhard G. Kratz, "Der vor- und der nachpriesterschriftliche Hexateuch," in *Abschied vom Jahwisten* (ed. J. Ch. Gertz et al.; BZAW 315, Berlin: de Gruyter, 2002), 295–323, esp. 316–22.

[63] Erhard Blum, "Der kompositionelle Knoten am Übergang von Josua zu Richter: Ein Entflechtungsvorschlag," in *Deuteronomy and Deuteronomic Literature: Festschrift Chris H. W. Brekelmans* (ed. M. Vervenne and J. Lust; BETL 133; Leuven: Peeters, 1997), 181–212, esp. 187.

[64] For the analysis see Mareike Rake, *"Juda wird aufsteigen!" Untersuchungen zum ersten Kapitel des Richterbuches* (BZAW 367; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2006), 119.

[65] Levin, *Der Jahwist*, 404.

patriarchs, the Israelites are to cut themselves off strictly from the other inhabitants of the country, which are now supposed to exist. But *in the first place* the angel's command touches on the cult. And here a fundamental difference appears: Abraham and Jacob sacrifice to Yahweh at the sanctuaries in the country (Gen 12:7–8; 13:18; 28:10–19), but the Israelites are to destroy the altars of the country's population. This is a tribute paid to the goal of the Deuteronomistic History. In Judg 2:1–2* the theological programmes of the two histories meet for the first time and are interwoven, but not without tension.

The Developed Concept

What was initiated in Judg 2:1–2* was afterwards increasingly developed further. Here three motifs are in the foreground: (1) How extensive were the parts of the country which were not occupied? (2) How are the Israelites supposed to behave towards the people of the country who have remained there? (3) Why had Yahweh failed to fulfil the promise of the land completely?

(1) The most important document showing that the land had not been completely occupied, but was partly still inhabited by the Canaanites, is held to be the so-called *negatives Besitzverzeichnis* in Judg 1:21, 27–35, i.e., the list of notes which place on record the failures of the tribes in their attempt to settle Canaan.[66] This had a key importance for Albrecht Alt's picture of the history. It is from the settlement geography indicated there that the cultural and religious antagonism between Israelites and Canaanites can most clearly be deduced. The idea of a northern and a southern cordon of "Canaanite" city states has its textual basis here. The *Verzeichnis* or "list" genre seems to speak in favor of the source's reliability.

But it can be shown that this list is not a literary unity and that hence the essential precondition for seeing it as an already existing part of the tradition is lacking. "No two of these … notes are constructed alike."[67] The beginning was probably the statement in Judg 1:21, according to which the Benjaminites did not conquer Jerusalem.[68] This reservation follows the tradition in 2 Sam 5:6–9 which tells that Jerusalem was conquered by David. This was the nucleus out of which the list of other cities which remained unconquered developed, step by step.[69]

---

[66] See the recent thorough investigation by Rake, *"Juda wird aufsteigen!"*, 21–73.

[67] A. Graeme Auld, "Judges I and History: A Reconsideration," *VT* 25 (1975): 261–85, esp. 279.

[68] Thus Rake, loc. cit. She assumes, however, that the parallel note in Josh 15:63 is prior.

[69] The notes in Judg 1:21, 27–29, 34–35 have secondary parallels in Josh 15:63; 17:11–12; 16:10, and 19:47–48 (Greek text) in the lists of the allotted territory. The fact that Judg

The whole chapter depends on the present heading to the book, which imitates the heading of the book of Joshua and therefore goes together with the subsequent division of the books of Joshua and Judges. Josh 1:1 looks back to the death of Moses, and in the same way Judg 1:1 looks back to the death of Joshua. Because there is no official successor, the Israelites act as a unified subject, as they do in the rest of the book of Judges too, and they turn to Yahweh. The question put to God has its model in David's campaign in 2 Sam 2. Like that, Judges 1 has to do with the conquest of Hebron and later of Jerusalem. But the influence of the Jahwist's narrative about the patriarchs can also be detected. Eduard Meyer's hypothesis that in Judg 1 we have the Yahwist's account of the settlement, has certainly long been rejected, and for good reason; but it was based on certain clues.[70] The "Canaanites and Perizzites" as inhabitants of the country (vv. 4, 5) are unmistakeably based on Gen 13:7 (cf. 34:30). In this pair of nations we can also detect the basic for of the stereotyped lists of nations: "Canaanites, Hittites, Amorites, Perizzites, Hivites, Jebusites." The first of these can be found in Exod 3:8, but all the examples[71] "prove … without exception to be interpolations, or belong to the latest parts of the Jehovistic-Deuteronomistic history."[72] From now on the occupation means either having to drive out the previous inhabitants or having to separate from them completely.

The listing of the unconquered country in Judges 1 suggests the historical circumstances of the Persian era. It documents the claim to parts of the country which the Israelites did not at that time in fact possess: the plain of Jezreel and the coastal plain (v. 27), West Galilee (v. 31) and the Shephelah (v. 29). Somewhat less incomplete, but on the other hand more extensive in its claim, is the list Judg 3:1–3 (and parallel Josh 13:2–6) which assigns the land of the Philistines, Phoenicia and the Lebanon to the land of the promise which had not been completely conquered – regions, that is to say, which have never belonged to the country of Israel. The most extensive claim is made in the late summary in Gen 15:18–21, where the promised land comprises the whole Syro-Palestinian land bridge from the Nile (נְהַר מִצְרַיִם) to the Euphrates (הַנָּהָר הַגָּדֹל).[73] We are reminded here of the fiction about David's empire in 2 Sam

---

1:30–33 no longer has any such parallels is due to the circumstance that this part of the list was added later. See Rake, ibid., 60–62.

[70] Eduard Meyer, "Kritik der Berichte über die Eroberung Palaestinas (Num. 20,14 bis Jud. 2,5)," *ZAW* 1 (1881): 117–46, esp. 133–41.

[71] Gen 10:16–18; 15:19–21; Exod 3:8, 17; 13:5; 23:23, 28; 33:2; 34:11; Num 13:29; Deut 7:1; 20:17; Josh 3:10; 9:1; 11:3; 12:8; 24:11; Judg 3:5; 1 Kgs 9:20; Ezra 9:1; Neh 9:8; 1 Chr 1:14; 8:7.

[72] Meyer, loc. cit., 125.

[73] See Christoph Levin, "Jahwe und Abraham im Dialog: Genesis 15," in *Gott und Mensch im Dialog: Festschrift Otto Kaiser* (ed. M. Witte; BZAW 345/I; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2004), 237–57, esp. 250, repr. in *Verheißung und Rechtfertigung*, 80–102, esp. 95.

8:1–14, though this is admittedly no longer based on the promise of the land, and where the problem about cohabitation with the existing population therefore does not arise.

The account which presents Israel as having shared its own area of settlement with foreign peoples can only be traced up to the beginning of the book of Judges. The note in Judg 3:1–6 is the last trace of this kind. Neither the period of the Judges nor the era of the monarchy could have been described if this was the presupposition. That is again evidence that the motif has one of its origins in the secondary combination of the Enneateuch.

(2) Starting from Judg 2:1–2a*, the relationship to the inhabitants of the country was determined by the command for a strict separation, so that Israel's own identity might be preserved. From the beginning the separation acquired a religious significance in the narrower sense, since Judg 2:2a relates it to the centralization of the cult, according to Deut 12: "You shall break down their altars."

The motif has been picked up and deepened several times. The earliest parallel is to be found in Deut 7: "When Yahweh your God brings you into the land which you are entering to take possession of it, and clears away many nations before you, then you shall make no covenant with them. But thus shall you deal with them: you shall break down their altars, and dash in pieces their pillars, and hew down their Asherim, and burn their graven images with fire. For you are a people holy to Yahweh your God" (vv. 1abα*, 2bβ, 5–6a). The secondary nature of this version can be detected from the contradiction that Yahweh is going to destroy the peoples completely, but that any alliance with them is nevertheless forbidden. The command to destroy the altars is not given in the singular form of address, like the rest of the text, but shifts into the plural, because Judg 2:2 is quoted. Now it is not longer only the altars which are to be destroyed but the Asherim and "graven images" of their gods as well.

This motif recurs in Exodos 34. After the sin with "the Golden calf," Yahweh, on Moses's intervention, resolves to forgive the people and to make a new covenant with them. Its condition was originally: "Observe what I command you this day. You shall make for yourselves no molten gods" (Exod 34:11a, 17). This instruction has been supplemented from Deut 7:2, for good reason: "Take heed to yourself, lest you make a covenant with the inhabitants of the land whither you go. You shall tear down their altars, and break their pillars, and cut down their Asherim" (Exod 34:12a, 13).

Afterwards it was obvious that the prohibition of an alliance with the inhabitants of the country must affect not only the cultic places but idolatry too. For this purpose the prohibition of any alliance is given specific form in the prohibition of intermarriage. The earliest evidence for this prohibition is found in the Yahwist, in the story about the wooing of a bride for Isaac Gen 24 (im-

plicitly in vv. 4 and 38, in the pre-redactional source; explicitly in vv. 3 and 37, at the hand of the redaction). It is picked up in Deut 7 and linked with the prohibition of alliance in Judg 2:2: "You shall not make marriages with them, giving your daughter to his son or taking his daughter for your son. For he would turn away your son from following me, to serve other gods" (vv. 3–4a).

This prohibition is then also taken up in Exod 34:15a, 16: "Take heed to yourself, lest you make a covenant with the inhabitants of the land and take of their daughters for your sons, and their daughters play the harlot after their gods and make your sons play the harlot after their gods." It is now unmistakeably clear that the contamination with the inhabitants of the land leads to an infringement of the First Commandment, and hence to the surrender of Judaism's religious identity. Exod 23:23–25a, 32–33 and Judg 3:6 also presuppose this interpretation. Later it was actually given concrete form in Exod 34:15b: "Take heed to yourself … when they play the harlot after their gods and sacrifice to their gods and one invites you, you eat of his sacrifice." The infringement of this prohibition is subsequently added in Num 25:1b–5, right at the end of the earlier Tetrateuch: "And the people began to play the harlot with the daughters of Moab. These invited the people to the sacrifices of their gods, and the people ate, and bowed down to their gods. So Israel yoked himself to Baal of Peor. And the anger of Yahweh was kindled against Israel; and Yahweh said to Moses, Take all the chiefs of the people, and hang them in the sun before Yahweh, that the fierce anger of Yahweh may turn away from Israel. And Moses said to the judges of Israel, Every one of you slay his men who have yoked themselves to Baal of Peor." Here the cross reference to Ezra 9–10 makes it quite clear that this touches the nerve of the post-exilic community.

(3) This example also shows the theological assessment. In line with the principle that *in quo quis peccaverit in eo punietur*, the uncompleted occupation of the country is explained by saying that the Israelites did not drive out the inhabitants but became involved with them. This is the later reproach in Judg 2:2b, to which the people react with weeping and a penitential ritual. The logical problem which thereby arises is less important than the theological solution. This – read as a threat – was also a way of explaining the final loss of the country and the exile: "If you turn back, and join the remnant of these nations left here among you, and make marriages with them, so that you marry their women and they yours, know assuredly that Yahweh your God will not continue to drive out these nations before you; but they shall be a snare and a trap for you, a scourge on your sides, and thorns in your eyes, till you perish from off this good land which Yahweh your God has given you" (Josh 23:12–13). The foreign peoples now count as the instrument by means of which Yahweh tests the faithfulness of his people (see also Judg 3:4).

Later this interpretation was felt to be too hard, and the attempt was made to soften it by flimsy means: Yahweh did not drive out the peoples immediate-

ly but only gradually (Exod 23:30; Deut 7:22), so that the wild beasts were not able to multiply; for at the beginning there were too few Israelites. Another solution was that the Israelites were first of all supposed to learn the practice of war from the previous inhabitants (Judg 3:2).[74] All this shows how difficult it was to link the idea about the incomplete occupation with the early period. But it is also evidence that this touched on what was a vital problem for the community of the Second Temple.

---

[74] See Smend, "Das uneroberte Land," 97–99 (= 169–71).