THE EMERGENCE OF ANCIENT ISRAEL: A MODEL OF COHERENCE BETWEEN ARCHAEOLOGY AND THE BIBLE

by

Jerry Keith Culbertson

A dissertation submitted for the degree of

Doctor of Theology

at the South African Theological Seminary

December 2019

Promoter: Dr WR Domeris

DECLARATION

I, the undersigned, hereby declare that the work contained in this dissertation is my own original work and has not previously in its entirety or in part been submitted to any institution for a degree.

Signed_____ Date _____

DEDICATION

I will forever cherish the loving support offered by my best friend and confidant, my wife Kathy, who allowed me to stow away in my upstairs hideaway and produce this labour of love.

Thank you so much for the time you allotted me away from you to finish this work. I affectionately dedicate this dissertation to you.

I also appreciate my sweet black Labrador Retriever, Rilee Standing Bear—who spent countless hours lying at my feet as this work took shape and finally came to fruition. Thank you buddy!

Sincerely,

Jerry Keith Culbertson

Birmingham, Alabama

2019

ABSTRACT

The question of the origin of Israel in the Land of Canaan has been debated and re-debated for at least a hundred years. The initial model (the Conquest Model) set forth by WF Albright in the 1920s dominated the biblical and archaeology scene until the 1960s. With the diminishing influence of Albright's model, two others were proffered: (1) The Peaceful Infiltration Model by A Alt and M Noth, and (2) The Peasant Revolt Model proposed by G Mendenhall and N Gottwald. Others would follow: The Symbiosis Hypothesis championed by V Fritz and I Finkelstein and the Auto-Ethnogenesis Model set forth by S Bunimovitz and Z Lederman.

As the debate heated and cooled over the years, the archaeological world came to the conclusion that archaeology had received the short-end of the stick—that is, the biblical texts (the Bible) had set the agenda and determined the interpretation of the material culture unearthed. To this end, the pendulum had not only swung in the direction of the pre-eminence of archaeology over the Bible, the effect of the swinging pendulum was to sever the Bible from the discussion almost entirely. Archaeologists who still give the Bible some credence do so with major disclaimers attached to their comments, most often noting that the stories or events were not true or historical, but did contain some memories or some kernel of truth in regard to the way the people remembered, or wanted to remember, Israel's emergence in Canaan.

This dissertation focuses on presenting archaeology and the Bible as separate yet important players in the discussion of the emergence of Israel in Canaan. It seeks to present a model (an Eclectic Model) in which the material data of archaeology and the biblical texts cohere, in that there are so many instances of convergence that it is not an either / or, but both. This work demonstrates a model of coherence between archaeology and the Bible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DECLARATION 2
DEDICATION 3
ABSTRACT 4
TABLE OF CONTENTS 5
ABBREVIATIONS 10
CHAPTER ONE 12
ARCHAEOLOGY AND THE BIBLICAL TEXT 12
1.1 Introduction to the problem—is it a worthy pursuit? 12
1.2 Is the methodology research design capable of answering the main question of the thesis? 13
1.3 Biblical exegetical study and archaeological data: Why have the two never been integrated into a single study? 13
1.4 What is the relationship of the Bible to the archaeological data? 14
1.5 Do archaeology data and biblical texts have different agendas? 15
1.6 Has every 'i' been dotted and every 't' crossed? 15
1.7 Is there a definitive answer for how Israel originated in Canaan? 16
1.8 Outline of Chapters 17
1.9 Summary of Chapter One: Archaeology and the Biblical Text 19
CHAPTER TWO 20
AN HISTORICAL SURVEY OF SCHOLARSHIP ON THE SETTLEMENT PERIOD 20
2.1 Introduction 20
2.2 William F Albright (1891–1971) 22
2.3 Yigael Yadin (1917–1984) 24
2.4 George E Wright (1909–1974) 25
2.5 John Bright (1908–1995) 26
2.6 Albrecht Alt (1883–1956) 27
2.7 Martin Noth (1902–1968) 28
2.8 Yohanan Aharoni (1919–1976) 29
2.9 Joseph Callaway (1920–1988) 29
2.10 Manfred Weippert (1937–) 30
2.11 George Mendenhall (1916–2016) 31
2.12 Norman Gottwald (1926–) 33
2.13 Volkmar Fritz (1938–2007) 34
2.14 Israel Finkelstein (1949–) 35

2.15 William Dever (1933–) 38
2.16 Dale Manor (1950–) 42
2.17 Shlomo Bunimovitz (1953–) 43
2.18 Zvi Lederman (1951–) 44
2.19 Thomas Thompson (1939–) 44
2.20 Summary of Chapter Two: An Historical Survey of Scholarship on the Settlement Period 45
CHAPTER THREE 49
SOURCE DOCUMENTS: JUDGES 1 AND JOSHUA 49
3.1 Introduction: The Bible as a Source Document 49
3.2 Judges 49
3.3 Joshua 52
3.3.1 The Historicity of the Exodus 53
3.3.2 Israel Prepares to Enter Canaan 55
3.3.3 The Fall of Jericho (Josh 3:1–6:27) 55
3.3.4 Ai (Josh 7:1-8:35) 57
3.3.5 Gibeon (Josh 9:1–27) 59
3.3.7 The Final Northern Campaign and the Fall of Hazor (Josh 11:1–23) 62
3.3.8 The Major Thrust of the Conquest is Completed (Josh 12:1–24) 65
3.3.9 Summary of Joshua 65
3.4 Summary of Chapter Three: Judges and Joshua 66
CHAPTER FOUR 68
ARCHAEOLOGICAL DATA: EXCAVATI0ON OF CANAANITE MOUNDS 68
4.1 Introduction 68
4.2 Jericho 69
4.2.1 Sellin and Watzinger— Early Excavations at Jericho 1907–1909 70
4.2.2 Garstang Excavations 1930–1936 70
4.2.3 Kenyon's Excavations at Jericho 1952–1958 71
4.3 Ai 72
4.3.1 Judith Marquet-Krause Excavation at Ai 1933–1935 74
4.3.2 Joseph Callaway Excavation at Ai 1964–1976 74
4.4 Hazor 76
4.4.1 John Garstang 1928 trial digs 77
4.4.2 Yigael Yadin 1955–1958 / 1968–1970 78
4.4.2.1 First Four Seasons 1955–1958 79
4.4.2.2 The Fifth Season, 1968 80
4.5 Lachish 80

4.5.1 James Leslie Starkey (1895–1938) and Olga Tufnell 81
4.5.2 Yohanan Aharoni 1966–1968 82
4.5.3 David Ussishkin 1973–1994 83
4.5.4 Yosef Garfinkel, Michael Hasel, and Martin Klingbeil 84
4.5.5 Lachish Summary 85
4.6 Laish (Dan) 86
4.7 Jerusalem 88
4.7.1 Jerusalem Summary 93
4.8 Summary of Chapter Four: Excavations of Canaanite Mounds 93
CHAPTER FIVE 94
ARCHAEOLOGICAL DATA: REGIONAL SURVEYS 94
5.1 Introduction 94
5.2 Yohanan Aharoni (Upper Galilee) 97
5.3 Zvi Gal (Lower Galilee) 100
5.4 Adam Zertal (Manasseh)—the Central Hill Country of Israel, northern part 101
5.5 Israel Finkelstein (Ephraim) 103
5.6 Nelson Glueck and S Mittmann (Transjordan) 105
5.7 The Judean Hills and the Shephelah 108
5.8 Arad and Beersheba Valleys 111
5.9 The Judean Desert 113
5.10 Benjamin 113
5.11 Summary of Chapter Five: Archaeological Data: Regional Surveys 114
CHAPTER SIX 118
EMERGENCE MODELS FOR ISRAEL'S ARRIVAL IN CANAAN 118
6.1 Introduction to the Models 118
6.2 Albright: The Conquest Model 119
6.2.1 Reasons to Reject the Conquest Model 124
6.2.2 Conquest Model: The Final Verdict 128
6.3 Albrecht Alt—the Peaceful Infiltration Model 128
6.3.2 Yohanan Aharoni 131
6.3.3 William Dever and Norman Gottwald: Peaceful Infiltration Model and Nomadism 132
6.3.4 Richard Hess: Peaceful Infiltration Model and Amphictyony 133
6.3.5 Joseph Callaway: The Peaceful Infiltration Model 134
6.3.6 Manfred Weippert: The Peaceful Infiltration Model/Peaceful Migration 134
6.3.7 Joshua/Judges: The Peaceful Infiltration Model 134
6.3.8 The Peaceful Infiltration Model: The Verdict 135

6.4 George Mendenhall: The Peasant Revolt Model 135
6.4.1 Norman Gottwald: The Peasant Revolt/ Social Revolutionary Theory 140
6.4.2 Peasant Revolt Model: The Final Verdict 144
6.5 Volkmar Fritz: The Symbiosis Hypothesis 148
6.5.1 The Merneptah Stele 151
6.5.2 The Song of Deborah 152
6.5.3 The Unconquered Cities 152
6.5.4 Israel Finkelstein: The Symbiosis Hypothesis 152
6.5.5 The Symbiosis Hypothesis: 155
6.6 Bunimovitz, Lederman, and Dever: The Auto-Ethnogenesis Model 156
6.6.1 William Dever: Auto-Ethnogenesis Model—Track One 157
6.6.2 Shlomo Bunimovitz and Zvi Lederman: Auto-Ethnogenesis Model— Track 2 . 158
6.6.3 The Auto-Ethnogenesis Model: The Final Verdict 164
6.7 TL Thompson: The Conquest by Imagination Theory—Minimalists 164
6.7.1 The Conquest by Imagination Theory: The Final Verdict 165
6.8 Summary of Chapter Six: Models for Israel's Arrival in Canaan 165
CHAPTER SEVEN 167
THE SETTLEMENT OF ISRAEL IN CANAAN: A NEW PERSPECTIVE 167
7.1 Introduction 167
7.2 The Conquest Model 168
7.2.1 Conquest Model: The Book of Joshua 170
7.2.2 Conquest Model/Canaanite Mounds: Jericho 172
7.2.3 Conquest Model/Canaanite Mounds: Ai 174
7.2.4 Conquest Model/Canaanite Mounds: Hazor 176
7.2.5 Conquest Model/Canaanite Mounds: Lachish 177
7.2.6 Conquest Model/Canaanite Mounds: Leshem/Laish (Josh 19:47 Judg 18:29), Dan (Josh 19:47) 180
7.2.7 Conquest Model/Canaanite Mounds: Jerusalem 182
7.2.8 Summary of the Conquest Model/Canaanite Mounds 183
7.3 The Peaceful Infiltration Model 184
7.3.1 Settlement Patterns as shown by Regional Surveys 185
7.3.2 Summary of the Peaceful Infiltration Model 186
7.4 The Peasant Revolt Model (Social Revolution Model) 187
7.4.1 Peasant Revolt Model Summary 189
7.5 The Symbiosis Hypothesis 191
7.5.1 Continuity of the Material Culture between the Canaanites and Israelites 192
7.5.2 Ethnic Markers? 194

7.6 The Auto-Ethnogenesis Model 202
7.6.1 Yahwism 203
7.6.2 Why No Pork? 205
7.6.3 The Merneptah Stele 206
7.6.4 Auto-Ethnogenesis: Final Verdict 207
7.7 Conquest by Imagination Theory: The Minimalist School of Thought 207
7.8 Summary of Chapter Seven: The Settlement of Israel in Canaan: A New Perspective 208
CHAPTER EIGHT 210
THE EMERGENCE OF ISRAEL IN CANAAN: AN ECLECTIC MODEL 210
8.1 Introduction 210
8.2 Israel in Transjordan: Moving towards Canaan 215
8.3 Israel in Canaan: the Merneptah Stele 219
8.4 Israel Enters Canaan: Albright's Conquest Model 220
8.5 Alt and Noth: The Peaceful Infiltration Model 223
8.6 Mendenhall and Gottwald: The Peasant Revolt (Social Revolution) Model 227
8.7 Fritz and Finkelstein: The Symbiosis Hypothesis 230
8.8 Dever, Bunimovitz and Lederman: The Auto-Ethnogenesis Model 233
8.9 An Eclectic Model 235
8.9.1 The Conquest Model's Role in the Eclectic Model 236
8.9.2 The Peaceful Infiltration Model's Role in the Eclectic Model 237
8.9.3 The Peasant Revolt Model's Role in the Eclectic Model 238
8.9.4 The Symbiosis Hypothesis' Role in the Eclectic Model 239
8.9.5 The Auto-Ethnogenesis Model's Role in the Eclectic Model 241
8.10 Summary of the Eclectic Model 241
WORKS CITED 245

ABBREVIATIONS

AASOR ……*The Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research*

ABD …….. *Anchor Bible Dictionary*

ANET ……. *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*

AUSDDS …….. *Andrews University Seminary Doctoral Dissertation Series*

BA ……. *The Biblical Archaeologist*

BAR ……... *Biblical Archaeology Review*

BASOR …… *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*

BBRS …….. *Bulletin for Biblical Research Supplements*

BR ……..... *Bible Review*

CTM …….. *Concordia Theological Monthly*

Erlsr …….. *Eretz-Israel*

ESV …….. *English Standard Version*

GTJ …….. *Grace Theological Journal*

IEJ …… *Israel Exploration Journal*

IES ……. *Israel Exploration Society*

JAOS …… *Journal of the American Oriental Society*

JBL …… *Journal of Biblical Literature*

JESHO ……..... *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient*

JETS …… *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society*

JNES …… *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*

JSOT …… *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament*

JTSA …… *Journal of Theological Studies Articles*

NEA …….. *Near Eastern Archaeology*

NICOT ……*New International Commentary on the Old Testament*

OJA …… *Oxford Journal of Archaeology*

PEQ …… *Palestine Exploration Quarterly*

SJOT …….. *Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament*

SBLABS ……. *Society of Biblical Literature Archaeology and Biblical Studies*

SBLMS …… S*ociety of Biblical Literature Monograph Series*

TA …… *Tel Aviv*

VT …… *Vetus Testamentum*

Z. Dtsch. Palast. – Ver …… *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palastina-Vereins*

CHAPTER ONE

ARCHAEOLOGY AND THE BIBLICAL TEXT

1.1 Introduction to the problem—is it a worthy pursuit?

I was first introduced to the difficult task of properly associating the material culture unearthed during an excavation project with the biblical text during the early days of excavating at Tel Beth-Shemesh, Israel.[1] Occasionally I was privy to conversations between co-directors, the field director and supervisors discussing how to interpret items (artefacts), surfaced during the dig. Questions often focused on whether or not the material finds were related to the Canaanites, Israelites or Philistines? Other questions dealt with what the finds had to do with the cultural milieu of a border-town so close to the Philistines. Admittedly, some decisions were reversed after further investigation or another season of work, while others have been maintained, and will be at least until something proves different.

Working at a site (Tel Beth-Shemesh) where quite an array of tenth-century material architecture has been surfaced, my interest in the topic of when and how did Israel emerge in the Canaan was fuelled. However, the tipping point was a lecture presented by Tel Beth-Shemesh Field Director, Dr Dale W Manor, at Faulkner University in Montgomery, Alabama in 2012.[2]

Manor's presentation covered the major proposals for the origin of Israel in Canaan, beginning with Albright's biblical model that eventually came to be known as the Conquest Model, Alt and Noth's Peaceful Infiltration Model, Mendenhall and Gottwald's Peasant Revolt Model, Fritz and Finkelstein's Symbiotic Model, and Bunimovitz and Lederman and Dever's Auto-Ethnogenesis Model. It was during Manor's remarks on the Auto-Ethnogenesis Model that the decision to pursue a

[1] My first year working at Tel Beth-Shemesh was 2000; the summer of 2019 marked my 16th season.
[2] Manor's topic was The Emergence of Israel: The Bible and Archaeology (2013:90–110).

detailed study of the origin of Israel was formulated. Manor quoted Faust who noted that 'the consensus today is that all previous suggestions have some truth regarding the origins of the ancient Israelites... the percentage and weight given to each process varies' (Faust 2006:173). Manor went on to say that Faust had failed to integrate biblical elements into the narrative (2013:102).

1.2 Is the methodology research design capable of answering the main question of the thesis?

In regard to the method of obtaining information regarding the biblical text, I consulted and interacted with scholarly commentaries, particularly dealing with the books of Joshua and Judges. I also consulted other sources relevant to the main question of the thesis—is there coherence between the archaeological data and the biblical text. I then applied the findings from this exegetical research to the question of whether or not the particular issue relating to the question interacted in any way or to what degree with the available archaeological data also associated with the inquiry.

It should be noted that no attempt is made to unload any text-critical issues in regard to the biblical references cited in this thesis. Rather, the biblical references are treated as sources in the same manner as archaeologists treat their own written sources—that is, as ethnographic sources.

In the same vein, research material obtained from major excavators in Israel—their autographs, field reports, journal articles and interviews were searched to see what impact they had in regard to answering the question of whether or not the two disciplines (biblical studies) and (archaeological data) shared similar conclusions.

An examination of the works cited tends to demonstrate that an adequate number of important resource documents were consulted and used in regard to answering the inquiry as to whether or not biblical texts and archaeological data have coherence.

1.3 Biblical exegetical study and archaeological data: Why have the two never been integrated into a single study?

After hearing Manor's lecture, particularly the fact that Faust and others had noted a certain degree of truth concerning the origin of Israel in Canaan in all previous suggestions (models), I decided to investigate the topic by a comparison and

integration of pertinent biblical text (those relating to Israel in Canaan) and the archaeological data noted in the earlier models along with new evidence produced in recent years.

I intend to explore the idea/explanation that Israel originated or emerged in Canaan in the early thirteenth century BC, not in a lightning-quick short-lived invasion with blitzkrieg-type speed, but rather as a result of a long and complex series of events—events that may well have been part of an earlier suggestion or model presented over the last ninety-plus years. I believe there is ample evidence garnered from this integration of disciplines to suggest in the strongest terms that there is coherence between archaeological data and the Bible. If my work moves forward a view that both the archaeological data and the biblical text should reside at the same table—then the pursuit was well worth my time.

1.4 What is the relationship of the Bible to the archaeological data?

I want to make clear from the outset that it is not my intention by way of this thesis to denigrate archaeology in favour of uplifting the Bible. The biblical text and the archaeological evidence both have a role to play in the question of the origin of Israel in Canaan. I will not approach the subject of coherence in a manner such as described by Merling as '…working in the outdated "prove the Bible' mode…"' (2004:29–42). Rather, it is my intention to approach the question of the origin of ancient Israel in Canaan drawing on a coherence-theory model.

Merling says that the information from the Bible and archaeology is parallel, not perpendicular, supporting and complementing but rarely intersecting (2004:29–42). While agreeing with Merling that one must look beyond a 'prove the Bible' (or 'disprove') synthesis toward a coherence-theory model—I will show that there is enough coherence (convergences) between the archaeological data and the biblical texts to set aside Merling's assessment that convergences are a rarity.

The main question raised by this thesis, implied in the title, is whether or not the two disciplines (archaeology) and (the Bible) can demonstrate a logical and consistent connection in terms of the question of the origin of ancient Israel in Canaan. I readily concede that there is not perfect coherence between the two, primarily because there

are inconsistencies in the comparison of archaeological evidence and biblical texts. However, I contend that this thesis will provide ample cases of convergence and coherence between the two disciplines in such a manner as to offer a significant likelihood of each discipline pointing in the same direction—in certain cases.

As the thesis unfolds, I will show that there are areas of coherence and convergences between the archaeological data and the biblical text easily recognizable. One of the objectives of the thesis is reached even when there is not a definite convergence, but overwhelming evidence that at least there is a possibility of coherence and thus no need to totally reject any association between the disciplines.

1.5 Do archaeology data and biblical texts have different agendas?

A major goal of the thesis is to show that the two disciplines have their own agendas in the pursuit of excavating a site or surveying a region. I believe my thesis successfully argues against either discipline controlling the other—especially in regard to formulating a plan for excavating a site or conducting a surface survey. Rather than one controlling the work, I suggest that both have significant, although different, roles to play in the process of uncovering ancient material cultures and how they contribute to such a storyline as the origin of ancient Israel.

It is my conclusion that the research conducted in the process of writing this thesis, both in biblical studies and the archaeological record, significantly makes the case for allowing the Bible a place in the overall search for the origins of ancient Israel in Canaan or in any other question relating to the collection and interpretation of the material culture in the Holy Land. After all, it has been noted by Finkelstein, who at times is no champion of the biblical text, that the Bible is the only epigraphical source available as a starting point to discuss the characteristics of Israelite settlements (1988:28).

1.6 Has every ‘i' been dotted and every ‘t’ crossed?

The complexity of the subject of this thesis does not lend itself to answering or attempting to answer every corollary issue that is attached to the question of the origin of Israel in Canaan. For example, I admit that as a man of faith, I accept the story of

the Exodus of the nation of Israel from Egypt and God's miraculous intervention in their escape as a matter of fact. Although it is unlikely that I could factually prove such an exodus from Egypt occurred, I accept the story by faith. Further, I have limited my research in certain areas such as where did the concept of worship of Yahweh originate and the issue of numbers—just how many Israelites entered Canaan (millions or thousands)?

After a cursory perusal of the outline of the chapters in this thesis, it will become apparent that the limitations placed on my research do not hinder the fullness of my investigation into the illusive question of the origins of Israel. Instead, it will be noted that I have provided a substantial base of investigative material, both from the discipline of archaeology and the study of the biblical text.

While noting the theological aspect of the taking (giving by God) of the land of Canaan, the subject of miracles and the faith of the Israelites has not been overly discussed. However, the author of the thesis has clearly noted that faith and obedience to God are critical factors in the process of Israel eventually possessing the full measure of the land of Canaan.

1.7 Is there a definitive answer for how Israel originated in Canaan?

I will not be as bold or arrogant as to claim that this thesis is the end-all to all questions concerning the origin of Israel in Canaan. However, I will in this work demonstrate a highly significant degree of just how the process of Israel emerging and finally taking the entire land of Canaan developed. I will demonstrate that the process is not the result of one theory or model but rather an eclectic model spawned by bits and pieces of the five models proposed over the past ninety-plus years. I also am convinced that this work will open the door for others to continue to search for the points of coherence and convergence between the biblical text and archaeological data without feeling it necessary to dismiss the biblical text as non-history.

I believe my thesis will spur other scholars to continue to press for the Bible to have its rightful place in the agenda of how Israel came into Canaan and the long complex process that finally resulted in Israel controlling the entire land. I hope that the discussion will prompt some to understand that the biblical text is a matter of faith and

has a theological component, such as in the book of Joshua while discontinuing the push to totally remove it from the historical discussion of Israel's origin in Canaan. The work in this thesis will make an important contribution toward giving the biblical text, the Bible—its due place in the discussion of Israel's origin.

1.8 Outline of Chapters

The current chapter, chapter one, attempts to answer questions in regard to whether or not the thesis has adequately dealt with important key aspects of research:

- Introduction to the problem—is it a worthy pursuit?
- Is the methodology research design capable of answering the main question of the thesis?
- What is the relationship of the Bible to the archaeological data?
- Biblical exegetical study and archaeological data: Why have the two never been integrated into a single study?
- Do archaeology data and biblical texts have different agendas?
- Has every "i" been dotted and every "t" crossed?
- Is there a definitive answer for how Israel originated in Canaan?

Again, I am confident that these important issues have been addressed in such a manner as to bring forth a successful conclusion to the overall thesis.

In chapter two I offer a survey of the scholarship that has dealt with the settlement period (the emergence of Israel in Canaan). The most important scholars engaged in the search for answers to the question of Israel's origins in Canaan are listed along with their credentials.[3] It should also be noted that a very brief mention is given to the minimalists' position, as acquitted by Thompson, identified as the Conquest by Imagination Model. This model has no credibility in regard to answering the question set forth by this thesis, and thus is not given any further consideration other than a mention of its existence.

[3] In chapter six a discussion of the major emergence models is undertaken, at which time the scholars mentioned in chapter two are placed in their respective bailiwick and their particular contribution to the question is noted in some detail.

Chapter three deals with the source documents, mainly the biblical books of Joshua and Judges. These two accounts of the Israelites in Canaan offer a striking contrast in places as to the emergence of Israel in Canaan and the extent to which they initially took the land. I consider the material gleaned from this chapter as very important for the detailed comparison with the archaeological data in subsequent chapters. An important factor revealed in the study of Joshua relates to the theological component often overlooked in the book.

Chapter four is a detailed examination of several of the important Canaanite mounds or tells which figure prominently in the early investigation of the emergence of Israel in Canaan. During the early years of the questioning of the origins of Israel in Canaan, the only archaeological evidence to be compared and contrasted with the biblical texts came primarily from these large Canaanite mounds such as Hazor, Jericho, Ai, Lachish, and so on.

Chapter five tells the story of the importance of the innovative regional land surveys conducted early but coming into their own in the 1970s and particularly in the 1980s, with the work of Israel Finkelstein and others highlighted. These regional surveys, coupled with the data from the large Canaanite mounds, added a whole new dimension to the overall consideration of Israel's entry and emergence in Canaan.

In chapter six the models, only briefly mentioned in chapter two, are now reviewed noting the major tenets of each theory's approach to the question of how Israel emerged in Canaan. Reasons to reject models and/or weaknesses are discussed in detail. Further, the arguments for and reasoning behind the scholarly assertions for the models are examined. In regard to the scholars mentioned who support these theories, more than their credentials are listed. Rather, an in-depth analysis of their reasoning and the evidence they presented is highlighted.

A new perspective on the settlement of Israel in Canaan is undertaken in chapter seven. An examination of the various models proposed is again outlined, only this time many different factors are also interjected into the mix as each model undergoes further scrutiny. It is the conclusion of this chapter that moves the thesis toward its culmination in chapter eight with the introduction of the Eclectic Model.

The Eclectic Model is unveiled in the final chapter, chapter eight. Each model is presented again, but this time in light of its contribution or lack thereof to the question of the emergence of Israel in Canaan.

1.9 Summary of Chapter One: Archaeology and the Biblical Text

In the end, the relationship between the Bible and archaeology data is fluid, not static. Thus, this thesis asserts that both disciplines can help understand the other, while noting that neither can, nor should, be used as a critique of the other. As Merling correctly notes, 'They must live separately and be blended and amended together cautiously' (2004:29–42).

My thesis builds momentum as it moves along, beginning with important information about the scholars who have dealt with this issue for many years and right up to the present time. From the review of scholarship, it is on to the source documents in chapter three (Joshua and Judges), and how the biblical texts shed light on Israel's preparation to enter Canaan, Israel's first encounter with the Canaanite stronghold of Jericho, the battle at Ai and other important topics concerning the early battles and movements of the Israelite army and the Israelite nation. Chapters four and five illuminate the evidence archaeology has provided from the excavations of the large Canaanite mounds and the added information brought about by the latter regional surface surveys. Finally, chapters six and seven pave the way for the introduction of the final scenario, a new proposal offered in the final chapter—chapter eight.

It is with respect that I offer this final conclusion concerning the overall benefit of my thesis. I believe, although certainly not reaching the level of scholarship of many investigators I consulted, my work will have an impact, particularly on those of faith. Hopefully, it will demonstrate the fallacy to those 'of faith' who are determined to use archaeology as a tool to prove the veracity of God's word. God's word does not need our help. Further, it is my desire to open the door to those who are considering or already have dismissed the idea of the biblical text as having any historical veracity at all. The challenge set forth by the evidence of coherence and convergence of the two disciplines will hopefully encourage non-believers to take a closer look at the contribution the Bible can make to the discussion of the origin of Israel in Canaan.

CHAPTER TWO

AN HISTORICAL SURVEY OF SCHOLARSHIP ON THE SETTLEMENT PERIOD

2.1 Introduction

The first order of business in this thesis is to examine the major scholarship contributing to the discussion of the settlement period which resulted in the emergence

of ancient Israel in Canaan. Over much of the twentieth century there were two basic opposing views to be found among archaeologists and biblical scholars concerning how Israel settled (emerged) in Canaan. One view claimed that they had gained the land by peaceful means, the other view proposed that they had taken it by military force (Merling1996:1).

In addition to the two dominant theories proposed by Alt and Albright, Mendenhall and Gottwald suggested that the origin of the Israelite nation actually lay not in an invasion or an infiltration, but rather in a revolt by the Canaanite peasantry against the overlords who ruled the land. This new proposal was quite different from the Conquest Model offered by Albright and the Peaceful Infiltration Model proffered by Alt, in that the people who eventually identified themselves as Israel did not enter the land from the outside—they were already present.

A fourth model/hypothesis about the emergence of Israel in Canaan (the Symbiosis Model) will be examined in this thesis. Volkmar Fritz suggests that an examination of the archaeological data shows that the occupation of the land of Canaan by the Israelite tribes occurred in a very similar way to the so-called Peaceful Infiltration Model (Fritz 1987:98). Fritz understands the wide-ranging adoption of the Late Bronze culture as the key to the sedentary nature of the Israelite tribes that entered Canaan in the twelfth century BC and slowly began the process of symbiosis. This process of symbiosis[4] eventually led to the indigenous population identifying as Israelites. Symbiotic is used in the adjectival sense of two interdependent groups living together to their mutual benefit.

Israel Finkelstein's Late Bronze II/Iron I transition theory put more substantial teeth into the Symbiosis Hypothesis with his extensively documented work, which drew heavily on studies of settlement patterns (Finkelstein 1988). Unlike Fritz, he understood the symbiotic relationship as occurring between indigenous nomads and the sedentary people, not with nomads who came from outside the country in a fashion similar to the infiltration hypothesis.

[4] Symbiosis refers to a mutually beneficial relationship between different people or groups. As in the case of the biology definition of symbiosis, the interaction typically is to the advantage of both.

The most recent hypothesis in regard to the origin of Israel in the Land of Canaan is referred to by Dale Manor as the Auto-ethnogenesis[5] Model (Manor 2013:100). Manor suggests there are two tracks to this model; track one is proposed by William Dever and track two by Shlomo Bunimovitz and Zvi Lederman.

Dever, one of the most prolific writers on early Israel, long built his case along the lines of the Peasant Revolt Model (2003:74). Israel emerged from the indigenous Canaanite population when the disaffected Canaanites withdrew to the hill country during and after the transition from Late Bronze Age to Iron Age I, ultimately coming to see themselves as Israelites—a self-generated ethnogenesis.[6] In Dever's opinion the indigenous Canaanite population was seeking a kind of Utopia (2003:189).

Bunimovitz and Lederman contend that the Canaanite occupants of Beth-Shemesh were forced or compelled to carve out a new identity during times when their very existence or identity was threatened by another group—namely, the Philistines (Bunimovitz and Lederman 2009:124). In essence, they assert that the Canaanites occupying Beth-Shemesh made a conscious decision to identify with (become) Israelites based on the threat posed by the incoming Philistines.

As the debate escalated and de-escalated over the years, the archaeological world came to the conclusion that archaeology had been put on the back burner, and the biblical texts were setting the agendas and determining the interpretation of the material culture unearthed. Archaeologists reacted by basically jettisoning the Bible from the discussion entirely—continuing to work on early Israelite sites, but in a world apart from biblical history. Fortunately, the current trend is toward a renewal of the importance of the Bible in the archaeological discussion. To that end, this dissertation focuses on presenting archaeology and the Bible as separate yet important players in the discussion of the emergence of Israel in Canaan.

2.2 William F Albright (1891–1971)

[5] Manor coined the term Auto-ethnogenesis referring to a permutation of the Peasant Revolt Model. Manor contends that this model operates on the premise that what became Israel was 'a self-generated' people definition that emerged from the resident Canaanite society.
[6] Ethnogenesis is a study of the formation of ethnic groups (Faust 2006:7).

The American scholar William Foxwell Albright led the charge in favour of Israel emerging in Canaan by way of military conquest. Albright's name was so often associated with the Conquest Theory that it came to be commonly referred to as 'Albright's Conquest theory' (de Vaux 1978:482).

Even though Albright passed away many years ago, he is still regarded by most Levantine archaeologists, biblical scholars and other Near Eastern researchers of the world of the Bible as a genius (Levy and Freedman 2008:9). Albright's mastery of so many disciplines linked to the study of the ancient Near East, in particular the world of the Old Testament (Hebrew Bible), earned him recognition as one of the last great orientalists (experts in the study of the history, languages and culture of the peoples of Asia). As an orientalist, Albright was able to work with multiple ancient and modern languages and in a range of scholarly fields.

The legacy of Professor Albright rests in his extraordinary record of scholarly publication. In 1941 Harry M Orlinsky of the Hebrew Union College in Cincinnati assembled and published Albright's bibliography in honour of his 50th birthday (Orlinsky 1941:66). At that time there were approximately 500 entries that spanned 30 years of scholarly work—an incredible amount of research, of which any scholar would be proud. However, this was only the midpoint in Albright's scholarly career, which continued for another 30 years. In total an additional 600 scholarly entries were made in his ledger, bringing the grand total to just less than 1,100 items, including books, peer-reviewed articles, notes, book reviews and other items. A complete record of his publications, spanning a time period from 1916 to 1971, was assembled by David Noel Freedman, and published as a book by the American Schools of Oriental Research (Freedman 1975).

Perhaps Albright's most enduring legacy is his contribution to the establishment of a new paradigm of ancient Near Eastern studies called 'Biblical Archaeology'. His astounding body of work, books, articles and public lectures defined a new relationship between archaeology and biblical studies (Levy and Freedman 2008:9).

Albright's career as a field archaeologist was brief, but had a great impact. His first excavation was at Tell el-Ful, a site identified as Gibeah of Saul. The site was chosen in part because of its biblical reputation as an Israelite social and religious centre, and

partly because logistically it would be cheaper to excavate a smaller mound than a major one. In like manner, he also directed excavations for four seasons at the obscure site of Tell Beit Mirsim located near the junction of the southern Judean hills and the Shephelah region some 20 miles southwest of Hebron. At these excavations Albright's innovative ceramic analysis and his rapid publication established him as a leading archaeologist (Levy and Freedman 2008:9). The innovative ceramic analysis was built around the work of the British archaeologist Sir Flinders Petrie at Tell el-Hesi located on the edge of the Negev coastal plain.

In regard to the emergence of Israel in Canaan, Albright primarily followed the biblical narrative found in the Pentateuch and Joshua, which he believed was based on underlying history (Hawkins 2013:30). Accordingly, the entire new group, given the name Israel, entered Canaan as a unified group and conquered it (Faust 2006: 155). Albright believed the invading Israelites were ethnically and religiously distinct from the indigenous population of Canaan; the Canaanites themselves being 'crude and depraved' (Albright 1963:109).

Albright brought to the subject of Israelite settlement by conquest a certain credibility founded in archaeology as he attempted to blend the Bible and archaeology, using archaeology as external evidence (Merling 1996:27). By 1935, Albright had already become the authority in American archaeological circles. He wrote an article that appeared in 1935 dealing with the Israelite conquest/settlement synthesizing the then available archaeological evidence combined with what he called 'Historical Conclusions' (Albright 1935:10). Albright was convinced at the time of its writing that the preliminary conclusions reached in regard to the work at Jericho, Bethel, Lachish, and less importantly, Tell Beit Mirsim, presented enough evidence to finally frame a chronological outline of the Israelite conquest/settlement (Albright 1935:10).

It was only after Albright's death that scholars chose to seriously challenge the paradigm Albright had created (Levy and Freedman 2008:9).

2.3 Yigael Yadin (1917–1984)

Yadin, an Israeli military officer, politician and scholar, is described by William Dever as Israel's prototypical 'biblical archaeologist' (Dever 1989a:41). As an Israeli

archaeologist, Yadin is best known for his role in acquiring the Dead Sea Scrolls, his excavation of Herod's mountain palace at Masada, and for making Israelis feel connected to their ancient history. Yadin also led the excavations at the large Canaanite mound of Hazor (1955–1958, and 1968). Yadin had hoped to return to Hazor, but died in 1984. The mantle was passed to Amon Ben-Tor, and a new expedition began in 1990.

Yadin was born on March 21, 1917 to Eliezer Sukenik (a teacher who became a professor of archaeology) and Hasya Feinsod (an early-childhood educator and women's rights pioneer). Yadin was recruited into the Haganah pre-state militia at the age of 16 and given the code name Yadin or 'judge' in Hebrew. He later adopted Yadin as his surname.

After Israel attained statehood, the various militias were united into the Israel Defense Force (IDF)—Yadin became the new army's second chief of staff in 1949 at the age of only 32. Yadin was instrumental in envisioning the IDF as an army consisting largely of a reserve force that could be quickly mobilized in emergency situations, an idea inspired by his observation of the Swiss army. He later represented Israel at armistice talks in Egypt.

Yadin resigned from the military in December 1952 and devoted himself to archaeological research, beginning with translating and interpreting a first group of Dead Sea Scrolls that his father had purchased in Bethlehem in 1947. His translation of what Sukenik called 'The War of the Sons of Light Against the Sons of Darkness' served as his 1955 doctoral dissertation at the Hebrew University.

Yadin, following the work of the American biblical archaeologist William Foxwell Albright, championed the Conquest Model in the academic circles of Israel. The archaeological evidence gathered from his work at Hazor (1955–1969) convinced Yadin that the conquest story found in Joshua was confirmed—'Here, I believe, at long last, the excavations provided testimony to the true course of events; and it turns out to be exactly as described in the Bible—if one reads critically' (Yadin 1975:255).

2.4 George E Wright (1909–1974)

Wright was a leading Old Testament scholar and biblical archaeologist, receiving his MA and PhD from Johns Hopkins University under the direction of William Foxwell Albright. Considered an expert in ancient Near Eastern archaeology, he was especially known for his work on the study and dating of pottery. He was considered the best spokesman for the Conquest Model settlement theory proposed by Albright.

During his distinguished teaching career at Harvard University, Wright directed three expeditions to Shechem (1956–1974), the Hebrew Union College Biblical and Archaeological School Expedition at Tell Gezer (1964–1965), and the Joint American Expedition to Idalion Cyprus (1971–1974). Wright was also the founder of the periodical *The Biblical Archaeologist.* Further, Wright was instrumental in the publishing of the complete findings of the archaeological excavations conducted by Elihu Grant at Tel Beth-Shemesh between 1929–1933.

2.5 John Bright (1908–1995)

Bright, an American Biblical scholar and author of *A History of Israel* (1959, 1972, 1981, 2000), was closely associated with the American School of Oriental Research pioneered by William Albright. He earned his BD from Union Theological Seminary in 1931 followed by a ThM degree in 1935. In the winter of 1931–32, Bright participated in an archaeological campaign at Tell Beit Mirsim, where he met Albright, who became his mentor. Bright also worked at a dig at Bethel in 1935.

Bright began his doctoral work under Albright at Johns Hopkins in 1935, but later dropped out due to financial difficulties. He resumed his studies and received his doctorate from Johns Hopkins in 1940. After completing his work at Johns Hopkins, under Albright, he returned to Union Theological Seminary, where he was appointed to the Cyrus H McCormick Chair of Hebrew and Old Testament Interpretation, a position he held until his retirement in 1975.

His most famous work *A History of Israel* was first published in 1959, with a second and third edition in 1972 and 1981, and a fourth in 2000. In the second edition, new information from the Adad-nirari III stele of Tell al-Rimah and the Hebrew ostracon found at Mesad Hashavyahu were included. The third edition included a thorough revision of the first four chapters. Bright's inclusion of new data did not sway him from

his conviction that the heart of Israel's faith lies in its covenantal relationship with YHWH (Bright 2000:19).

In the fourth edition of Bright's work (2000), William P Brown outlined in an appendix some of the changes in the field of historical research since the third edition had been published. Brown noted that:

> It should be pointed out that the driving force behind John Bright's scholarship was his desire to disseminate to the church and general public the fruits of biblical scholarship (Bright 2000:483 fn103).

Brown further noted that there was a widening chasm between the text and the trench—in other words, the integration of Palestine's material culture with the biblical witness of Israel's past (the traditional aim of biblical archaeology) could no longer be sustained (Bright 2000:465).

2.6 Albrecht Alt (1883–1956**)**

Alt, a leading German Protestant theologian, was a member of the Old Testament faculty at the University of Leipzig from 1922 until his death in 1956. He was a student of R Kittel and took over his chair at Leipzig. Often travelling to Palestine, he knew it well, and this familiarity was readily seen in his geographical and topographical studies. He made much of regional and territorial history in his lectures. He combined a mastery of the archaeology and historical geography of the Holy Land with a profound knowledge of the extra-biblical records relevant to the history and institutions of Israel.

Alt was a master epigraphist and philologist, interpreting not only Semitic and cuneiform material, but also late Greek, Roman and Byzantine sources. He was co-editor of the fourth edition of R Kittel's *Biblia Hebraica,* and in 1929 he published *Der Gott der Vater* on the early religion of the Hebrews. His work also made major contributions to the understanding of Israelite legal and political institutions.

In regard to the origins of Israel, he posited that groups of pastoralists gradually settled in Canaan (a peaceful infiltration) with more violent altercations in subsequent

times. Clearly, Alt was responding to the settlement models set forth by Albright and Mendenhall (Conquest Model and Peasant Revolt Model).

2.7 Martin Noth (1902–1968)

Noth is probably best known for his theory on the Deuteronomistic History (DH). Noth followed his teacher, Albrecht Alt, in rejecting the idea of the Hexateuch, claiming that the Pentateuchal sources did not extend into Joshua. The culmination of Noth's scholarly work was his *The History of Israel* (1960), which draws on his earlier works.

The military conquest of Israel (Conquest Model) was also rejected by Noth—following again the lead of his teacher, Alt. Noth differed from Albright in his understanding of the role the Bible played in the discussion. Albright was not a fundamentalist, describing himself as an adherent of neo-orthodoxy, a movement in which Scripture was viewed not as the Word of God itself, but as the vehicle for the Word of God (Schnucker 1991:331–333). He believed the Bible to be accurate unless corrected by the external evidence from archaeology (Albright 1965:95). Noth saw his own interpretation of the Bible as the test for both the Bible and archaeology (Merling 1996:33).

In regard to archaeology, he considered it as the test of the validity of the Bible stories (Schnucker 1991:331–333). Noth considered archaeology helpful but limited (Merling 1996:33). Archaeology, according to Noth, added colour and plasticity while at most it was still prehistory, and the text was history (Noth 1960:42, 48). He did concede that a history of Israel could not be written without archaeology, while at the same time viewing the text as the primary source for theories (Noth 1960:46–49).

Noth understood the Israelites as a semi-nomadic people, who slipped into the central hill country of Canaan and remained there almost unknown until they made it their permanent home (Noth 1960:69–72). It was only upon entering into the land of Palestine that the Israelites formed permanent tribal units (Noth 1960:119). Neither archaeology nor the Bible provided Alt or Noth enough data to explain the presence of Israel in Canaan. Paradigms developed from other cultures and times were needed. Noth died while on an expedition in the Negev, Israel in 1968.

2.8 Yohanan Aharoni (1919–1976)

Aharoni was an Israeli archaeologist and historical geographer. He launched his education at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem where he began to teach in 1954. In 1966 he became a full professor at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, but decided to move to Tel Aviv University in 1968, where he became the chairman of both the Department of Near East Studies and of the Institute of Archaeology.

His work in the field of archaeological excavation was extensive—participating at Ramat Rachel, Tel Arad, Tel Be'er Sheva, Tel Hazor and Lachish. He also studied ancient roadways in the Negev, and was part of the team that discovered the Bar Kokhba caves while surveying and excavating the Dead Sea region in 1953.

Aharoni published many articles in archaeological journals along with six books covering topics such as geography and the results of excavations. Tel Arad was excavated during 18 seasons by Ruth Amiran and Aharoni. He also excavated at Tel Be'er-Sheva from 1969–1976 and worked with Yagael Yadin at Hazor. Unlike Yadin, he was convinced that the evidence of the site proved that Israel had infiltrated the land by peaceful means (Ben-Tor 2013:29).

2.9 Joseph Callaway (1920–1988)

Callaway was a Professor of Archaeology at the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary and the director of the excavations at Tel et Tell (Ai), from 1962–1972. He studied at the University of London in 1961 under famed archaeologist Dame Kathleen Kenyon.

Labouring extensively at Ai for many years, Callaway concluded that the city of Ai described in the biblical account did not exist when Joshua supposedly encountered it (Callaway 1985:68–69). Instead, he argued that two villages (A and B) were to be found there. Joshua conquered the first village, which matches the biblical details, and the second village, built on the ruins of the earlier village, was Israelite (Callaway 1968:316). The second village was a kind of remodelling of the first village (Zevit 1985:58).

Callaway noted that, ‘Ai is simply an embarrassment to every view of the conquest that takes the biblical and archaeological evidence seriously’ (Callaway 1968:312). However, Callaway was persuaded that there was too much historical evidence to call the conquest of Ai legend or etiology (Callaway 1968:316). Instead, he offered a viable option to Albright’s view, namely that Joshua 8:1–29[7] reflects a conquest of Ai in Iron Age I, or in the twelfth century BC (Callaway 1968:316).

Callaway suggested that the evidence of the conquest, emerging from his excavation work, presented a much less grand picture of the conquest than the model set forth by Albright. However, he noted that it was more realistic and credible, since it actually had more support from the biblical traditions (Callaway 1968:319). Thus, the new evidence from archaeological research on the conquest of Ai supports the essential historicity of the conquest, although it seems to have been a less glorious enterprise than the traditionalists had made it. It was more of a process, with the first phase being a series of minor-scale raids on small villages and political integration with the Iron I inhabitants of the land, such as at Gibeon, followed by a second phase where the culture may well have been Israelite, spreading influence to Hazor in the north and Lachish in the south (Callaway 1968:319).

Callaway saw in the conquest accounts in general, and in the Ai account in particular, a rather free use of ancient sources expanded and interpreted to speak to the needs of later generations (Callaway 1985:268–269). The faithfulness of the writers preserving traditions, even when they did not always agree with one another, was to Callaway evidence of their authenticity (Callaway 1985:268–269).

2.10 Manfred Weippert (1937–)

Manfred Weippert found the Peasant Migration (Peaceful Infiltration Theory) more objective than the Conquest Model (Weippert 1971:145). The objective nature of the Peaceful Migration Theory is shown in that it is not influenced by either the Bible or archaeology (1971:145). According to Weippert, a major difference between Noth and Albright, with reference to their models/theories of the emergence of Israel in Canaan, is Noth’s placement of archaeology on the back burner of importance. Albright brought

[7] Unless otherwise specified, all scripture references are taken from the English Standard Version.

the archaeological data to the forefront, noting that ‘there must always be external evidence’ which provides the criteria for judgment of traditions (Weippert 1971:47). Albright thoroughly criticized both Alt and Noth for their lack of use of archaeological investigations (1971:47).

Weippert, following the work of Alt, saw at least two waves of Israelite migration coming from two groups of the tribes of Israel: the first from the tribes called the ‘Leah tribes’ and the second from the tribes called the ‘Rachel tribes’ (Weippert 1971:41–42). However, in regard to the two waves of immigration, there is almost no direct tradition (Weippert 1971:42).

Weippert did not place a high value on the archaeological evidence, since, as he put it, it cannot be presented as facts which speak for themselves, unalterable and sacrosanct—it is essentially silent evidence (Weippert 1971:129). The only archaeological fact with a high degree of probability connected with the settlement of the Israelite tribes in Canaan, according to Weippert, is the colonization of the Palestinian hill country, clearly seen in numerous small country settlements of the early Iron Age I (Weippert 1971:135).

Weippert goes on to postulate that if historical judgments are in the main probability judgments which are achieved by balancing various related or divergent possibilities (balance of possibilities), it seems obvious that the archaeological side of the balance, both in general and in individual cases, can have only little weight (Weippert 1971:135–136).

2.11 George Mendenhall (1916–2016)

Mendenhall obtained his PhD in Semitic languages from Johns Hopkins University and began a career in Ancient Near Eastern and Biblical Studies as well as related archaeology. He served as a professor at the University of Michigan from 1952 to 1986. His book *The Tenth Generation* proposed that the ancient Israelite settlement was actually the result of a cultural-religious egalitarian revolution within Canaanite society, rejecting the views of either a military conquest or a process of peaceful sedentism (Mendenhall 1973). Mendenhall died in August 2016, eight days short of his 100th birthday.

Mendenhall took the discussion of Israelite origins in an entirely new direction with his article, 'The Hebrew Conquest of Palestine,' (Mendenhall 1962). He stated from the outset that his intention was to offer an alternative model to that of the Conquest Model and the Peaceful Infiltration Model—the end result was what he called the Peasant Revolt theory (Mendenhall 1962:66). Rejecting the basic assumption of both Albright and Noth that Israel came from outside the land, he, instead, interpreted Israel's formation as an internal revolt within Canaan during the turbulent context of the Late Bronze-Iron I transition (Mendenhall 1976:154).

So it was that the larger indigenous Canaanite group, who had rejected the society they had abandoned, came together with the emerging religious community of the Hebrews. Therefore, the early Israelites were primarily an indigenous group formed through revolution conjoined with a sense of conversion. Mendenhall stated that the Sinai experience demonstrated that there was an alternative to blind allegiance to a human state that required absolute obedience. Early Israel was an ideological movement (the religion of YHWH), with her history and archaeology understood as a function of this new found theology (Mendenhall 1976:155). In the double sense of responsibility to man and YHWH, set forth in the worship of YHWH, this revolutionary insight produced in the escaping slaves their unique sense of community.

The full-blown fire of the revolution was ignited in Palestine—not a conquest of Palestine (Mendenhall 1976:154), but rather a socio-political process in which peasants revolted against a network of interlocking Canaanite city-states (Mendenhall 1962:73). Mendenhall argued that there is a very similar scenario when one examines the struggles of the Habiru during the Amarna period—essentially the Amarna materials and the biblical events represent politically the same process. It was a process of withdrawal, not physically and geographically, but politically and subjectively of large population groups from any obligation to the existing political regimes (1962:73).

Religion played a pivotal role in the formation of the nation of Israel, coming forth from the Peasant Revolt and its synthesis with the smaller band of slaves coming to Canaan from Egypt. Rather than ethnicity binding the people together as the nation of Israel, it was this new faith in YHWH that brought them together in this new social

organization, Israel. The people who became Israel were related by a common religious experience, not by ethnicity (Mendenhall 1962:73).

The process described by Mendenhall that resulted in the forming of the new social organization, Israel, occurred during the framework of the Late Bronze Age. It was a time when the socio-economic situation was ripe for such an upheaval to take place (Mendenhall 1976:153–154).

2.12 Norman Gottwald (1926–)

It is unfortunate that Professor Gottwald is referred to as an American *Marxist* biblical scholar. His analogical comparisons of the world of ancient Israel to his own contemporary period of time do not warrant such a characterization of this brilliant Old Testament scholar—considered by some to be the best Old Testament scholar of his time (Domeris 2018).[8]

Gottwald's career included lecturer at Columbia University 1953–1954, assistant professor of religion 1954–1955, professor of Old Testament Andover Newton Theological School 1955–1962, Lowry Professor 1962–1965, professor of Old Testament Graduate Theological Union Berkeley, California 1965–1982, and other short-term appointments as visiting lecturer. He was the lecturer for Advanced Theological Studies Jerusalem 1973–1974 and research fellow at Hebrew Union College in Jerusalem 1968–1969.

Gottwald, a student of Mendenhall, greatly expanded and improved upon his mentor's original proposal. In his most influential work *The Tribes of Yahweh: A Sociology of the Religion of Liberated Israel, 1250-1050 B.C.E.* (1979), Gottwald employed a sociological approach to the study of early Israelite religion and politics. He proposed that a small group of Israelites, bringing a unique religious ideology, joined with the local Canaanite peasants, and sought to overthrow the corrupt regimes

[8] Personal email from Dr Domeris 2018..

under which they lived. Together they created the basis for the twelve tribes of Israel (Gottwald 1979:210–219).

2.13 Volkmar Fritz (1938–2007)

Fritz completed his theological studies in Tübingen, Berlin, Heidelberg, Bonn and Marburg, where he earned his PhD in 1968. His interest in the land of the Bible and the material culture of ancient Israel took him to Jerusalem, where he studied biblical archaeology at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem.

In terms of first-hand experience in the field, Fritz worked as an area supervisor at the Arad excavations in the Negev from 1965 to 1967. His archaeological supervisor was Yohanan Aharoni. The results of his work at Arad became the central part of his Habilitation (post-doctoral dissertation), which he earned from the University of Mainz in 1973. He joined the faculty as a teacher of Old Testament at the University of Mainz. He was instrumental in building and expanding the university's library, making it one of the best in Europe in the area of biblical archaeology. Later Fritz was appointed as full professor in Old Testament at the University of Giessen.

One of Fritz's contributions to archaeology was his bringing a greater understanding between German and Israeli archaeologists. He was the first German scholar after the Second World War to obtain a licence to conduct an excavation in Israel. Together with his Israeli colleague, Aharon Kempenski, he directed the excavations at Tel Masos in the Negev from 1972–1975. His work made a major contribution to the understanding of the early history of ancient Israel.

Later, in 1982–1985, Fritz directed excavations of Tel el-Oreme/Tel Kinrot on the northwestern shore of the Sea of Galilee, and he also conducted two smaller digs at Feinan in Jordan in 1990. To his credit, nearly all of his excavations have been fully published. His example was not often followed by other early archaeologists, such as Yadin, who failed to publish their excavation results in proper form or in a timely fashion (Shanks 1983:22).

Fritz published a myriad of articles on various aspects of the archaeology of ancient Israel; a major focus of his research was on the architecture of public buildings, temples, palaces and domestic housing. Two of his most important publications dealt

with these subjects: *The City in Ancient Israel* (1995) and *An Introduction to Biblical Archaeology* (1996), appearing in both German and English.

In regard to the three major explanations of how Israel came into possession of the Land of Canaan, Fritz notes that all three are largely incompatible, because each has important weaknesses (Fritz 1987:84). He points out that the invasion hypothesis (Conquest Model) naïvely adopts the traditional interpretation of the book of Joshua, not taking into account the critical analysis of biblical books since the Enlightenment (1987:84). Furthermore, the infiltration theory (Peasant Migration Model) fails to explain adequately the fall of the Canaanite city-states, and the revolutionary hypothesis (Peasant Revolt Model) is forced into a laborious explanation of the conditions conducive to revolt and reorganization, without being able to give sufficient reasons for this development (1987:84).

2.14 Israel Finkelstein (1949–)

Finkelstein is an Israeli archaeologist and the Jacob M Alkow Professor of the Archaeology of Israel in the Bronze and Iron Ages at Tel Aviv University. He is widely regarded as a leading scholar in the archaeology of the Levant and a foremost applicant of archaeological data in reconstructing biblical history. Further, he is a member of the Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities and a '*correspondant étranger*' of the French Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres. He has received many prestigious academic and writing awards

Among Finkelstein's books are best-sellers: *The Bible Unearthed: Archaeology's New Vision of Ancient Israel and the Origin of its Sacred Texts* (2001) and *David and Solomon: In Search of the Bible's Sacred Kings and the Roots of the Western Tradition* (2006)—both were co-authored with Neil Asher Silberman. Perhaps his greatest work, at least in terms of ancient Israelite settlement patterns, is titled *The Archaeology of the Israelite Settlement* (1988). He authored *The Forgotten Kingdom* in 1995 dealing with the Northern Kingdom of Israel.

Finkelstein was trained as a field archaeologist in the excavations of Tel Be'er Sheva (1971), director Yohanan Aharoni, and Tel Aphek (1973–1978), directors Moshe Kochavi and Pirhiya Beck. In 1976, he started his own fieldwork in a variety of sites

and regions. In 1976–1978, he was field director at the excavation of Izbet Sartah under professor Moshe Kochavi. Izbet Sartah is an early Iron Age site near Rosh Haayin, Israel. From 1976 to 1978, he conducted survey work of Byzantine monastic remains in southern Sinai. In 1977 he was director of salvage excavations at the mound of ancient Bene Beraq near Tel Aviv. In 1980, he was co-director of the excavations of the Iron II site of Tel Ira in the Beer-sheba Valley with Beit-Arieh and B Cresson. From 1981–1984 he directed the excavations at biblical Shiloh in the highlands north of Jerusalem. From 1981–1987, Finkelstein was director of the survey that covered around 1,000km in the highlands north of Jerusalem---assisted by Shlomo Bunimovitz and Zvi Lederman. He directed the excavations at Khirbet ed-Dawwara from 1985–1986, an Iron I and early Iron IIA site in the desert fringe northeast of Jerusalem.

Since 1994 to the present, Finkelstein has been the co-director at the Megiddo excavations (1994–2012 with David Ussishkin, and since 2014 with Matthew Adams and Mario Martin). Megiddo is considered to be one of the most important Bronze and Iron Age sites in the Levant. His most recent project began in 2017 as co-director of the Shmunis Family excavations at Kiriath-Jearim—a key biblical site in the highlands west of Jerusalem associated with the Ark narrative in the book of Samuel. Christophe Nicolle and Thomas Romer of the Collège de France are his partners in this endeavour.

As one can readily see, Israel Finkelstein is a prolific writer and excavator in the land of Israel. He was selected as one of the 10 most influential researchers in the history of archaeology in the Levant by a Swiss publication in 1993. He is a force to be reckoned with in terms of any study of the origins of ancient Israel in the land of Canaan.

Certainly Finkelstein does not accept any part of the Conquest Model, as proposed by Albright and others. The excavation of major Canaanite mounds or tells played a valuable role in furthering the archaeological knowledge of the Land of Israel. However, these excavations alone did not allow for a thorough acquaintance with a region of the hill country necessary to fully investigate the settlements in the hill country of Canaan (Finkelstein 1988:354–356).

According to Finkelstein, it is impossible to come to grips with the settlement episode without a thoroughgoing acquaintance with at least the regions of the hill country in which the events took place. In order to do so, one must study the archaeological components, the ecological elements, as well as the patterns of occupation during the periods immediately preceding and succeeding the time of the Israelite settlement. Since the process of Israelite settlement was intimately connected with the nature of the land itself (landscape, climate, and economic potential), this is the only way to successfully conduct the research. In fact, he has taken the position that research evidence taken from the large Canaanite mounds, no matter the quantity, contributes little to the advancement of the question of Israelite origin in Canaan. The starting point is to focus on the direct evidence from regional surveys of Israelite settlement (Finkelstein 1988:352–356).

Consistent with his view of the importance of regional surveys, Finkelstein proposed that proponents of the unified military conquest theory (Conquest Model) were preoccupied with the devastation of the Late Bronze cities rather than with the settlement of the Israelite tribes (Finkelstein 1988:296). The archaeological evidence found in the excavation of the large Canaanite mounds contributed decisively to the understanding of the period, and at the same time actually contradicts the unified military conquest (Finkelstein 1988:296)

Alt's description of Israelite settlement as the peaceful infiltration of pastoral groups into the sparsely-populated regions of Canaan (Peaceful Infiltration Model) was the first to recognize the value of geography, ecology and sociology as tools for studying the Israelite settlement question (Finkelstein 1988:303). A major criticism of the theory is the failure to demonstrate or to trace the origins of the pastoral groups in the steppe, outside the country (Finkelstein 1988:304).

Finkelstein considered the Mendenhall/Gottwald sociological school theory (Peasant Revolt Model) on target in regard to two important points: (1) before the camel was domesticated as a herd animal, sizeable groups of people could not have lived deep in the deserts of the ancient Near East; (2) therefore, the nomads/pastoralists (who herded flocks, not camels) and the sedentary dwellers were two specialized parts of one dimorphic society. Their relationship was characterized by symbiosis rather than

by confrontation. However, he rejected the theory, based on his opinion that Mendenhall disregarded the archaeological evidence and Gottwald made use of only the 'hackneyed' evidence from the large Canaanite tells, without bothering to acquaint himself either with the results of excavations at the Israelite settlement sites (Finkelstein 1988:308).

2.15 William Dever (1933–)

Dever, PhD Harvard 1966, is an American archaeologist and prolific writer, specializing in the history of Israel and the Near East in biblical times. He was professor of Near Eastern Archaeology and Anthropology at the University of Arizona from 1975–2002. Currently he resides in Cyprus with his wife, Dr Pamela Gaber, and is a Distinguished Professor of Near Eastern Archaeology at Lycoming College in Pennsylvania.

Dever's field experience is impressive, having served as the director of the Harvard Semitic Museum-Hebrew Union College Excavations at Gezer in 1966–1971, 1984 and 1990; director of the dig at Khirbet el-Kom and Jebel Qaaquir (West Bank) 1967–1971; principal investigator at Tel el-Hayyat excavations (Jordan) 1981–1985; assistant director, University of Arizona Expedition to Idalion, Cyprus 1991, as well as others.

Dever used his background in the Near Eastern field of archaeology to argue for the persistence of the veneration of Asherah in the everyday religion of 'ordinary people' in ancient Israel and Judah (Dever 2008:314). He examined the archaeological evidence from a range of Israelite sites, largely dated between the twelfth and the eighth centuries BC, to conclude that this folk religion, with its local altars and cultic objects, amulets and votive offerings, was representative of the outlook of the majority of the population, and that the Jerusalem-centred 'book of religion' of the Deuteronomist circle set out in the Hebrew Bible was only ever the preserve of an élite, a largely impractical religious ideal (Dever 2008:90).

Since his retirement, Dever has become a frequent author on questions relating to the historicity of the Bible and ancient Israel. He has been critical of 'Biblical

minimalists' who deny any historical value to the biblical accounts.[9] However, he is far from being a supporter of biblical literalism either. Instead he has written:

> I am not reading the Bible as Scripture…I am in fact not even a theist. My view all along—and especially in the recent books—is first that the biblical narratives are indeed 'stories' often fictional and almost always propagandistic, but that here and there they contain some valid historical information. That hardly makes me a 'maximalist' (Dever 2003:1).

He went on to write in *Biblical Archaeology Review* that:

> Archaeology as it is practiced today must be able to challenge, as well as affirm, the Bible stories. Some things described there really did happen, but others did not. The Biblical narratives about Abraham, Moses, Joshua and Solomon probably reflect some historical memories of people and places, but the 'larger than life' portraits of the Bible are unrealistic and contradicted by the archaeological evidence (Dever 2006:26, 76).

Dever is clear that his historical field should be seen on a much broader canvas than merely how it relates to the Bible:

> The most naïve [misconception about Syro-Palestinian archaeology] is that the rationale and purpose of 'biblical archaeology' (and, by extrapolation, Syro-Palestinian archaeology) is simply to elucidate the Bible, or the lands of the Bible (Dever 1992a:358).

Dever joined the faculty at Lycoming College in 2008 as Distinguished Professor of Near Eastern Archaeology. Lycoming College, for a small college, has a number of students majoring in archaeology—something quite uncommon.

[9] Biblical minimalists do not consider the Bible as reliable evidence for what happened in ancient Israel and that Israel itself is a problematic subject for historical study (Moore and Kelle 2011:33). Minimalist is a derogatory term given by its opponents, who were consequently dubbed maximalists. Neither side accepted either label.

Dever includes himself when noting that biblical scholars have long known that all the books of the Hebrew Bible were written long after the events that they purported to describe. The process that produced the Bible as a whole was accomplished by composite writers and editors in a long and exceedingly complex literary process that stretched over a thousand years (Dever 2003:1). As the archaeological evidence mounted in the heyday of 'Biblical archaeology', the question of Israelite origins grew more intractable (Dever 2003:5). Three competing theories or 'models' eventually emerged (Dever 2003:5).

The Conquest Model, as championed by the legendary orientalist William Foxwell Albright, in Dever's assessment was set aside by the mounting archaeological evidence in regard to destruction levels (or lack thereof) at such sites as Dibon and Hesbon in Transjordan and by Kenyon's work at Jericho. Simply put, archaeology tells us that the biblical story of the fall of Jericho, miraculous elements aside, cannot have been founded on genuine historical sources (Dever 2003:47). Further, he cited Callaway's work at Ai (1965–1972) as a major blow to the conquest theory (Dever 2003:47–48).

Dever recognized that Albright was not alone in his belief in the Conquest Model. John Bright, a student of Albright, wrote that the external evidence at our disposal is considerable and important, and in light of it, the historicity of such a conquest ought no longer to be denied (Bright 2000:129). Further, a leading Israeli archaeologist, Yigael Yadin, said that archaeology broadly confirms that at the end of the Late Bronze Age (thirteenth century BC) semi-nomadic Israelites destroyed a number of Canaanite cities and gradually and slowly built their own sedentary settlements on the ruins and occupied the remainder of the country (Yadin 1982:23).

In regard to Alt and Noth's Peaceful Infiltration Model, Dever noted that the model is badly flawed by its dependence on typical nineteenth-century European misconceptions about Bedouin life (Dever 2003:52). As our knowledge of Bedouin life and the Arabic language increased it was apparent that Bedouins did not infiltrate, but rather they came in strongly as land-hungry hordes, settling only when drought, famine, or adverse political conditions compelled them to (Dever 2003:52).

The Peasant Revolt Model, as proposed by Albright's student George Mendenhall, was a highly original contribution to American biblical scholarship in the twentieth century (Dever 2003:52). Mendenhall proposed an internal revolution that was religiously motivated. However, Dever noted that even if the theory was brilliant (which he questioned), it was too radical for most scholars and perhaps too precocious (Dever 2003:53). Furthermore, there was little, if any, archaeological evidence to support it (Dever 2003:52). According to Dever, the Peasant Revolt Model seems more compatible with current archaeological data and theory than any other model—especially in the modified form advanced by Gottwald's emphasis on the role of technology and economy of the Late Bronze Age Canaanite society (Dever 1992b:553).

The pottery of the Iron I hill-country colonists is the best clue to their origins (Dever 2003:125). Dever noted that:

> Ceramic specialists (among them my own students) have demonstrated that despite the similarities in the basic forms of Late Bronze Age and Iron I pottery, the potting techniques were often different. In particular, Iron I potting techniques generally reveal fewer wheel-forming techniques, except in its finishing (2003:118).

The shift to hand-made vessels would seem to indicate a change from large-scale industrial production to cottage industry. Each family, or perhaps a village potter or two, would have made locally all the pottery that was required—a fairly simple repertoire (Dever 2003:118).

The ceramic repertoire of the Iron I villages shows many overall continuities with that of the Late Bronze Age II, but it contains far fewer individual forms (Dever 2003:120). Further it should be noted that in the Iron I villages there is a near-total absence of any imported wares. This stands in sharp contrast to the typical urban repertoire of Late Bronze Age Canaanite sites, where luxury imports from Cyprus and the Greek mainland are common (Dever 2003:120). The most intriguing and controversial question concerning the pottery of this period is whether or not ceramic analysis can enable one to identify the settlers in the hill country ethnically and determine their origins (Dever 2003:121). Finkelstein (1988) argued against Dever's conclusion that

there is continuity in the Late Bronze Age pottery and the pottery assemblages found in the settlements in the hill country:

> Although it is possible to point to a certain degree of continuity in a few types, the ceramic assemblage of the Israelite Settlement sites, taken as a whole, stands in sharp contrast to the repertoire of the Canaanite centers (Finkelstein 1988:274).

Dever pointed out that the few similarities acknowledged by Finkelstein (1988:275) can be explained by the fact that the sedentarized nomads lacked an established ceramic culture and likely absorbed traditions from the well-developed cultures in their vicinity (Dever 2003:124). In reality, Finkelstein's argument for sharp differences between the Late Bronze II and Iron I ceramics is only in the differing percentages of vessel types (Dever 2003:124).

Dever, despite his differences with Finkelstein's assessment of the ceramics, is in agreement that the pottery found in the hill-country villages is of indigenous origins (Dever 2003:125). Dever concluded that this continuity of the pottery shows that these early settlers emerged from within the Late Bronze Age Canaanite society with the only question being from where? (Dever 2003:125).

2.16 Dale Manor (1950–)

Manor studied under renowned professor William Dever at the University of Arizona receiving his PhD in 1996.[10] He is Professor of Archaeology and Bible at Harding University in Searcy, Arkansas. Manor has been Field Director of the Tel Beth-Shemesh Excavation Project in Israel since 2000. In addition, he served on the staff of the Tel Miqne/Ekron and Tel Rehov Projects in Israel. Manor was also an assistant editor of the *Anchor Bible Dictionary* in which he has several articles. He has also authored articles that appear in the *Oxford Encyclopaedia of Archaeology in the Near*

[10] In 2000 I began my archaeological work under the direction of Dr Manor, who was and continues to be the Field Director at the Tel Beth-Shemesh excavations in Israel. I have excavated for 16 seasons under Dr Manor's direction. Our Israeli directors are Shlomo Bunimovitz and Zvi Lederman of Tel Aviv University.

East, the Eerdman's *Dictionary of the Bible* and the *New Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*.

The study of ethnogenesis is a study of the formation of ethnic groups (Faust 2006:7). When did the people known as Israel know they were Israel, is an often-asked question. In a paper presented at Faulkner University in Montgomery, Alabama in the spring of 2012, and published in 2013, Manor coined the term 'Auto-ethnogenesis' referring to a permutation of the Peasant Revolt Model (Manor 2013:100). Manor's contention is that advocates of this model essentially operate from the premise that what became Israel was a *self*-generated people definition that emerged from the resident Canaanite society. Manor sees two tracks characterizing this model, one track set forth by Dever, and the other by Bunimovitz and Lederman.

Manor has been my mentor since I began my archaeological fieldwork in 2000. His expertise in the field of interpretation of archaeological material culture combined with his vast knowledge of the Old Testament renders him a rare combination as a field director. Dr Manor first encouraged the writing of this thesis.

2.17 Shlomo Bunimovitz (1953–)

Bunimovitz is Senior Lecturer in Archaeology at Tel Aviv University. He received his PhD from Tel Aviv University in 1989, writing on *The Land of Israel in the Late Bronze Age—A Case Study of Socio-Cultural Change in a Complex Society.* He has continued to research in the areas of ethnicity and material culture, immigration and acculturation processes in Palestine and Cyprus at the end of the Bronze Age.

Bunimovitz has published many articles dealing with the above subjects in relation to the Bronze Age and the Iron Age. He has written or co-authored several books including *Shilo: The Archaeology of a Biblical Site,* co-authors Israel Finkelstein and Zvi Lederman (1993); *Highlands of Many Cultures Vol. 1: The Sites,* co-authors Finkelstein and Lederman (1997); *Tel Beth-Shemesh: A Border Community in Judah. Renewed Excavations at Tell Beth-Shemesh, Part 1: The Iron Age,* co-author Zvi Lederman (2009)

His field experience includes survey and excavation work alongside Finkelstein and Lederman. Currently he is co-director of the Tel Beth-Shemesh Project that began in 1990. For the past 29 years, with only a couple of non-excavating years, Bunimovitz and Lederman have led the team and volunteers who faithfully come year after year to the amazing site of Tel Beth-Shemesh. The author of this thesis has had the privilege of working 16 seasons under the direction of Bunimovitz, his co-director Zvi Lederman and field director Dale Manor.

Bunimovitz subscribes to the Auto-ethnogenesis Model set forth by Manor in his presentation at Faulkner University (Manor 2013:15). Along with Lederman, co-director of the Tel Beth-Shemesh excavation, he proposes that the people of Tel Beth-Shemesh (Canaanites) were forced or compelled to carve out their identity during times when their very existence or identity was threatened by another group—the Philistines (Bunimovitz and Lederman 2009:124).

2.18 Zvi Lederman (1951–)

A Harvard-trained PhD, Lederman is a Researcher in Archaeology at Tel Aviv University, Israel. He was a member of the Land of Ephraim Survey, and has excavated at Aphek, Mount Ebal, Beer-Sheba, Shiloh and Beth-Shemesh. His PhD dissertation was titled: *An Early Iron Age Village at Khirbet Raddana: The Excavations of Joseph A. Callaway.* Since 1990, he has co-directed the Tel Beth-Shemesh Project along with Shlomo Bunimovitz, also of Tel Aviv University.

Lederman and Bunimovitz make a good team and are passionate about the work at Beth-Shemesh and its contribution to the understanding of the border town's relationship to and influence on the region, especially in relation to the Philistines. Both Lederman and Bunimovitz subscribe to what Manor (2013:15) coined as the Auto-ethnogenesis Model of Israelite settlement.

2.19 Thomas Thompson (1939–)

Very little mention is made in this thesis in regard to the Biblical minimalists, of whom Thompson is one of the leading writers (Dever 2003:191). Born in Detroit, Michigan,

he was professor of theology at the University of Copenhagen from 1993–2009. He lives in Denmark and is now a Danish citizen.

Thompson is one of the Copenhagen School faculty that has a very low view of the historicity of the Bible, in fact, giving it little or no historical value at all (Dever 2003:191). Thompson refers to the Old Testament as 'fictionalize[d] history' (Thompson 1992:9). This loosely-knit group of scholars holds that the Bible cannot be used as a source to determine the history of ancient Israel, and that 'Israel' itself is a problematic concept (Casey 2014:24). As a biblical minimalist/historian Thompson's deconstruction of history and archaeology ends up purporting that Israel never existed (Dever 2003:19; Thompson 1995:683–698).

Thompson's arguments in his 1999 work *The Bible in History: How Writers Create a Past, (*US title: *The Mythic Past: Biblical Archaeology and the Myth of Israel*), were highly controversial and were criticized by many biblical scholars, prominent among them being William G Dever in his book *What Did the Biblical Writers Know and When Did They Know It? (*Dever 2003:30–34).

Given the documented fact that Thompson is prone to extreme exaggeration (Dever 2003:31), he was considered an outsider and never accepted by the religious establishment. He eventually found his niche in the Copenhagen School along with other like-minded revisionists (Dever 2003:31).

2.20 Summary of Chapter Two: An Historical Survey of Scholarship on the Settlement Period

The initial chapter of this thesis recognizes some of the major scholars who have been or are currently engaged in the complex discussion of how, where and when Israel emerged in the Land of Canaan. A brief summary of each scholar's credentials and expertise was given, followed by their contribution to the question of the origin of Israel in Canaan. As this thesis develops, the contribution of these scholars will be fleshed out in regard to their particular idea (theory/model) of how Israel emerged. Five models or theories are listed and associated with the scholar or scholars who first proposed them, and other scholars who continued their initial work: (1) The Conquest

Model; (2) The Peaceful Infiltration Model; (3) The Peasant Revolt Model; (4) The Symbiosis Model; (5) The Auto-ethnogenesis Model.

Dever points out that the mainstream European biblical scholarship has virtually given up on writing a satisfactory history of ancient Israel (2001:7). Halpern (2010:279) notes that the investigation of the Israelite Settlement, the discussion of textual-archaeological correlations has grown sterile or stale. Dever notes that judging by the scant discussions in the literature; the notion of 'theory' meets with apathy at best and often with open hostility (2001:76)

American archaeologists have shown some interest in what is usually called 'theory and method'; however, their understanding of *method* has generally been only improved digging and recording techniques. This lack of inquiry into the very intellectual foundations of the discipline, basically absent in American archaeological circles, causes Israelis to view the few attempts at theory-building by Americans with scepticism (Dever 2001:76). Examining the current material dealing with the origin of ancient Israel, there seems to be a continued lack of theory building and offering of new models, while scientific and digital gadgetry continues to be added to excavation projects.

As this thesis goes forward, it should be pointed out that the relationship between the archaeological world and the realm of biblical history seems at times to be working more closely than in past years. At least the language of some influential archaeologists reflects a desire to find some role for the Bible texts in the discussion of the history of Israel. Particularly, Bunimovitz and Faust have offered a positive view toward the integration of archaeology and the Bible noting that using the Bible as a cultural document to answer certain questions will restore its central place in the archaeological discourse of the biblical period. They go on to say:

> Conceiving of both the biblical text and the ancient material artifacts as cultural documents, we believe that their inspection will be fruitful and enlightening. Words and artifacts can give us access to the mindset of the people of the biblical period (Bunimovitz and Faust 2010:43).

The position suggested by Bunimovitz and Faust is very refreshing for those who consider the Bible to be more than just a 'cultural document'. I see no problem with Bunimovitz and Faust's suggestion that a new archaeological agenda lead the way, rather than its direction being dictated by the biblical texts (Bunimovitz and Faust 2010:44).

Unfortunately, the majority of scholarship, not just the minimalists, continues to view the biblical texts as non-historical. Murray wrote in 1998:

> It does not matter whether the stories … are true … And even a forgery is an important piece of evidence for the period that perpetrated it … This principle of unconscious revelation through representation … is one of the most powerful tools in the modern historian's study of mentalities (Murray 1998:xxxi).

Bunimovitz and Faust's positive statement concerning the relationship of the Bible and the archaeological agenda is essentially negated in their agreement with the statement of Murray some ten years earlier (Bunimovitz and Faust 2010:48).

More than 30 years ago in the 1980s (Bunimovitz and Faust 2010:47), Dever argued for the separation of what was then popularly called 'Biblical Archaeology' from biblical studies generally, and theological studies in particular—'we won that battle' (Dever 2010:349). Then in the 1990s Dever, once the most vocal advocate for a secular Syro-Palestinian archaeology, called for a 'New Biblical Archaeology' (Dever 1993:706–722).[11] Disappointingly, Dever's plea for a 'New Biblical Archaeology' along new lines of construction was generally unheeded (Bunimovitz and Faust 2010:47).

Bunimovitz and Faust applauded the effort to bring to the forefront a 'New Biblical Archaeology'. However, they suggested that the 'New Biblical Archaeology' does not directly address the need for a more sophisticated integration between the biblical texts and the archaeological finds, nor do new methodologies necessarily transform an old agenda (Bunimovitz and Faust 2010:47; Clarke 1973:11). The positive rhetoric

[11] Dever's call for a New Biblical Archaeology was a call to reintroduce the biblical text into the world of archaeology. He noted that the texts, problematic as they might be, are still important in an attempt to study the Iron Age. Dever called for a new cooperation between archaeologists and biblical scholars.

used in suggesting that the Bible once again be at the heart of the archaeological discourse (Bunimovitz and Faust 2010:50) is quickly diminished by a critical analysis of the language used in regard to this so-called return:

> While liberating the research from the 'shackles of the Bible', it is rather the new approach to Biblical Archaeology suggested here that reinstates the Bible at the heart of the archaeological discourse of the Iron Age (Bunimovitz and Faust 2010:50).

While the state of the relationship between archaeology and biblical history is encouraging, there is still a wide gulf between men and women of faith and the true adherent to the pre-eminence of archaeology over the Bible. Although noting that the Bible is valuable in the new archaeological agenda, it is especially disheartening to read Bunimovitz and Faust's description of the Bible as an 'unconscious revelation' (Bunimovitz and Faust 2010:50).

CHAPTER THREE

SOURCE DOCUMENTS: JUDGES 1 AND JOSHUA

3.1 Introduction: The Bible as a Source Document

On the subject of the use of the Bible in archaeological discourse, two prominent Israeli archaeologists are on record as noting that the problematic nature of the Bible has rendered it almost illegitimate (Bunimovitz and Faust 2010:43). The author of this thesis does not accept this premise; however, he understands that this is the current position of many who deal with the question of the origin of Israel in Canaan. Quite correctly, Coote and Whitelam recognize that the Bible has been the most influential source of the prevailing ideas about the nature of Israel from its inception (Israel's) to the present—ultimately functioning as a document of faith that preserves the life, shape and identity of many communities of faith (2010:14). Along the same line of thought, Amnon Ben-Tor contends that if one eliminates the Bible from the archaeology of the land of Israel in the second and first millennia BCE, you have deprived it of its soul (1992:9).

Bunimovitz and Faust refer to the Bible as a cultural document that when viewed as such, can be used to answer questions raised by the archaeological data which will restore it (the Bible) to its central place in the discussion (Bunimovitz and Faust 2010:43). The concept of the Bible as a cultural document will be explored more thoroughly as this thesis proceeds.

3.2 Judges

The first category of evidence for the emergence of Israel in Canaan comes from the biblical texts themselves (Dever 1990:40). Two biblical documents, Judges and Joshua, stand out as sources to consult in regard to the emergence of the Israelites in the land of Canaan. Without going into a detailed analysis, it has been suggested that the book of Judges presents a significantly different and more accurate picture of the taking of the land of Canaan by the Israelite tribes than does the book of Joshua

(Bloch-Smith and Nakhai 1999:65; Dever 1990:79). Due to the demise of the Conquest Theory, Joshua was viewed as problematic history, and attention was directed to Judges, which seemed to tell a story that at least did not contradict the archaeological evidence (Moore and Kelle 2011:107).

Clearly, the purpose of the book of Judges is to portray the unfolding of Israel's history from the death of Joshua down to the advent of the monarchy—an era referred to as 'the period of the Judges' (Goslinga 1986:196). The biblical text has little to say about the day-to-day activities of many of the judges, although it does seem to distinguish the activities of major judges who saved the people from major dangers, as opposed to judges with no such deeds attributed to them (Isserlin 2001:68). Judges primarily presents a general picture of an essentially rural society linked by a common faith living in turbulent times where 'every man did that which was right in his own eyes' (Isserlin 2001:67; Judg 21:25, KJV).[12] The first three chapters of Judges broadly outline the conduct of the Israelites during the period of the Judges with regard to the Canaanites and their gods, and also with regard to the Lord himself (Goslinga 1986:197).

On the one hand, Judges 2:11–23 evokes an era in which the Israelites and Canaanites lived side by side, sometimes amicably and at other times antagonistically (Bloch-Smith and Nakhai 1999:65). On the other hand, Joshua reflects a more theologically-based document, highlighting the direct involvement of the Lord in the eventual securing of the land of promise. A superficial reading of Joshua can give the impression that the Israelites occupied Canaan by means of a divinely-enabled blitzkrieg that put them in control of the entire country and encouraged all the Canaanites to leave (Goldingay 2011:90).

In times of crisis, judges led the Israelites in attacks against their enemies (Judg 3:7–8; 4:1–2; 6:1; and others), but many years (Judg 3:11, 30; 5:31) seem to have passed peacefully (Bloch-Smith and Nakhai 1999:65). It was in these times of crisis that God raised up charismatic leaders (primarily militia leaders) who led successful forays against the entrenched Canaanites without really winning any decisive battles (Dever

[12] All subsequent scripture references, are from the ESV unless otherwise stated, but this one is from the KJV.

1990:41). Among other things, Judges chapter 1 presents a very human process in which the Israelite occupation of Canaan was actually quite piecemeal (Goldingay 2011:90).

The twelfth and eleventh centuries BC in Palestine have usually been labelled either the period of the Judges, following biblical historiography, or the premonarchial period (Ahlstrom 1993:371). Chronology is vague in Judges concerning single events and the total length of the period (Isserlin 2001:67). In general, the material found in the book of Judges demands exhaustive critical analysis on a par with the book of Joshua (Bloch-Smith 1999:65). Judges begins with a flashback into the book of Joshua when Judah and Simeon had generally exterminated their enemies and relatively secured their allotments—Judges 1:1–21 (Manor 2005:14). However, the remaining tribes had failed to secure their allotments, and they are pictured as living as neighbours with the Canaanites—Judges 1:22–36. Judges presents a picture of the occupation of Palestine that makes it clear it was a long process, accomplished by the efforts of individual clans, and only partially completed (Bright 2000:129). The process is best seen in the first chapter of the book of Judges.

Judges obviously deals with leadership or a crisis in leadership (Judg 2:10). The crisis was born out of the failure of Joshua's generation to properly train the next generation (Butler 2009:lxxvii). Judges also deals with the fact of Israel's disobedience of the will of God, which is defined twice (Judg 2:11; 3:7). The people never passed God's test (Judg 3:4), which resulted in their limited occupation of the land of Canaan. In some sections of Judges, God's guidance and specific intentions are clearly spoken of, while in others it is as if God left the nation to itself for a time: this is especially true of chapters 17–21 (Goslinga 1986:201). Here, Israel's political and social troubles can be traced directly to the people's failure to follow the example of Joshua's generation (Judg 2:17). Judges 2:11–19 presents a deliberate sketch of the course of Israel's history during this period (Goslinga 1986:199).

Rather than attempting a strict chronology, Judges presents a theological history with a geographical and moral framework (Butler 2009:lxvi). As a source for examining the emergence of Israel in Canaan, opinions differ as to the usefulness of Judges. The traditional view is represented by Keil (2001:248), who maintains that Judges was

written during the time of Samuel based on oral and written documents. Ahlstrom represents the postmodern Scandinavian approach, noting that the author of Judges did not intend to describe actual events, since such a literary pattern cannot be used for writing history (Ahlstrom 1993:375). Butler views Judges as a historical construct by the editor, who collected and combined the hero stories, but it is at the same time a necessary construct (Butler 2009:lxxi).

Halpern (1988:276–277) argued in his work *The First Historians: The Hebrew Bible and History* that a historical core in Judges is evident and recoverable. Moore and Kelle wrote:

> Halpern's defense of Judges was the most complete and systematic expression of the nonminimalist position, and most historians have continued to use Judges as a historical source. Few have included specific scenarios or people from Judges in history, but most at least note that Judges and archaeology do not appear to contradict each other (2011:107–108).

Moore and Kelle further argued that Judges exhibits exactly the kind of society that would produce monarchical states such as Israel under Saul, David and Solomon, and should not be discounted (2011:108).

3.3 Joshua

Goldingay notes that an examination of how Joshua works as a narrative is important, if one is to truly understand the message of the book:

> The whole is put together as a sequence: the introductory challenge, the taking of the land, the allocation of the land and the closing challenges. The book gives much weight to certain stories (notable Rahab, Jericho, Ai) and skips over the detail of many of the other events (2015:148).

Goldingay's comments give credence to the fact that Joshua's account is highly theological rather than giving the chronological historical details of Israel's emergence in Canaan. While maintaining that the stories are not fictional, Goldingay contends that they are basically factual stories that use the techniques of their culture, which are different from those of modern Western storytelling (2015:149).

Following the death of Moses, his successor, Joshua, is said to have led the Israelite tribes in a well-planned and complete conquest of the land of Canaan which included three major military campaigns (Bloch-Smith and Nakhai 1999:65). The first was the crossing of the Jordan River and the miraculous fall of Jericho, then the capture of Ai and Gibeon, and finally the invasion of the hill country around Jerusalem (Josh 1:1–10:29). The second campaign ended with the conquest of the southern cities of Makkedah, Libnah, Eglon, Hebron and Debir (Josh 10:28–43). The final northern campaign resulted in the conquest of Hazor (Josh 11:1–13:7). The result was that the Canaanite residents were allegedy decimated and their land divided among the twelve Israelite tribes (Josh 13–22).

Modern Western readers assume that a story needs to be completely historical in order to be valid, and if it combines history and parable, they are inclined to assume that you must be able to tell where story ends and parable begins (Goldingay 2015:162). Goldingay goes on to say that it seems that in inspiring the book of Joshua, the Holy Spirit did not see it that way, and God invites us to relax in reading the book as it is (2015:163). Goldingay's comments speak to the theological nature of the book of Joshua intertwined with the historical account.

It is clear that the book of Joshua highlights only three military campaigns (Josh 6–8; 10; 11). Merling asks whether or not it is possible that Joshua was written, not so much as a book of conquest, but rather as a book of confirmation (1996:210). In other words, perhaps the primary goal of the book of Joshua was to confirm and re-affirm the uniqueness of Israel, as evidenced by the presence and guidance of God (Merling 1996:155). The first half of the book of Joshua tells of the military exploits of Israel with special emphasis on the work of God, rather than providing details of the battles and the extent of the devastation of the cities.

3.3.1 The Historicity of the Exodus

Joshua 1:1 relates that after the death of Moses, the Lord said to Joshua the son of Nun, Moses' assistant, 'Moses my servant is dead. Now, therefore arise, go over this Jordan, you and all this people, into the land that I am giving to them, to the people of Israel' (Josh 1:2). This thesis accepts that there was an exodus of Israelites from the bondage of Egypt, led by Moses, that resulted in a wilderness wandering that ended

at the death of Moses, and that Joshua had been commanded to take the land God had promised to the descendants of Abraham. Yigael Yadin asks, 'What nation would invent such a crazy story, that they were slaves in Egypt and they left that country and came to this country, and then make that the kernel of all their history?' (Shanks 1983:16–23). Yadin concludes that even if one wants to minimize it, there is a core of truth there—a historical core even if it did not happen exactly as it is recorded (Shanks 1983:16–23). There is only a single tradition of Israel's origin preserved—they came from outside Canaan, from Egypt, where they were slaves (Shanks 1983:16–23).

Bright, in his major work *A History of Israel* notes that many view the biblical stories of the Exodus and other events with the profoundest scepticism (2000:107). He correctly goes on to say that to ignore the scepticism by merely rehearsing the biblical narrative would be pointless (2000:107). The best possible outcome may be reached only when the biblical traditions are examined in light of the available evidence—only then may one make such positive statements as the evidence seems to justify (Bright 2000:107). Halpern suggests that the closest parallel to the book of Exodus in the ancient West is *Homer's Odyssey*—neither account records events that are likely to have left marks in the archaeological record, or even in contemporaneous monuments (1992:87). Halpern views the story of the exodus as a historical myth of an entire people—a focal point for national identity (1992:88).

The famous hieroglyphic text known as the Merneptah Stele dates to about 1205 BC and refers to Israel at this time as a people (not a country or nation) probably located in Transjordan (Rainey 2008:54).[13] Pharoah Merneptah was not only aware of Israel, he boasts that one of the most important achievements of his reign was the defeat of Israel (Shanks 1992:19). Thus, according to this evidence, in 1207 to 1205 BC, Israel was a force in Canaan living among the petty states that were organized under the Egyptian crown.[14] Though a cultural unity, Canaan was politically without identity (Bright 2000:119). These dates are within the transition period between the Late Bronze Age and Iron Age I.

[13] This major piece of evidence regarding Israel's presence in Canaan at this time will be explored more fully later in the thesis.

[14] At this juncture in time, the end of the Late Bronze Age, Egypt was basically too weak to sustain an empire (McCarter 1992:131).

3.3.2 Israel Prepares to Enter Canaan

Prior to the Israelite nation laying siege to Jericho, Joshua recounts, in some detail, the preparations that were made prior to Israel's crossing the Jordan River into Canaan—even noting the distance (2,000 cubits) to be maintained between the Levitical priests carrying the Ark of the Covenant and the people following behind (Josh 3:1–4). The people were told to consecrate themselves in preparation for the wonders they would witness at the hand of the Lord. Joshua tells the readers that God's intention was to exalt him in the sight of the people so they would know that the God of Israel was with him, as he was with Moses (Josh 3:7). The overriding belief in God's omnipresence in history is present in all the biblical books, but nowhere more forcefully than in the book of Joshua. In the Joshua volume in the Anchor Bible series Wright correctly says that 'there is one hero, and only one, and it is God himself, and to him Israel must give all praise and credit' (Boling 1982a:13).

The book of Numbers (chapters 13–36) tells the story of Israel's time and preparation in Transjordan. It was not a time of peace and settlement. The kings of Transjordan, Sihon and Og were defeated. The book of Deuteronomy reviews how the Israelites defeated King Sihon when he refused them passage through his land and attacked them at Jahaz. Soon afterward, the Israelites spied out Jazer and captured it. As they headed north from Jazer, the Israelites were attacked by King Og's forces at Edrei, but they defeated the king and took control of his land as well. Both Sihon and Og were Amorites (Deut 3:8). A significant part of the land, from the Arnon River in the south, to the Yarmuk River in the north and on up into Bashan was taken by the forces of Israel. In fact, the text notes in Deuteronomy 3:3: 'So the Lord our God gave into our hand Og also, the king of Bashan, and all his people and we struck them down until he had no survivors left. And we took all his cities'.

3.3.3 The Fall of Jericho (Josh 3:1–6:27)

Two things stand out in the biblical text of the book of Joshua: (1) it is a compilation of the earliest events of the Israelites in the land of Canaan—the Land of Promise; (2) it tells the stories of the battles the Israelites fought and how they were led prior to the period of the Judges. Early commentators of the book of Joshua understood the text to say that Israel's mighty army destroyed every city it attacked and massacred all the

inhabitants leaving the land empty of foes, ready for peaceful Israelite occupation thereafter (Albright 1935; Wright 1962; Yadin 1993).

Albright, the father of the Conquest Model, accepted the basic biblical tradition of invasion and conquest (Isserlin 2001:56). Gottwald went so far as to write:

> A cursory reading of the Bible supports the conquest theory to such an extent that generations of readers never even considered another possibility… Nothing could seem more conclusive. Thus the solidest piece of evidence for the conquest model is its great antiquity, deeply rooted in the old Israelite traditions (1979:192).

Gottwald's assessment shows the popularity the Conquest Model enjoyed among those who did not dig deeply into the biblical text. Merling further notes that even those who doubt the authenticity of the biblical accounts assume that the book of Joshua is a story of universal conquest (1996:107). This recognition demonstrates the fact that there was an undeniable military component (a conquest) involved in the taking of the Land of Canaan—the question remains as to how much involvement Israel had, or what role, if any, Israel played in the process? The source documents of Judges and Joshua certainly reflect the old Israelite traditions.

The belief in an all-encompassing, bloodthirsty conquest is not only an accepted theory, but leaves theologians and pew-sitters alike with a soul-searching sense of guilt. How could such a description of violence and brutality fit within the Christian perspective? What does it say to one when wrestling with modern-day conflicts/wars? Robert Coote wrote that 'Joshua presents an orgy of terror, violence and mayhem … it forms a triumphant finale to the Bible's foundational epic of liberation, the savage goal toward which God's creation of Israel and delivery of Israel from slavery in Egypt appears to point from the start' (1998:555).

From the outset, and throughout the book of Joshua, the writer emphasizes the presence of God among his people, Israel (Josh 1:1). The accounts are particularly specific about the conquest of the Benjamin region, where God brought down the walls of Jericho, gave them Ai by stratagem and the compact with the Gibeonites through deceit (Isserlin 2001:54). It was God with them (Josh 3:10) and in control (Josh 3:15–

17). Thus, the battle for Jericho was not a battle at all, but more in the vein of a miraculous event orchestrated by God (Merling 1996:108). The priests of God blew the trumpets, carried the Ark of the Covenant, and it was God, not the Israelites, who gave Jericho to his people (Merling 1996:108). Joshua chapter 6 expresses plainly, and in a powerful manner, that it was the power of Yahweh alone that was responsible for Israel's occupation of the land (Stern 1991:145). Quite correctly, Merling notes that one must approach the reading of the book of Joshua with an eye toward seeing the biblical writer's emphasis on the presence and power of God in all the events (1996:160). Clearly, the biblical writers noted that God fought for Israel (Josh 10:42).

The conquest of Jericho occurred in such an extraordinary manner, and is described in great detail, primarily because it was the first city the Israelites confronted as they entered the Land of Promise. It is likely that the Lord chose to use Jericho as an object lesson to impress upon the people that they were receiving the land solely as a gift from him, and that the land properly belonged to the Lord alone (Goslinga 1986:73). Jericho was dealt with more severely than any of the other cities of Canaan, to make this point clear.[15] The Israelites' taking of the land as a gift from God, meant that they were to dedicate it to him and live within the land as a holy nation (Goslinga 1986:74).

3.3.4 Ai (Josh 7:1–8:35)

The frankness of the biblical text and the integrity of the Lord are demonstrated in the events surrounding the Israelite attack on the city of Ai. Israel was not invincible, certainly not when they were acting in defiance of the commandments of the Lord. God did not protect them or assist them when, after having warned them (Josh 6:18), Achan took some of the dedicated things (Josh 7:1). The significance of Joshua chapter 7 is the picture it presents of the holiness of God's covenant with Israel—a picture that revealed God would not at all times and in all circumstances grant victory and prosperity to Israel (Goslinga 1986:83).

Perhaps feeling a bit overconfident, following the victory at Jericho, the spies sent out by Joshua to evaluate the city of Ai reported that only 2,000 or 3,000 men would

[15] According to the biblical record, the firing of Canaanite towns was not a general practice of the Israelites (Isserlin 2001:57).

be needed to take the city because of its size (Josh 7:3). Little did Joshua know that sin was in the camp when he dispatched his troops to launch an attack in which 36 of his men lay dead at the hands of the soldiers at Ai while the rest of them retreated for their lives (Josh 7:5). Ai was a wake-up call to the people that the God of Israel meant what he said, and enforced disobedience with severe punishment. Joshua took all of Israel with him to administer the severe punishment upon Achan and his household (Josh 7:24–26). The end of the story in Joshua chapter 7 demonstrates how a defeated nation could find new hope and help from Yahweh (Butler 2014:398).

Having obeyed the Lord by ridding the camp of the sin of Achan, Joshua took all his army to attack Ai (Josh 8:1), having received from the Lord his blessing and also permission to enjoy the spoils of victory. The story of Joshua chapter 7 sheds important light on the sober, realistic character of sacred history (Goslinga 1986:83). Unlike Jericho, where the strategic planning belonged to the Lord and the Israelites simply followed the plan—the attack on Ai shows the military planning of a great general such as Joshua. He used the element of ambush, surprise and deception to draw out the men of Ai on to the open battlefield where a great victory was given to them by the Lord (Josh 8:1–29). At both Jericho and Ai God gave Joshua action plans, quite different for the two places, yet both expressing how it was not by military power that Israel was going to take Canaan (Goldingay 2011:38).

The events at Ai were finalized with a grand worship assembly in which Joshua reiterated to the people the importance of following the commandments set forth by God through his servant Moses (Josh 8:30–35).[16] Surely, it was an impressive sight to behold—with half the Israelites in front of Mount Gerizim and the other half in front of Mount Ebal as Joshua read every word from the commandments given to Moses. The Ai story shows that if you sort things out with God, you can have a new start (Goldingay 2011:39). Israel learned a valuable lesson on how to find its way back to its identity as the people of God once that identity is lost—it must come through purification (Butler 2014:427).

[16] It was here at Mt Ebal and Mt Gerizim, essentially in the neighbourhood of the Canaanite town of Shechem where Joshua renewed the covenant with Israel. This thesis will explore in chapter six why there was no conflict between the Israelites and the inhabitants of Shechem.

What better way to start afresh than with a call to renew a commitment to the commands of the Lord? At Mount Ebal and Mount Gerizim the people gathered to renew the covenant of blessing as well as cursing by submitting to the Lord God of Israel as his servants (Manor 2005:36).

3.3.5 Gibeon (Josh 9:1–27)

Israel's defeat of Ai, shortly after the phenomenal conquest of Jericho, sent panic throughout Canaan. Joshua 5:1 shows that the Amorite kings were overwhelmed by fear (Goslinga 1986:91). Most of the city-states made military alliances with other city-states to take a stand against the onslaught of the Israelites. In Joshua 9:1–5 the text tells that Gibeon and its surrounding cities decided to use deception to seek an alliance with Israel, after which they were found out and cursed for their subterfuge (Manor 2005:37).

Through an elaborate deception, involving making themselves (the Gibeonites) appear to be travellers who had come from a faraway country—they persuaded Joshua and the leaders of Israel to make peace with them. The story illustrates the importance of asking the counsel of the Lord prior to making significant decisions (Josh 9:14). It further illustrates the fallacy of relying solely upon human wisdom, as pointed out in the book of Proverbs 14:12 (Manor 2005:40). The peace that Joshua and the leaders (princes) of Israel made with the Gibeonites could not be overturned, regardless of the murmuring of the congregation of Israel (Josh 9:18). The Gibeonites made up the population of the cities of Gibeon, Chephirah, Beeroth and Kiriath-jearim (Josh 9:17). Perhaps Israel, besides falling for the elaborate deception, was desirous of having at least one ally in the world of enemies surrounding them (Goslinga 1986:94).

Perhaps to please the congregation and save face, Joshua and the leaders of Israel agreed that they could not 'smite' the Gibeonites (kill them); however, the Gibeonites would suffer a severe penalty for their deception—they would be hewers of wood and drawers of water for the entire Israelite nation (Josh 9:21). Having decided to let the Gibeonites live, the leaders kept them from mingling with the Israelites and leading them astray by compelling them to accept the humiliating tasks of woodcutters and water carriers (Goslinga 1986:95).

3.3.6 Gibeon Rescued and the Southern Campaign (Josh 10:1–43)

Adoni-zedek, a Jebusite (Goslinga 1986:96) king of Jerusalem, upon hearing of the utter destruction of Ai by the Israelites and the peace they had made with the Gibeonites, was fearful. His fear was precipitated primarily because he knew that Gibeon, by comparison to Ai, was a great city (one of the royal cities) and the men of Gibeon were known as mighty warriors (Josh 10:1–3). Adoni-zedek's fear prompted him to initiate an alliance with other city-states in his area to punish the Gibeonites for their having entered into an alliance with the enemy—Israel. The five Amorite city-state kings who aligned themselves with Jerusalem were Hoham, king of Hebron, Piram, king of Jarmuth, Japhia, king of Lachish and Debir, king of Eglon (Josh 10:3–4).[17] Thus the city-states of Jerusalem, Hebron, Jarmuth, Lachish and Debir prepared to attack Gibeon.[18]

When the Gibeonites realized that they were in danger of attack from the Amorite confederacy, they sent word to Joshua who was camped with the Israelite nation at Gilgal asking him to protect them because they were the servants of Israel (Josh 10:5). The great general Joshua marshalled his army and marched through the night to arrive in time to fight for the Gibeonites against the Amorite kings who dwelled in the hill country (Josh 10:7–9).[19] This gave Joshua the element of surprise along with the continued aid of the Lord God of Israel (Josh 10:10), who discomfited Israel's enemies. It should be noted that the distance from Gilgal to Gibeon is about 19 miles (Manor 2005:40).

The Israelite victory at Gibeon over the attacking Amorite kings is described as a 'great slaughter at Gibeon' (Josh 10:10) and precipitated the southern campaign as Joshua and the Israelite army pursued the Amorite kings as they hastily retreated. Joshua chased them westward to Beth-horon[20] and then south-westerly through

[17] The name Amorites refers to the native population of Canaan in general (Goslinga 1986:97). This was the term God used when explaining to Abraham that it would be a long time before it was proper to give his descendants the country; the Amorites' waywardness did not justify God's doing so. But now it did. But only once did God give the Israelites the land and take up the waywardness of the land's occupants in order to do so, as well as commission Israel to be the means of exacting the divine redress (Goldingay 2011:52).

[18] The hostile cities of the alliance lay in the highlands south and southwest of Jerusalem.

[19] Verse 8 shows that Joshua must have consulted the Lord for advice (Goslinga 1986:97).

[20] This was Upper Beth-horon, five miles northwest of Gibeon, not Lower Beth-horon that lay more to the west. See Joshua 16:3, 5 (Goslinga 1986:98).

Azekah and Makkedah (Manor 2005:43). God's miraculous assistance came in the form of hailstones which fell upon them as far south as Azekah, and making the sun stand still (Josh 10:6–15) as Israel routed and destroyed the coalition (Josh 10:16–27). The whole nation of Israel perceived that what Joshua asked for literally came to pass, which showed at this point that the majesty of a heavenly commander rested on Joshua (Goslinga 1986:99). Since Joshua was engaged in battle with five armies of important cities, a thorough mopping-up here would save time and effort in several later campaigns (Manor 2005:43).

The southern campaign is summarized in Joshua 10:28–43—no mercy shown to the Canaanites (no more treaties). The long day allowed Joshua to take Makkedah, where he dealt with the populace as he had at Jericho. From there the Israelite army moved on to Libnah, which was apparently not involved in the initial Amorite coalition, but was in the path of the Israelite assault, an essential city to take so as to secure the central highlands and the Shephelah. Lachish, also not involved in the coalition, was strategically located and thus a necessary town to take—its fate was the same as Makkedah and Libnah. The king of Gezer, Horam, came to the defence of Lachish only to find himself and his army destroyed; there is no record of Israel laying siege to Gezer (Manor 2005:46). Eglon, a member of the original coalition, fell in the same manner as the preceding city-states. Hebron, a member of the coalition, and all the towns within its jurisdiction were destroyed and every person killed.[21] From Hebron Joshua turned back to Debir and conquered it with the same ferocity as he had employed at other cities (Hebron and Libnah).

Joshua 10:40 says: 'So Joshua defeated the whole land, the hill country and the Negeb and the lowland and the slopes and all their kings; he left none remaining'. It sounds as if Joshua had completed the conquest of Canaan, though the context immediately makes clear that the 'whole country' does not mean that—it means the whole of the area south of Gibeon, roughly the bottom half of the mountain heartland, the bottom third of the promised land as a whole (Goldingay 2011:55). The accounts of Joshua and the Israelite army rescuing Gibeon from the Amorite coalition and the subsequent search and destroy mission as they pursued the retreating armies, tell a

[21] Apparently Hebron was taken and then abandoned by Israel. Hebron was later inhabited by the Anakim (Josh 14:6–15), and it was necessary for Israel to retake the city, as well as many other cities.

story of their gaining general control through victories over the major strongholds. The summary does not indicate that every village or hamlet was destroyed—it was not a total extermination of the Canaanites (Manor 2005:47). In fact, Joshua 13:2–6; 15:13–19, 63; 23:7–13 clearly show that complete control of Canaan was not accomplished—cities already said to have been taken by Joshua and all of Israel are shown in Judges 1:9–15 to be taken by individual action (Bright 2000:129).

The story in Joshua chapter 10 demonstrates again that God is in control and supports Israel as she is obedient to his will. Bright suggests that the conquest of Palestine by Israel was, to some degree—how much we will never know—an 'inside job' (2000:138). After Joshua completed the mission to save the Gibeonites and gain control of southern Canaan all the way to Kadesh-barnea and Gaza, he and the army of Israel returned to their camp at Gilgal (Josh 10:41–43).[22] The account given in the book of Joshua leaves little doubt that the Bible depicts the conquest of Israel as a bloody and brutal business (Bright 2000:142).

3.3.7 The Final Northern Campaign and the Fall of Hazor (Josh 11:1–23)

In northern Canaan, Hazor was the prime military strategic site in the region and was a massive city, acting as sentinel for a major crossroad (Manor 2005:48). Upon hearing of the Israelites' devastating attacks on the southern half of Canaan, the king of Hazor (Jabin) began to form an alliance of city-states in his region to fight against Israel. The alliance is described (perhaps hyperbolically) as a great horde unable to be numbered (like the sand on the seashore), (Joshua 11:4). The host was not literally that large, but the description is a hyperbole to emphasize the overwhelming size of the enemy (Manor 2005:48). The group included the kings of Madon, Shimron, Achshaph, the northern hill country, Arabah south of Chinneroth, the lowland, Naphoth-dor on the west, Canaanites in the east and west, Amorites, Hittites, Perizzites, Jebusites in the hill country, and Hivites under Hermon in the land of Mizpah.[23] Given the size and scope of the armies gathered to meet Israel in the north,

[22] The mission of Joshua and the Israelite army included an all-night march in order to arrive in time to engage the enemy at Gibeon and then an all-day-battle—a day that was extended long enough for them to gain control of the entire southern portion of Canaan. Surely God gave them extraordinary strength to complete this task.

[23] Madon was probably 5 miles west of Tiberias, and Achshaph was about 7 miles southeast of Acco. The Arabah is the desert region in the Jordan rift valley through which the river flows. Chinneroth

Goldingay goes so far as to say that the destruction of Hazor (Josh 11) is archaeologically verified and was a greater miracle than the fall of Jericho (Goldingay 2015:163).[24] Given that this thesis has already established that the majority of modern archaeologists give little or no credence to the biblical texts as history—it is safe to conclude there would be little agreement with Goldingay's conclusion.

Without crediting the planning sessions of Joshua and his leaders, the text tells of another surprise attack on the armies of the northern coalition which had gathered at the waters of Merom. Apparently the surprise attack came as the armies of the northern coalition were planning their own strategy against Israel. The attack was such a surprise that the coalition army was dispatched in total disarray (Josh 11:6–9). God's ban on the use of armaments (they were to hamstring the horses and burn the chariots)[25] emphasizes that the key to victory is faithfulness not proliferation of armaments (Manor 2005:49: see Leviticus 26:7–8; Psalms 20:7, 33:17).

Much like the description of the southern campaign, Joshua and the army of Israel routed the forces, which were under the leadership of Jabin, king of Hazor, (Josh 11:10) and pursued them as they all basically fled toward their homes with Israel in hot pursuit. Great Sidon likely refers to the Sidon on the west coast of Canaan, and the Valley of Mizpeh is located to the extreme east near Mount Hermon.

Evidently Jabin had time to retreat to his stronghold at Hazor, where Joshua eventually took the city and executed the king. Except for the curse of the ban on rebuilding given against Jericho, Hazor's fate was basically the same as what was brought against Jericho. Joshua makes Hazor an example to the remaining Canaanites, emphasizing the strength of Israel. Further, he systematically

probably refers to the Sea of Galilee, although there is a city by the same name in the region. Dor is on the Mediterranean coast about 15 miles south of Haifa (Naphoth refers to the heights of Dor), but no mountains surround Dor. It may refer to the Carmel range or its elevation about the coastline. The Jebusites are not limited to Jerusalem—contingents may have lived elsewhere, or some survivors from Jerusalem may have joined forces with them. Mount Hermon is the eastern extremity for the allies.

[24] The archaeological evidence for the fall of Jericho and the biblical data will be compared later in this thesis.

[25] The camp at Merom with its lack of open ground made the normally formidable chariots a nuisance for the allies (Manor 2005:49).

exterminates the indigenous population, as he did in the south, following the instructions given by Moses (Josh 11:12).

Adding insult to injury, or to make the point further to the remaining Canaanites that Israel was in control—Joshua burned the city (Josh 11:13). Hazor joined the list of only five cities, according to Judges and Joshua that were burned or suffered physical destruction during the Israelite invasion of Canaan.[26] As noted previously, it was not the habit of Israel to burn cities, but rather to take the cities that stood on mounds and thus enjoy the spoils of the cities they had conquered (Deut 6:10–11).[27] Joshua, it might be said, was following a chain of command and thus did not find it necessary to repeat everything, since God had already spoken through Moses (Manor 2005:50: Exodus 34:11–12; Deuteronomy 7:2).[28]

In the summary given in Joshua 11:16–23, the text shows that Joshua and the Israelite army had broken the major resistance of the Canaanites—'So Joshua took all that land…' The warring between Israel and the Canaanites was anything but a swift series of battles over a short period of time. The Israelites made peace with only one city, the city of the Hivites—Gibeon, and this was done only through trickery and deceit on the part of the Gibeonites.

The story of the northern conquest shows clearly the work of the Lord using Joshua and the Israelites as his agent against the Canaanites, whose sinful ways were overflowing before God (Josh 11:20–21). The story ends with a note that Joshua continued to clean up some areas, earlier conquered but not held, such as Hebron, Debir and other cities in the southern hill country of Canaan. The Anakim were reported to be giants, descendants of the inhabitants of Hebron who intimidated the ten spies by their stature (Manor 2005:51; Numbers 13:21–22, 28, 33; Deuteronomy 2:10, 21). It has been suggested that possibly Caleb was the actual commander who captured the region of Hebron, with Joshua as the supreme commander receiving the credit (Manor 2005:51). At any rate, the unfinished business of taking control of the

[26] Jericho (Josh 6), Ai (Josh 7–8), Hazor (Josh 11:11–13), Jerusalem (Judg 1:8), and Laish (Judg 18).

[27] A mound is a pile or ridge of earth raised about the surrounding level. In the context of archaeology, it refers to the levels of cities that were built upon one another as the preceding city was destroyed and a new one built atop the flattened rubble. 'Tel' and 'mound' are used synonymously in describing levels of cities rebuilt on the ruins of a previous city

[28] The point made in Deut 6:10–11 will play a prominent role in the latter part of this thesis.

cities in the south was accomplished, and Joshua began to distribute the land inheritance to Israel according to their tribal allotments (Josh 11:23).

And the land had rest from war (Josh 11:23).

3.3.8 The Major Thrust of the Conquest is Completed (Josh 12:1–24)

In Joshua chapter 12, the narrator summarizes the conquest of the Promised Land and also includes the campaign from the east side of the Jordan (Josh 12:1–6). Manor notes two reasons why: (1) to show the unity of Israel as a body, and (2) to show a continuity of Joshua's leadership with that of Moses (2005:52). The kings of western Canaan are listed, including several kings and cities which were not mentioned in the earlier narratives (Josh 12:7–24).

The story is not carried any further, but rather it is supplemented by the review of Israel's conquests, and a complete list of the defeated kings is supplied (Goslinga 1986:110). The first part of chapter 12, verses 1–6, is not found in the first eleven chapters, because Israel had already taken control of the Transjordan under Moses (Goslinga 1986:110). It is nevertheless recalled here because the conquest of the whole land formed one single work begun by the Lord and carried out through his grace.

3.3.9 Summary of Joshua

The first 12 chapters of Joshua tell the story of Israel's entry into the Land of Promise led by Joshua and the guidance of the Lord God of Israel. Chapter 13 begins what is recognized as the second half, or part two, of the book. This second part contains a host of place names and geographical references (Goslinga 1986:114).

In the second half of Joshua, the Lord blesses Joshua with a period of peace—no more war, and allows him the privilege of leading the dividing of the land among the people of Israel (Goslinga 1986:114). While it is true that much of the land still remained in the hands of the enemy (Josh 13:6), the Lord promised that he would drive them out. God allowed the same man who had brought them into Canaan to supervise the division of the land. Goslinga believes that Joshua is a type of Christ:

after gaining salvation for his people, Jesus too grants each believer his allotted share (Goslings 1986:115).

The final verses of the book of Joshua present the ending of the literary story of Joshua by providing the final act in the biography of Joshua, and showing the nature of Israel's obedience and conquest of the Promised Land (Butler 2014a:337). They complete the story begun with the promises to Abraham in Genesis chapter 12. In Joshua 24:28 the conquest narrative is finished, as each Israelite who joined in the covenant ceremony goes on to receive his inheritance. Joshua chapter 23 records that the victories experienced by the Israelites were miraculous and undeserved—God fought for Israel (Josh 23:3, 9) as he had promised (Josh 23:5). Not only was Israel's control of the land credited to God's power, even the distribution of the land was directed by God (Merling 1996:109; Num 26:55; Josh 14:1, 2).

Freedman quite correctly asserts that the primary message of the book of Joshua is the supremacy of YHWH/Yahweh, and that he is in control of all events (1967:37–38).[29] The frequency of the use of the name YHWH in Joshua makes clear the point of God's overriding control of the activities of Israel in the Land of Promise.[30]

3.4 Summary of Chapter Three: Judges and Joshua

Butler sees the literary unit (Josh 24:29–32) as a major indicator that the book of Judges is presented as a sequel to the book of Joshua (2014a:337). Thus, the book of Judges begins with the death of Joshua and the question of who will now lead the nation against the Canaanites. Both Judges and Joshua provide the historical picture of how God intended the Israelite nation to secure the land promised to Abraham, and what was actually accomplished by the Israelites in the process. Both stories reveal the Lord God of Israel as faithful to his promises, even in the face of Israel's failures to comply fully with his directives.

[29] YHWH is known from the Greek as the tetragrammaton, which means consisting of four letters. YHWH was the four-letter name of the God of Israel. The books of the Torah and the rest of the Hebrew Bible (with the exception of Esther, and Song of Songs) contain this Hebrew name. Religiously observant Jews and those who follow the Talmudic Jewish traditions do not pronounce YHWH, nor do they read aloud transliterated forms such as Yahweh. Instead they substitute terms such as 'The Holy One, Blessed Be He', Adonai 'The Lord', or HaShem 'The Name'.

[30] YHWH is used as the specific title of God some 224 times in the book of Joshua (Merling 1996:108).

The chief question, in regard to the biblical text and the origins of ancient Israel, is how the biblical texts pertaining to the emergence of Israel in Canaan are to be understood, and how they are to be illumined by the archaeological data? This chapter has shown encouraging signs that the Bible (biblical texts) is being given more positive attention. Rightly so, several scholars have pointed out the important role the text plays in the archaeological discussion—of particular note are the comments recorded earlier, but worthy of repeating. Coote and Whitelam pointed out that the Bible has been the most influential source of the prevailing ideas about the nature of Israel from its inception (Israel's) to the present--ultimately functioning as a document of faith that preserves the life, shape and identity of many communities of faith (2010:14). Ben-Tor's powerful statement should also be considered by every archaeologist working in the land of Israel—he contends that if one eliminates the Bible from the archaeology of the land of Israel in the second and first millennia BCE, you have deprived it of its soul (1992:9).

As this thesis progresses, the question will be either at the forefront of the discussion or always lingering near the surface. Certainly the positive statements surfaced in this chapter will be part of the continued discussion of the biblical text and its relationship to the archaeological data. Prayerfully, at the conclusion of this work, a reasoned and demonstrative answer will be proffered.

CHAPTER FOUR

ARCHAEOLOGICAL DATA: EXCAVATION OF CANAANITE MOUNDS

4.1 Introduction

The starting point for this portion of the thesis is major Canaanite mounds and their influence and contribution to the question of the origin of Israel. Over the years, as the debate over the origins of Israel continued and intensified, archaeological excavation methods and interpretation steadily improved. These new techniques and improvements brought about a significant tension between the biblical text and archaeological data. The excavation of several Canaanite mounds was the major contributor to understanding the archaeological data compared to the biblical texts. Later, in the early 1970s and onwards, the archaeological surface-survey engendered a new dynamic in the overall enquiry. The contribution of the surface surveys will be the subject of Chapter four. In reference to Canaanite mounds the logical starting place is Jericho.[31]

A premise of this thesis is that one should allow the two distinct disciplines, archaeology and biblical studies, to function independently of one another—that is, neither should dictate a specific agenda. When this formula is followed, it allows for any coherence between the two disciplines to surface as material evidence is examined and intertwined with biblical and other sources. In so doing, the archaeologist and the biblical scholar must accept the fact that there are, and will continue to be, instances where no coherence is found. In such cases, neither discipline has trumped the other—it is just a fact. Both sources are valuable, but both have obvious limitations (Dever 2017:44).

[31] According to the biblical text (Josh 6) Jericho was the first city-state encountered by the Israelites after they crossed the Jordan River into Canaan.

Dever, speaking of what he calls ‘convergences’ notes that when one uses sound methods and deals with the evidence in an honest manner, the two sources (archaeological data and biblical texts) must be dealt with independently and then compared. At this point, there may be convergences—that is, points at which the parallel lines of evidence come together (2017:44). He continues:

> Then we arrive at what historians often call ‘the balance of probability’, or what jurisprudence would regard as ‘the preponderance of evidence’. This is a modest, but obtainable, goal. The inquiry may not offer iron-clad ‘proof’, which neither Biblical studies nor archaeology can claim. But it offers us all that we need to know to get on with meaningful lives (Dever 2017:44).

In the case of the Canaanite mounds archaeological data, some is presented as direct contradiction of the biblical text without allowing for any possible convergence. The same indictment may be applied to some conclusions drawn by scholars from the biblical text. This thesis suggests it would be better in both cases to allow for a verdict of ‘cannot know’ or ‘cannot be determined’, which would at least leave the door open for possible coherence/convergence of the two disciplines.[32]

4.2 Jericho

Jericho is situated in the wide plain of the Jordan Valley, about six miles north of the Dead Sea and close to the steep cliffs that fringe the valley to the west (Kenyon 1993:674). It is located next to a copious spring on the western edge of the Jordan Valley (Wood 1990:45). Jericho enters written history as the first town west of the Jordan to be captured by the Israelites (Josh 2:1). The main mound of the oasis, Tel es-Sultan, is generally identified as the oldest city (Kenyon 1993:674). The main mound rises to a height of 21.5 metres and covers an area of about four hectares (approximately 10 acres).

[32] Archaeological structures cannot be dated per se. Dating is determined through the difficult task of examining the complexities of ceramic typology, epigraphic sources and coins. A more detailed discussion of the dating of destruction layers and structures will be dealt with later.

According to the biblical text, following its destruction at the hands of Joshua (Josh 6) and the Israelites, Jericho was abandoned for centuries until the new settlement was established by Hiel the Bethelite in the time of Ahab—in the ninth century BC (1 Kgs 16:34). Other biblical texts suggest that Jericho never recovered importance, with archaeological evidence showing that occupation on the ancient site came to an end at the time of the Babylonian Exile. The centres of the later Jerichos were elsewhere in the oasis (Kenyon 1993:674).

One problem faced by excavators, in regard to tying the written record to the archaeological data, is that the book of Joshua provides very little specific information about the cities captured by the Israelites (Merling 1996:111). Without specific detail, Joshua records that the walls of Jericho fell and the city was burned (Josh 6). Jericho serves as a flagship concern against the biblical narrative found in Joshua chapter six. Excavations through the years have failed to identify remains associated with the Exodus and Conquest regardless of the date to which one subscribes (Manor 2013:94).

4.2.1 Sellin and Watzinger— Early Excavations at Jericho 1907–1909

The first major excavation at Jericho was conducted by an Austro-German team that worked from 1907 through 1909 (Wood 1990:47).[33] According to their report they uncovered three superimposed civilizations: pre-Israelite, Israelite, and Jewish and Byzantine (1913). While their charts and drawings were impressive, they conducted their work during the formative years of archaeological technique with an emphasis on exposing architecture, rendering their work of 'limited' use (Kenyon 1993:674). Their work came before pottery chronology was well developed, so their dating was far off the mark (Wood 1990:47).

4.2.2 Garstang Excavations 1930–1936

J Garstang organized the next series of excavations at Jericho in 1930–1936. Garstang was the first director of the newly-created Department of Antiquities under British Mandate Palestine (Moorey 1991:64). Garstang had his initial training with

[33] see E Sellin and C Watzinger's 1913 report in German.

Petrie and excavated at numerous Palestinian sites prior to coming to Jericho. His interest in excavating at Jericho came primarily from an article by Watzinger in which he stated that Jericho had been largely abandoned at the time of Joshua (Moorey 1991:64).

After six seasons of work at Jericho, Garstang concluded that the history of Jericho stretched from the Neolithic through the Bronze Age and, after a 100 year-lacuna, resumed in the Iron Age (Garstang and Garstang 1948:46, 77). Garstang and his brother archaeologist identified five superimposed cities, noting that City IV met its doom as a result of an earthquake that struck about 1400 BC. Such an earthquake was consistent, according to them, with the story of Joshua's conquest (1948:138–140).

Garstang asked an up-and-coming British archaeologist named Kathleen Kenyon to review and update his findings. Kenyon did so and came up with more or less the same conclusion reached by Sellin and Watzinger twenty-five years earlier: that Jericho was destroyed at the end of the Middle Bronze Age in the mid-sixteenth century BC, and was unoccupied throughout the Late Bronze Age, except for a small area occupied for a short time in the fourteenth century BC. (Kenyon 1951:121–122).

4.2.3 Kenyon's Excavations at Jericho 1952–1958

In 1951 Kenyon wrote a review of Garstang's work at Jericho, at his request, in preparation for renewed excavations (Kenyon 1951:101, 122). Kenyon reported that Garstang's conclusions in regard to his Late Bronze Age City IV had not been accepted when they first appeared, citing Albright 1939 and Vincent 1935, and she too was not in agreement with his conclusions (1951:104). Kenyon's evaluation graciously allowed Garstang's errors to be the result of a lack of detailed ceramic information about LBI when he excavated. She went on to say that there were no Late Bronze Age materials at all in the city or in the tombs (1951:115). In Kenyon's opinion, the Late Bronze Age city (City IV) had no walls, and what had been thought to be walls really belonged to City II (1951:119; 1957:261–262). The Late Bronze Age settlement at Jericho existed for only a short time during the fourteenth century BC, with no occupation at all during the thirteenth century BC (1951:121–122).

Kenyon introduced rigorous stratigraphic excavation techniques entailing detailed analysis of soil and debris layers and careful recording of the sides of the excavation squares called balks (Kenyon 1972; Wood 1990:49). She concluded that her own fieldwork confirmed her earlier review of Garstang's work, in that the double-city wall Garstang associated with the Israelite invasion in about 1400 BC—in fact dated to the Early Bronze Age, some 1000 years earlier (Wood 1990:49). Garstang's City IV, which he had dated to about 1400 BC, according to Kenyon, occurred at the end of the Middle Bronze Age, about 1550 BC (Kenyon 1957:262). In short, according to Kenyon, there was no strongly-fortified city at Jericho in the Late Bronze Age for Joshua to conquer (Wood 1990:49).

During Kenyon's own excavation she found little Late Bronze Age pottery (Kenyon 1978:273). She found that the Middle Bronze Age City was followed by a gap between settlements of some 900 years, with the Middle Bronze Age city followed by an Iron Age settlement (1952:71). It was not until 1954 that Kenyon discovered any evidence of the LBA at Jericho (1954:61). The evidence consisted of foundations for a wall, a floor (about one metre in area), a tabun and a juglet (1954:61). From this limited evidence, Kenyon concluded that even though the wall was small, it did demonstrate that there was a settlement which Joshua might have attacked at Jericho in the fourteenth century. However, she continued that the existence of such evidence does not 'prove the date of the destruction of Jericho by the Israelites' (1954:61). A later attempt by Kenyon to find more of the Late Bronze Age stratum was unsuccessful (1960:107–108), although she does concede that there apparently was some kind of occupation at the site in the second half of the Late Bronze Age (1981:371).

4.3 Ai

Ai was a Canaanite city some twenty-five miles northwest of Jericho, about one mile from Bethel and ten miles north of Jerusalem (Zevit 1985:60). The ruins of the city are popularly thought to be in the modern-day archaeological site at et-Tell.[34] After being destroyed in 2400 BC, Ai was abandoned until around 1220 BC in Iron Age I (Callaway

[34] Edward Robinson (1794–1863) identified many sites in the Levant on the basis of local place names and basic topography. Robinson suggested that et-Tell or Khirbet Haijah were likely Ai based on philological grounds; he preferred et-Tell because there were visible ruins. Albright believed that et-Tell was ancient Ai based on excavations there in the 1920s.

1993:44). The Iron Age I village at Ai was settled as part of an influx of newcomers, who apparently met with little or no resistance (1993:44).

The new village occupied 2.5 acres of the acropolis while the ancient walls around it covered 27.5 acres. The EBA walls at Ai still stood, but they were not secure. The villages were not fortified, a characteristic of most temporary sites (Callaway 1993:45). The houses were characterized by pillars or piers and four arch constructions in the walls, a distinctive feature of houses of this period, a technique pointed out by Albright at Bethel (Callaway 1993:45). The houses depended largely on cisterns for a water supply, with every house in the village having its own cistern hewn in the soft Senonian chalk of the acropolis area (1993:45).[35] The settlers were likely to have been farmers and shepherds—one cistern was found near Ai, no other city nearby, hewn out from the Senonian chalk, presumably for the shepherds in the fields (Callaway 1993:45).

Long collared-rim storage jars with high flaring rims were characteristic of the first phase of development (Callaway 1993:45). This was also common at all the earliest IAI sites. No burnished pottery was found, leading one to believe that the village must have terminated at some time in the eleventh century BC around 1050 BC (1993:45).[36]

The conquest of Ai was the second stop on Joshua's military campaign into Canaan. According to the Bible (Josh 7, 8), Jericho had already fallen and Ai was next. Joshua sent spies to reconnoitre Ai, and they returned with a report that only two or three thousand men would be required to take the city, because it had so few people. The Israelites organized an attack with 3,000 men, only to be rebuffed by the men of Ai and lose 36 Israelites in the initial battle for Ai (Josh 7:2–5).

Two major archaeological expeditions have been conducted at the site of Khirbet et-Tell, between Jericho and Bethel; the first led by Judith Marquet-Krause in the 1930s and the second by Joseph A Callaway from the mid-1960s through the early 1970s (Zevit 1985:58). The archaeological evidence adduced by these excavations clearly shows that during the period referred to as the Early Bronze IB (*c*.3100 BC–*c*.3000

[35] the chalk became practically impermeable when wet—they did not use plaster.
[36] Burnishing was a form of pottery treatment in which the surface of the pot was polished using a hard smooth surface such as a wooden or bone spatula, smooth stones, and similar, while the pot was in a 'leathery' green state before firing.

BC) an un-walled village existed on the Tell. Gradually, this village grew until it developed into a major walled city of 27.5 acres in the Early Bronze IC (*c*.3000 BC – *c*.2860 BC). This city was destroyed at the end of the Early Bronze IC, and the site remained unoccupied for more than 1,100 years (Zevit 1985:58). Callaway suggested that the two large un-walled villages represented an earlier Canaanite village which was conquered by Joshua, and a later Israelite village (Callaway 1968:316). There was no evidence of burnt houses at Ai (Callaway 1993:45).

4.3.1 Judith Marquet-Krause Excavation at Ai 1933–1935

Judith Marquet-Krause led three seasons of excavation at Ai from 1933 to 1935 and was preparing for a fourth season when she died in the summer of 1936 at the youthful age of 29. Her 1934 season was quite lengthy—it was conducted over a six-month period (Callaway 1993:39). Although she served under Garstang as an apprentice at Jericho for her first field experience in 1932, she later concluded that the city of Ai was destroyed and abandoned at the end of the Early Bronze Age, about 2400 BC, and not resettled until about 1200 BC. At this point, an unfortified village of about three acres was built on the acropolis of the earlier city (Marquet-Krause 1949).[37]

Marquet-Krause, influenced by Martin Noth, concluded that the conquest account in Joshua chapters 7-8 is more legend than history (Callaway 1968:314). She based this conclusion on the historical presence of the ruins at et-Tell, noting that the destruction had occurred long before the Israelites took possession of the site in Iron Age I. The conquest was minimalized in the views of Marquet-Krause and Noth, but the Iron Age I village at et-Tell was, to them, Israelite or Benjamite (Callaway 1968:314).

4.3.2 Joseph Callaway Excavation at Ai 1964–1976

According to Callaway, ‘Ai is simply an embarrassment to every view of the conquest that takes place in the biblical and archaeological evidence seriously’ (1968:312). Callaway penned this assessment after only two seasons of excavating the site. He goes on to offer some defence for archaeologists, in that Ai and Jericho were selected as theological type-sites of the conquest by the deuteronomic traditionalists, who

[37] Marquet-Krause’s report is in French: see Works Cited.

unduly exaggerated their historical importance and prejudiced the climate of reality within which the archaeologist must work (1968:312).

Callaway opened eight sites (areas) adjacent to the Marquet-Krause excavations and in new areas along the lower eastern fortification of the city. The Iron Age I village according to Callaway was settled as part of an influx of newcomers, who apparently met with little or no resistance (Callaway 1993:44). Some sophistication is evident in regard to the construction of houses, with houses at Ai located only where the Senonian layers are found (Callaway 1993:45). This fact may indicate that the arriving settlers had experience in building cisterns (Callaway 1993:45).

The archaeological evidence adduced by Callaway's excavation revealed an un-walled village from the Early Bronze IB (3100 BC–3000 BC) on the Tell. Gradually, this village grew until it developed into a major walled city of some 27.5 acres in Early Bronze IC (*c*.3000 BC–2860 BC). This city was destroyed at the end of the Early Bronze IIIB (*c*.2550 BC–2350 BC), and the site remained unoccupied for more than 1,100 years (Zevit 1985:58).

Even though Callaway concluded that there was no evidence for Late Bronze occupation at et-Tell, he cited too much historical evidence to call the conquest of Ai a legend or etiology (1968:315). Callaway suggested that there were two closely-limited Iron Age I phases at Ai. The first is the major building phase of the village, which covers less than three acres on the east side of the acropolis. The second is a repair of the same buildings, which involved rebuilding some walls, blocking some entrances, and laying some new floors over about ten centimetres of accumulated fine earth on the Phase I floors. Not all the Phase I structures were used in Phase II, because a large building in Area BXV, which was destroyed by fire, was left in ruins and abandoned (1968:316). The picture from the archaeological evidence of a conquest of Ai, as envisioned by Callaway, was of minor-scale raids on small villages like the Phase I settlement at Ai, but mainly a picture of political integration with the Iron Age I inhabitants, such as those at Gibeon (1968:319).

Ziony Zevit noted that in the course of his visits to et-Tell he was struck by the astounding extent to which the topographic details of the battle of Ai stated or implied

in the biblical accounts could be identified on the ground at Khirbet et-Tell and the immediate vicinity (1985:64).

4.4 Hazor

Of all the sites mentioned in the Book of Joshua as having been conquered by the Israelites, none is more important, with destruction as significant, as Hazor—a large Canaanite site north of the Sea of Galilee (Ben-Tor 2013:28). Hazor is the tallest mound in Israel, identified with Tell el-Qedah (Tell Hazor) some seven miles north of the Sea of Galilee. During the time under consideration, the time of Joshua, Hazor covered an area of approximately 150 acres, likely accommodating from twenty-five to thirty thousand inhabitants (Yadin 1983:16–23). The site comprises two distinct areas: the mound proper covering some 30 acres at the base and about 40 metres above the surrounding plain, and a large rectangular lower city of about 170 acres (1,000 x 700 metres) to the north of the mound (Yadin 1993:603). The upper city was established first, during the Early Bronze Age of the middle of the second millennium BC, while the lower city was founded in the middle of the eighteenth century BC (Middle Bronze IIB)—it was permanently abandoned during the middle third of the thirteenth century BC (Late Bronze IIB), when the final Canaanite city was destroyed (Yadin 1993:603).

The city was, without doubt, the most important city in northern Canaan during the Middle Bronze Age IIb (Ben-Tor 1992:184). The cultural and political ties of Hazor and neighbouring Laish (Dan) with Syro-Mesopotamia in the MBA IIa and the beginning of the MBA IIb could suggest that in later times too, the kingdom of Hazor maintained links with the Syrian political and economic system, rather than with the Canaanite Delta kingdom (Ben-Tor 1992:184).

Hazor is mentioned in the conquest narrative primarily in Joshua chapter 11, which describes how Joshua defeated a Canaanite league headed by Jabin, King of Hazor (Josh 11:10–15). In these verses there is a direct reference to the role of Hazor at the time of the Israelite conquest (Yadin 1993:594). Joshua captured Hazor, smote its king and burned the city. Hazor features prominently in the account of the conquest of Joshua (Josh 11:10–13). Jabin was one of the 31 kings of Canaan vanquished by Joshua (Josh 12:19) and the town became part of the territory of Naphtali (Josh 19:36).

Later, Jabin, King of Hazor, and his captain Sisera are mentioned in the account of the wars of Deborah, a judge of Israel (Judg 4:2). It is also recorded in the biblical text (1 Kgs 9:15) that Solomon built the city together with Megiddo and Gezer, but that in 732 BC it was destroyed by Tiglath-Pileser III. After this date there is no further mention of Hazor in the biblical texts.

Hazor was first excavated, in trial digs, by John Garstang in 1928. From 1955–1958 and in 1968, Israel's leading archaeologist Yagael Yadin excavated the site. A key member of Yadin's team was fellow Israeli archaeologist Yohanan Aharoni. This was an interesting combination, since the two men held very different views about the origin of Israel. On the one hand, Yadin was an ardent supporter of the so-called Albright school, which aligned more or less with the conquest account reflected in the book of Joshua. On the other hand, Aharoni was a keen supporter of Alt and Noth's theory, which followed the account in the book of Judges—a slow, peaceful infiltration at first, followed by a second phase in which the Israelites expanded into more fruitful plains and valleys still occupied by the Canaanite cities (Ben-Tor 1992:28). Yigael Shiloh, later the head of archaeology and excavator of the City of David, was also involved in the water-tunnel work. Renewed excavations began under Ammon Ben-Tor in 1990 and have continued until the present.

4.4.1 John Garstang 1928 trial digs

John Garstang made trial digs at Hazor in 1928. The results of his soundings were not published in detail. Garstang concluded that the lower city was an enclosure not a city, as it was later shown to have been (Negev and Gibson 2001:220). Garstang believed this enclosure to be a camping ground for infantrymen and chariotry rather than an actual dwelling area (Yadin 1993:595). He found a row of pillars in the centre of the mound and assumed they were part of a stable from the time of Solomon (Yadin 1993:595). On the west side of the mound proper stood a structure that he dated to the Israelite and Hellenistic periods. He further concluded that since no Mycenaean pottery was found, the site should be dated to about 1400 BC, the period to which he had assigned Joshua's conquest (Yadin 1993:595).

The earliest remains of occupation dated back to the middle of the eighteenth century BC (stratum 4, MBA IIB). The mound or tell is made up of two distinct parts:

an Upper City/the tell (an area of 30 acres) and a Lower City—a large expansive plateau area covering 175 acres (Negev and Gibson 2001:220). Excavations later proved that Hazor was the leading city in Canaan occupying some two hundred acres—a veritable metropolis in ancient terms (Mazar A 1992:284).

4.4.2 Yigael Yadin 1955–1958 / 1968–1970

The excavations, led by Yadin from 1955–1958 and in 1968, featured as supervisors under his charge archaeologists who would become leaders in their own right as the years progressed: Y Aharoni, C Epstein, M Dothan and T Dothan, R Amiran, I Dunayevsky, J Perrot and E Stern.

At the outset of the excavation, Yadin and Aharoni agreed that Hazor should be a testing ground, both historically and archaeologically, for their opposing theories (Ben-Tor 1992:28).[38] The debate over the character of the Israelite settlement and the work of generating an empirical body of evidence to prove or disprove one or another of the accounts (historical hypotheses, one could call them) established a paradigm of archaeological practice that guided disciplinary work for decades afterwards (El-Haj 2001:2). When the excavations were concluded, the stratigraphic picture was straightforward:

- The last Canaanite city (Stratum XIII) was violently destroyed and, after a short occupational hiatus, a new settlement (Stratum XII), confined to Hazor's acropolis, was discovered.
- This new settlement was poor in nature and was most probably of semi-nomadic character.
- The many pits, which are a common feature of this new settlement, were clearly dug into the destruction layer of the last Canaanite city.
- The pottery found in these pits, as well as the pottery associated with the flimsy architectural remnants of this new settlement, was identical to the ceramic

[38] The dispute has been understood as a reflection of the multiple social imageries and interests then pervasive in Israeli society. These were more than dispassionate scholarly alternatives. In their differing reconstructions of the Israelite conquest, Yadin and Aharoni both implicitly expressed their own understanding of modern processes of territorial conquest and nationhood (El-Haj 2001:100). It should also be noted that neither Yadin nor Aharoni considered their conclusions final, with both expressing the hope that future excavations would help clarify the picture (Ben-Tor 2013:29).

repertoire of the tiny Iron Age settlements Aharoni had found in his archaeological survey in Upper Galilee. Aharoni had attributed these settlements to the early, peaceful phase of the Israelite settlement, which, as a follower of the Alt school, he saw as belonging to a period preceding the downfall of Hazor (Ben-Tor 2013:28).

In the lower city the order of the levels from top to bottom is Stratum 4 which represents the MB IIB eighteenth century BC; Stratum 3 is MB IIC seventeenth and sixteenth centuries BC; Stratum 2 is LB I the fifteenth century BC; Stratum 1-b is LB II A (the el-Amarna period) fourteenth century BC; and Stratum 1-a LB II B is the thirteenth century BC (Yadin 1993:595).

4.4.2.1 First Four Seasons 1955–1958

During the first four seasons, the lower city areas C, D, E 210, F, H, and K were cleared, with each area having five distinctive strata. The stratigraphical sequence in all the areas was identified. It became evident that the entire area had been inhabited from the MBIIB eighteenth century BC down to the LBIIB of the thirteenth century BC (Yadin 1993:595). The upper city yielded three main areas of excavation—area A in the centre, area B on the western edge and area G on the eastern edge. The site of Garstang's row of pillars, which he dated as a stable from the time of Solomon, was in area A (Yadin 1993:599).

The last Late Bronze Age level on the mound (the upper city) was Stratum XIII, which parallels Stratum 1a in the lower city, where destruction occurred and Canaanite Hazor came to an end in the thirteenth century BC (Yadin 1993:599). As it was in the case of the lower city, few new houses were built and the ruins of the previous strata were reconstructed, and some structures were erected here and there around the reservoir (Yadin 1993:599). Stratum I B represents the peak of Hazor's prosperity in the Late Bronze Age II (Yadin 1993:595).

After a short gap, a small settlement arose at the beginning of the Iron Age on the ruins of Stratum XIII. This settlement in Stratum XII can hardly be called a city, since it consisted mostly of deep silos, hearths and foundations for tents and huts (Yadin 1993:599). The pottery found was typical of the twelfth century BC and closely

resembled that found in similar poor Israelite settlements in Upper Galilee (Yadin 1993:599).

Hazor is a third millennium BC city confined to the mound. At the end of the third millennium, a gap in occupation occurred until the MBAI when the mound was properly resettled (Yadin 1993:603). In the mid-eighteenth century BC (MBAIIB) the large lower city was founded, and excavations showed it was not an enclosure or campground but a city (Ben-Tor 1993:604). Fortifications were built with a deep fosse on the west, and the dirt removed to create the fosse was used to build a rampart on the west and north (Yadin 1993:603).

The final end of the city, upper and lower, probably came in the second third of the thirteenth century BC by conflagration. Stratum I-A was completely destroyed in the thirteenth century BC (Yadin 1993:597). There is important evidence for understanding the process of Israelite settlement in the remains of Stratum XII (Yadin 1993:603). The remains clearly belong to the twelfth century BC, when Hazor ceased to be a real city (Yadin 1993:603).

4.4.2.2 The Fifth Season, 1968

The primary purpose of the fifth season (1968) was to elucidate certain details that had not been sufficiently clarified in the previous seasons (Ben-Tor 1993:604). Most of the work was conducted in areas where excavations had already taken place, with just a few and limited new areas of excavation work conducted. It was during the fifth season that the water system was discovered (Ben-Tor 1993:604). No changes occurred in the numbering of the strata of the Late Bronze Age or the Iron Age.

4.5 Lachish

Tel Lachish, in Arabic Tell ed-Duweir, is located near the edge of the Nahal Lachish (Wadi Ghafr) through which a route passed from the Coastal Plain to the Hebron Hills (Ussishkin 1993:897). Several wells supplied the city with its water—one was excavated at the northeast corner of the mound. The water supply, along with the location on a main road and fertile land, contributed to the development of a major city.

Among the cities in ancient Judah, Lachish was second only to Jerusalem in importance. A principal Canaanite and, later, Israelite site, Lachish occupied a major tell (mound) twenty-five miles southwest of Jerusalem, nestled in the foothills of the region in Judah known as the Shephelah (King 2005:36). The nearly rectangular tell extends over 18 acres on the summit with nearby wells providing water for drinking and vegetation (King 2005:36). Lachish was surrounded by deep ravines on all sides except at the vulnerable southwest corner—it was here that the city gates had to be strongly fortified.

Lachish was one of the central cities in the Plain (Shephelah), located seven miles from Beth Guvrin on the road leading south (Negev and Gibson 2001:288). Joshua 10:23 notes that the king of Lachish was one of the five kings who fought against Joshua at Gibeon and was eventually defeated by the Israelites. Later, it would be one of the fortified cities of Judah, where the king of Judah, Amaziah, was killed after fleeing from conspirators in Jerusalem (2 Kgs 14:19; 2 Chr 25:27). Lachish is mentioned several times in the El Amarna letters of the fourteenth century BC, although this was not helpful in identifying the city.

The site was first excavated by James Leslie Starkey (director) from 1932–1938 (Negev and Gibson 2001:288). The second Israeli expedition was directed by Yohanan Aharoni from 1966–1968. Aharoni's work was limited in nature (King 2005:38). The third dig, 1973–1994, was led by David Ussishkin.[39] In 2013 a fourth expedition to Lachish was begun under the direction of Yosef Garfinkel and continues to date.

4.5.1 James Leslie Starkey (1895–1938) and Olga Tufnell

The importance of Canaanite Lachish became clear during the excavations of the British expedition directed by JL Starkey before the Second World War (Clamer and Ussishkin 1977:71). It was funded by Charles Marston and Henry Wellcome with the aim of finding the biblical city of Lachish. Starkey was ably assisted by Olga Tufnell, and G Lankester Harding (King 2005:36). C Inge was also a member of the team. The excavations continued until 1938, when director Starkey was murdered as he made

[39] The excavation proper ended in 1987.

his way to Jerusalem for the opening of the Rockefeller Archaeological Museum. Tufnell, Harding and Inge remained for the 1938–1939 season. Starkey was able to produce only some brief preliminary reports, later used by Tufnell to finish his work.[40] Starkey was able to distinguish more than seven occupation levels, paying close attention to architectural units (King 2005:36).

The Starkey excavation succeeded in finding a wealth of well-stratified pottery, a key part of the ceramic corpus of Palestine, and the Lachish Letters.[41] The peak development of Lachish occurred in the Late Bronze Age (Negev and Gibson 2001:288). In a moat, three temples were found superimposed one upon another. The second temple was built in the LBA IIB or during the El Amarna period (Negev and Gibson 2001:288).

Major finds of the Starkey expedition were the fosse temple from the Late Bronze Age, the great shaft, outer revetment wall, city gates, Lachish Letters or ostraca and the Solar Shrine of the Persian and Hellenistic periods. Most of the material relating to the Late Bronze Age Lachish comes from the temples and from the tombs. The last LBA stratum yielded some inscriptions, two of them Canaanite from the thirteenth century BC. An inscription on one of the bowls helped date the temple to about 1220 BC or about the time of the Israelite conquerors (Negev and Gibson 2001:288).

Starkey's work focused primarily on the burial grounds around the tell and the remains from the time of the Judean kingdom, so that knowledge of the Canaanite city remained fragmentary at best (Clamer and Ussishkin 1977:71).

4.5.2 Yohanan Aharoni 1966–1968

[40] Tufnell returned to London, and over the next two decades worked at the Institute of Archaeology sorting, collating, studying and presenting the material found at Lachish. She completed her final publication *Lachish IV* in 1957. Tufnell had no formal training in archaeology; however, she had worked for Flinders Petrie for a number of years as his secretary before being given a field assignment. She then went to work with Starkey. Her work has been regarded as the pre-eminent source book for Palestinian archaeology.

[41] the Lachish Letters or Lachish Ostraca are a series of letters written in carbon ink in Ancient Hebrew on clay ostraca. The letters were discovered by Starkey in 1935 on the third campaign. The letters were probably written shortly before Lachish fell to the Babylonian army of King Nebuchadnezzar around 588/6 BC

Described by Philip King in a 2005 BAR article, Aharoni's expedition was limited (2005:38). Aharoni's work focused mainly on the solar shrine identified by Starkey in the 1930s. He published his work in the 1975 publication *Investigations at Lachish: The Sanctuary and the residency (Lachish V).*

4.5.3 David Ussishkin 1973–1994

Ussishkin of Tel Aviv University undertook renewed excavations at Lachish to complete Starkey's unfinished work. His special interest was in the Late Bronze Age (1550–1200 BC) and Iron Ages (1200–587 BC). He continued the excavation of a Judahite palace-fort and the city-gate complex previously investigated by Starkey (King 2005:41). Ussishkin's work at the city-gate complex is outstanding for resolving the knotty problems associated with the pottery chronology of Iron Age II (1000–587 BC). Few of Starkey's conclusions had to be revised by Ussishkin's renewed excavations (King 2005:40). He deliberately left areas only partially excavated, so that future archaeologists might test his conclusions with fresh concepts and newer techniques (King 2005:39).

Little is known about Lachish in the Middle Bronze Age, when the city must have been one of the major cities in southern Canaan (Ussishkin 1993:898). It is difficult to determine when the settlement on the mound was renewed (Ussishkin 1993:898). Shortly after the destruction of the MBA city a temple was built in the abandoned fosse near the mound's northwest corner. The finds from the MBA IIB-C include fortifications, a palace, a cult place and occupational remains at the edge of the mound—the most noteworthy being the richly-furnished tombs hewn in cemeteries around the mound—and included pottery, weapons and scarabs typical of the period (Ussishkin 1993:898).

Lachish reached its zenith toward the end of the LBA; it may have been the largest city in Canaan after the fall of Hazor in the thirteenth century BC (Ussishkin 1993:898). In the thirteenth and twelfth centuries BC (Level VII, the LBA) Lachish was a large and prosperous Canaanite city prior to being destroyed by fire. A shrine called the Fosse Temple, constructed in three major phases, dates to this period (King 2005:40). It was built within a filled-in moat (thus the name fosse) at the northwest corner of the mound, outside the city, and was in use throughout the Late Bronze Age (King 2005:40).

The northeast section (area S) yielded remains of buildings on the edge of the mound in levels VII and VI dating to the thirteenth and twelfth centuries BC, indicating that no city wall existed here (Ussishkin 1993:899). Little is known about the settlement on the mound's summit between the end of MBA and Level VII. Level VI followed chronologically and stratigraphically and reflected cultural continuity with the Level VII city. Level VI represents the last prosperous Canaanite city, then under Egyptian control. It had been built shortly after the destruction of Level VII and eventually suffered the same fate: it is uncertain who destroyed the Level VI city (King 2005:40).

Ussishkin discovered another temple, totally different from the Fosse Temple, which had been built on the summit of the mound and which reflected Egyptian architectural style. A large bronze metal shoe or the city's gate socket bore the cartouche of Pharaoh Ramesses III (1182–1151 BC)—undoubtedly the builder of the city gate (King 2005:41). The finds in Level VI suggest that Lachish was firmly under the control of Egypt, which gave needed protection to the city. After the destruction of Level VI, Lachish was abandoned for two centuries, only to be resettled by the Israelites in the tenth to ninth centuries BC. The Israelite city is contained within Level V. Little is known about Lachish at this time, except that it was not fortified.

4.5.4 Yosef Garfinkel, Michael Hasel, and Martin Klingbeil

There were three previous expeditions to Lachish: 1932–1938 Starkey and Tufnell; 1966–1968 Yohanan Aharoni; and David Ussishkin 1974–1987. The Starkey-Tufnell and Ussishkin expeditions set new standards in excavating and publications—while also revolutionizing understanding of the various aspects of Lachish, such as the later history of Judah and the pre-Israelite Late Bronze Age Canaanite city (Garfinkel, Hasel and Klingbeil 2013:48). After seven productive years excavating at Tel Qeiyafa, Garfinkel's team decided to move on to Lachish in the belief that a clearer understanding of the early development of the kingdom of Judah could be achieved. Since Lachish was the second most important city in the kingdom of Judah, investigators believe that Lachish will give clear answers to the question of the early development of the kingdom of Judah (Garkinkel, Hasel and Klingbeil 2013:48).

This fourth expedition to Lachish is a joint project of the Institutes of Archaeology at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem and the Southern Adventist University in

Tennessee. A special scientific adviser to the project is the distinguished David Ussishkin. The new excavations will focus on Level IV and V—the two layers that can further the understanding of how Judah developed from its beginnings into the fully-fledged state destroyed by Sennacherib in 701 BC (Garfinkel, Hasel and Klingbeil 2013:48).

Garfinkel, Hasel and Klingbeil consider the seven-year excavation at Qeiyafa along with the renewed excavations at Lachish as one regional project (2013:51). The excavators will look first to the data, and base dating only on radiometric, objective measurements; ethnic identification will come from animal bones, pottery, cult objects and urban planning. An open-minded approach will not allow for the support of thirty-year old incorrect hypotheses (2013:51).

4.5.5 Lachish Summary

Canaanite Lachish was apparently under Egyptian domination, as was all of southern Canaan. Philistine monochrome pottery (often termed local Mycenaean IIIC:1b) and bichrome ware were not found in the excavations at Lachish. The absence of this pottery has far-reaching implications: (1) Lachish was not settled when the Philistine bichrome ware was widespread; (2) Philistine bichrome should be dated to the last third of the twelfth century BC or later—following the destruction of Level VI; (3) the Canaanite city Level VI was totally destroyed by fire, the inhabitants were killed or deported, and the city was abandoned and not resettled until the tenth century BC; (4) it seems the destruction of Level VI was related to the collapse of Egyptian hegemony over southern Canaan in about 1130 BC (Ussishkin 1993:904).

The three temples, one above the other, suggest a ritual tradition which developed over several generations. However, there was a marked change of plan in each level (Clamer and Ussishkin 1977:80). The first temple dates from MBIIB and accords with widespread tradition in the land during the Early Bronze Age. The second temple in Stratum IV is more in tune with the building tradition prevalent in the late MBIIB period. The third and final altering of the temple plan, in which the orientation was changed to the north, was likely due to a ritual change during the Late Bronze I period. Level III occupation probably came to an end during one of the campaigns of Thutmose III,

when Egypt was beginning to establish control over the Beth-Shean valley (Clamer and Ussishkin 1977:80).

4.6 Laish (Dan)

Tel Dan, formerly Laish, is situated at the foot of Mount Hermon, in the heart of a rich and fertile region (Biran 1993:323). This large fifty-acre site is located at the junction of the country's ancient north-south and east-west caravan routes, and was therefore important and prosperous (Biran 1993:323). Biran notes that the identification of Dan with Tel Dan, the Hebrew name given to Tell el-Quadi 'the judge's mound', by the Israel Government Names Committee in 1955—was first proposed by E Robinson in 1838 (1993:323). Potsherds collected at the site over the years provided archaeological support for Robinson's proposal, and it was accepted by the scholarly world (Biran 1993:323). The final stamp on the confirmation of the site with Dan-Laish came in 1976 with the discovery of the inscription 'To the god who is in Dan' (Biran 1993:324).

Dan, first mentioned in Genesis 14:14, was originally named Laish or Leshem (Josh 19:47; Judg 18:29). Dan, along with Hazor, was one of the most important mounds in the Huleh Valley. Excavations at both sites revealed occupation strata attributable to the Israelites (Mazar A 1990:334–335). There was only a small village on the upper mound at Hazor where such data was collected. But, at Dan, the settlement of the Israelite tribe of Dan was identified over the entire twenty-five acre mound (Mazar A 1990:335). An abundance of Early Bronze Age sherds, even in the earliest seasons of the excavation, indicated that Dan-Laish was a large, prosperous city at the end of the Early Bronze Age II and in the Early Bronze Age III (Biran 1993:324).

The first excavation at Dan was conducted late in 1963 by Z Yeivin. It was only a brief exploratory work on behalf of the Israel Department of Antiquities and Museums. Yeivin uncovered remnants from the Early Bronze Age II, Middle Bronze Age II, and the Iron Age—salvage excavations were carried out during 1966 and 1967 and have continued every year since under the direction of Avraham Biran (Biran 1993:324).

Under the direction of Biran, excavators worked in area A on the site's southern slopes, area B and H in the south, area T in the site's northwest corner, area Y on its

eastern side, area K at its south-eastern corner and area M at the centre of the mound (Biran 1993:324). Late Bronze Age remains were found in areas K, B and M. In area Y excavators found a scarab from the time of Ramses II (fourteenth and thirteenth centuries BC). In area B a krater with four handles was found, dating to the beginning of the LBA (Biran 1993:326). One gains a perspective on the wealth of Laish in the fourteenth/thirteenth centuries BC from tomb 387 that yields, along with the remains of some forty men, women and children—31 imported vessels, of which 28 were Mycenaean and three Cypriot (Biran 1993:326). There were also seven local vessels, alabaster and bronze objects, weapons, numerous ivories, gold and silver jewellery, spindle whorls, beads and basalt bowls.

Above the tomb an occupation level dated to the end of the Late Bronze Age (Stratum VII)—remains of this level were also found in areas B and T. The last Bronze Age level at Laish, which was poorer than the earlier levels, continued into the beginning of the twelfth century BC, when the city was conquered by the Israelite tribe of Dan (Biran 1993:326).

The first Israelite level at Dan, Stratum VI, dated to the first half of the twelfth century BC—represented mainly by pits used as silos. These pits were sunk into the Bronze Age strata. There was also a burn level separating the Late Bronze Age Stratum VII from Stratum VI, which was a radically poorer architectural construction:

The appearance of the pits suggests not only the end of one stratum of occupation and the beginning of another, but also—and more significantly— radical change in the settlement pattern and life-style of the inhabitants to the point of implying a change in population (Biran 1989:83).

Further, almost all the pits contained a variety of vessels—mostly storage vessels. The so-called collared-rim jars of the Iron Age I found at Dan suggest that perhaps the Israelite tribe of Dan indeed settled the Canaanite city of Laish at the end of the second millennium BC (Mazar A 1990:334–335). Except for the collared-rim pithoi, most of the pottery seems to continue the Bronze Age ceramic tradition (Biran 1993:326). The collared-rim pithoi appear for the first time at Dan in Stratum VI and resemble the pithoi found at sites from the early Iron Age in the hill country of Judah and Ephraim (Biran 1993:327).

This archaeological data prompted the lead excavator, Biran, to suggest there was a radical change in the settlement pattern and lifestyle of the inhabitants, which implies that a new population had arrived at Laish (Biran 1994:100). The Israelite tribe of Dan is the most-probable candidate for this new population at Laish. The Late Bronze Age city came to an end towards the end of the thirteenth–beginning of the twelfth century BC. While the archaeological data is not conclusive, it at least allows for the possibility that the Israelite tribe of Dan did move from the south, near Beth-Shemesh, to the north, and take and burn the Canaanite city of Laish, as the biblical text relates.

4.7 Jerusalem

Ancient Jerusalem extended over several hills or spurs, with its eastern border marked by the Kidron Valley, which separates Mount Scopus and the Mount of Olives; the western border is the Valley of Hinnom, which turns east, skirting Mount Zion to form the southern border joining the Kidron Valley near the spring of En Rogel (Shiloh 1993:701). The northern border of the city is less well-defined, because the hills on which Jerusalem was built merge with the hilly areas to the north without a clear-cut topography (Shiloh 1993:701).

Modern Jerusalem, unlike other large Canaanite mounds, does not lend itself to excavation.[42] Therefore, it is a misnomer to characterize Jerusalem as a large Canaanite mound. The continuous occupation of the ancient city, right up to the present, did not allow for a mound or tell to develop in the fashion of a Hazor or Jericho. For example, with the modern overburden of the ruins in ancient Jerusalem, it would be difficult to locate where the destruction mentioned in Judges might have occurred (Manor 2013:101). Nonetheless, a word about this major city and its role in the origin of the Israelite nation in Canaan is important.

The area referred to as the City of David, excluding the Temple Mount, is small; the width of the crest of the ridge varies from 60 to 100 metres amounting to little more than 12 acres (Shiloh 1993:702). It was on the hill of the City of David where the earliest site of ancient Jerusalem was established (Shiloh 1984:1). Jerusalem started

[42] However, it is probably the most excavated city in the world (see David's Jerusalem in BAR July/August Vol 24 1998 p. 25 by Margreet Steiner).

out as a small city built on a low rise above a spring (the Gihon Spring). It was surrounded by higher mountains on the north, east and west.[43] The southern end of the City of David, ancient Jerusalem, came to a point where three valleys continued southward.[44] The southern end of the city was one of its most important and vulnerable areas (Shiloh and Kaplan 1979:40). Builders from all periods endeavoured to utilize the rock as a foundation and to take advantage of walls surviving from earlier periods (Shiloh 1993:701).

Jerusalem was among the few Canaanite cities mentioned in Egyptian documents from the second millennium BC as a settlement of distinction prior to the Israelite conquest (Meir Ben-Dov 1985:31). Jerusalem's importance stemmed from its role in Egypt's military disposition, which was the controlling factor in Canaan at that time. The main axes of transport were of vital importance to Egypt's trade in the north with the superpowers of the Tigris and Euphrates area. One of these major axes—the road that traversed Canaan from west to east and linked up the north-south routes—ran close to Jerusalem. Thus, the city is mentioned in correspondence between the Egyptian kings who then ruled Canaan and some of the governors of the Canaanite cities. This correspondence is preserved in the Amarna Tablets archive uncovered in Egypt, and demonstrates that even though Jerusalem remained a relatively small city, it was of prime importance because of its location (Meir Ben-Dov 1985:31).

Negev and Gibson suggest that the first settlement of Jerusalem goes back to the beginning of the Early Bronze Age around 3000 BC (2001:260). However, Y Shiloh's work showed the city was first settled during the Chalcolithic period some 5,500 years ago—nobody knew the settlement of Jerusalem went back that far (Shiloh 1984:25). In the Bronze and Iron Age periods up to the tenth century BC, the area of settlement in the south-eastern hill was fairly small, consisting of about 15 acres (Negev and Gibson 2001:260). The principal remains of biblical Jerusalem have been uncovered in the area of the City of David, the south-eastern hill overlooking the Gihon Spring[45]

[43] Anyone familiar with mountains would hardly refer to the so-called mountains around Jerusalem (Mount of Olives to the east, the Temple Mount to the north, the hill known as the Upper City to the west or the hill upon which the village of Silwan is perched just across the Kidron Valley) as mountains per se, even though they do rise above the ancient City of David, Jerusalem.

[44] The three valleys that converge at the southern point of the old City of David are the Kidron on the east, the Tyropoeon Valley Street down the centre of the old city and the Hinnom Valley to the west.

[45] The Virgin's Fountain.

in the Kidron Valley (Negev and Gibson 2001:260). Only in the City of David is it possible, depending on the state of underground preservation—to unearth occupational remains of the Canaanite and early Israelite cities of the Bronze and Early Iron Ages (Shiloh and Kaplan 1979:36).

Six major excavations and numerous minor ones have been conducted at Jerusalem. Dame Kathleen Kenyon led excavations that ended in 1967, the last major one prior to Yagal Shiloh's expedition. Kenyon died in 1978 without writing a final report. In one of her popular books on Jerusalem, she noted that she 'did not believe that opportunities for (stratigraphical) excavations survive (in this area)…If they do, I wish the excavators luck'.[46]

Despite Kenyon's analysis, Shiloh began excavating in the area of the 'Old City of David' and continued for eight seasons from 1978 to 1985.[47] From the Chalcolithic period only pottery sherds were found (Shiloh 1984:7). The earliest remains of a structure belonged to the Early Bronze Age I and II (3000–2800 BC)—a dwelling typical of that period. Certain periods are missing from the archaeological record: EBIII (2500–2000 BC), MBI (2000–1800 BC), and LBI (1550–1300 BC). However, it does not necessarily mean that the site was unoccupied at these times. In fact, Cahill distinguishes between what she calls 'negative features' and 'negative evidence', noting that the absence of certain features does not necessarily rise to the level of 'negative evidence' that there wasn't settlement or structure there at one time (1998:35). Kenyon failed to appreciate fully the fact that not all occupational levels will show up in each excavation square (Shiloh 1984:35).[48]

Shiloh noted that the builders in each stratum sought to build their structures directly on the bedrock, and thus often damaged earlier strata, which occasionally were even destroyed altogether (Shiloh 1984:25). During the MBII (1800 BC), Jerusalem was walled for the first time (Shiloh 1984:26). About halfway down the eastern slope of the City of David, Kenyon found about sixty-five feet of this wall, which she correctly dated

[46] *Digging Up Jerusalem*, London, 1974:9.
[47] When Shanks asked Shiloh about Kenyon's analysis, he said he remembered that in her book she said three or four times that she could see no reason to go back there (Shanks' 1988 interview with Shiloh).
[48] Shiloh's remarks are found in note #116.

(Shiloh 1984:26). Shiloh found an additional two hundred sq. metres of this wall—at some points nearly ten feet thick (1984:26). This defence line, often rebuilt, served the city for more than a thousand years, until the Babylonian destruction of Jerusalem in 586 BC.

In Stratum 16, most of the archaeological evidence for the settlement of Jerusalem in the Late Bronze Age I, representing the Jerusalem of the El-Amarna Archive, was discovered in the burial-caves on the hills around the City of David, such as those at 'Dominus Flevit' (Shiloh 1984:26).[49] Contrary to M Steiner's claim[50] that only miniscule amounts of Late Bronze pottery were found during large-scale excavations in the City of David (Steiner 1998:27), Cahill points out that pottery from the Late Bronze Age, including imported Cypriot and Mycenaean wares, was found by several archaeologists, including Macalister, Duncan and Shiloh (Cahill 1998:35). In addition, Cahill notes that the pottery assemblage recovered from the Stepped-Stone Structure's rubble from the thirteenth and/or the twelfth centuries BC is identical to the pottery found in the terrace fills; this led Cahill, and her colleague D Tarler, to conclude that the two assemblages imply that the Stepped-Stone Structure and the terrace fills must have been contemporary, and should be interpreted as the superstructure and substructure of a single architectural unit (Cahill 1998:35).

Germane to this thesis is a discussion of the Late Bronze II city (*c.*1300–1200 BC), because it was basically the Canaanite-Jebusite city that King David captured around 1000 BC, several hundred years after it was built. According to 2 Samuel 5:7, '…David took the stronghold of Zion, that is, the city of David.' Shiloh found the base of what must have been the famous *Metsudat Zion*, the Fortress of Zion. The Fortress of Zion was built in about the thirteenth century BC on the acropolis of the ridge or spur that became the City of David. However, because the hill drops off sharply to the east, the Jebusites built a system of stone terraces that hugged the slope, forming a massive substructure for their citadel. Shiloh found no building superstructures from the Canaanite-Jebusite period, and could go no further because of the Arab houses on

[49] See SJ Sylvester, *The Excavations at Dominus Flevit, Part II, The Jebusite Burial Place.* Jerusalem, 1964.

[50] See Steiner in BAR article July/August 1998 Vol. 24(4);26–33, 62. Steiner asserts that no Late Bronze Age remains have been discovered in Jerusalem.

the site. However, he suggested that the main structures of the Jebusite citadel should be preserved on the bedrock at the top of the slope (Shiloh 1984:26).

After the conquest of the city, a new citadel, what Shiloh calls the 'Citadel of David', was built on the site of the Jebusite citadel. Shiloh argues that the area called Ophel probably refers to the central citadel area, and that Ophel is not exclusively used with respect to Jerusalem—it may be an urban architectural term denoting the outstanding site of the citadel or acropolis (Shiloh 1984:27). The site of the acropolis in the City of David was fixed, architecturally, in Stratum 16, and this site served not only the Canaanite city, but also the 'Citadel of David' in the Iron Age II (Shiloh 1984:26). The Israelite builders constructed a massive stepped-stone structure that still covers the northern part of the Jebusite citadel substructure. This stepped-stone structure has been preserved to a height of nearly fifty feet and is surely one of the most impressive surviving Iron Age monuments in Israel. According to Shiloh, the stepped structure probably served as a sort of huge supporting wall for a superstructure rising at the top of the eastern slope, at the northern end of the City of David (Shiloh 1984:27).

Only a few scattered remains were found of the Iron Age I city (1200–1000 BC), the final phase of the Jebusite city prior to its conquest by David (Shiloh 1993:702). At the time of David (*c.*1000 BC), the Jebusites lived in a small walled city on the Hill of Ophel. Apparently the Jebusites entered the border area on the ruined and depopulated hill and erected fortifications there, in particular on the stronghold of Zion. From there, they ruled over a small territory which separated the tribal area of Judah from that of Benjamin and constituted a foreign enclave in their midst (Mazar B 1975:50). To protect their water supply during times of siege they carved an upper tunnel which led to the vertical shaft from within the city walls (Warren's Shaft). The shaft, vital to the survival of the Jebusites, may have also led to the city's capture by the Israelites (Shiloh and Kaplan 1979:36–49). In 2 Samuel 5:8 it states that David said, 'Whoever would strike the Jebusites, let him get up the water shaft to attack the lame and the blind, who are hated by David's soul.' The Hebrew word *tsinnor* is often translated 'water shaft' although there is no scholarly consensus on the meaning (Shiloh and Kaplan 1979:36–49). The shaft first discovered by Charles Warren in the 1860s may be the one through which Joab first gained access to the Jebusite city (Shiloh and Kaplan 1979:36–49).

4.7.1 Jerusalem Summary

Whatever the city of David looked like when the Israelites entered Canaan, apparently it was a stronghold that was strong enough to resist Israelite pressure for two hundred years, or until the time David conquered it in about 1000 BC (Shanks 1998:25). In the case of Jerusalem, there is no conclusive data to dismiss the fact that at some point the Israelites, men of Judah, had taken the city, at least for a brief time, and set fire to the city or a portion thereof; however, the archaeological record cannot contribute anything to this matter (Reich 2011:294).

4.8 Summary of Chapter Four: Excavations of Canaanite Mounds

The results from excavations of significant Canaan mounds during the twentieth century occupy a central place in the discussion of how the Israelites entered and eventually conquered the Land of Canaan. It is obvious that the mounds were excavated prior to the advent of modern procedures and protocols continuing to be developed near the end of the twenthieth century. Even in the twenty-first century, new and innovative tools and procedures continue to change the face of archaeological method and interpretation.

As important as the excavation of the large Canaanite mounds was to the question of the origin of Israel in Canaan—they only told part of the story. A significant development, a missing part of the puzzle, would be added as the regional surveys were analysed and the results added to the total data gathered from the mounds. This thesis has intentionally refrained from a full discussion of the results of the excavations at the mounds. A more thorough description of the results of the excavations at such sites as Jericho, Ai, Hazor and others will be presented in view of how the material finds concur with the biblical text along with conclusions as to how this evidence contributes to the understanding of ancient Israel emergence in Canaan.

However, prior to this important discussion, it is also pertinent to discuss the contributions made by regional surveys to the understanding of just how Israel entered, and took the land of Canaan.

CHAPTER FIVE

ARCHAEOLOGICAL DATA: REGIONAL SURVEYS

5.1 Introduction

Major shifts occurred as a result of the large archaeological surveys in the highlands of Israel following the Six-Day War of June 1967. Following the end of the conflict, archaeologists had greater access to the central hill country of the land of Israel. This was especially true for the region between the Beersheba and Jezreel valleys (the heartland of Israelite settlement) (Finkelstein 1988:18). Extensive surveys in the regions of Judah, Ephraim, Manasseh, and Issachar, in the Sharon, the northern Negev and parts of Transjordan revealed the establishment of dozens of small settlements that may be considered Israelite (Mazar A 1992:285). Within the framework of the Israel survey, intensive surveys carried out in the central hill zones revealed hundreds of sites, adding a new dimension to understanding the region (Ben-Tor 1992:6).

The surveys brought with them fresh conceptual innovations to Biblical Archaeology, but at the same time, ironically, eroded its connection with the Bible (Bunimovitz and Faust 2010:45). Three major results of the surveys are listed by Bunimovitz and Faust: (1) the surveys brought to the forefront the people without history, (2) reconstruction of settlement and demographic history of the land of Israel presented a long-term perspective (*longue durée)* rather than the almost super-historical position in the eyes of some biblical scholars, (3) environmental and ecological factors, previously ignored, became the basis for explaining not only the structure of daily life and socio-political organizations in ancient Canaan and Israel, but also cultural change (Bunimovitz and Faust 2010:45).

The distancing of settlement archaeology from the history of events signalled the growing chasm between cultural interpretation of the archaeological record and the biblical text. If the Israelite settlements in Canaan can be explained by ethnographic analogies for the settling of pastoral nomad groups, the ecology of the highlands, and

long-term cyclical settlement processes, then the biblical text becomes redundant (Bunimovitz and Faust 2010:45). Bunimovitz and Faust cite Israel Finkelstein's works (Finkelstein 1988; 1992; 1994). The broadening of the research programme in the archaeology of the land of Israel, which took place in the 1980s and early 1990s, reflected a break with the biblical agenda, though not necessarily with the Bible (Bunimovitz and Faust 2010:47).

Some noted scholars, in the early days of archaeological research, attempting to trace the Israelite settlement pattern in the thirteenth–twelfth centuries BC, suggested that the archaeological evidence did little to help the investigation (Noth 1938:22; Weippert 1971:135–136).[51] Noth, writing in 1938, notes that it must be recognized that even in light of archaeological research there are fewer certainties about historical events than we are willing to admit (1938:22). Weippert, some thirty years after Noth, had this to say about the state of archaeological evidence and the search for Israelite settlement patterns:

> The result is largely negative or, at the very best, uncertain … it seems obvious to me that the archaeological side of the balance, both in general and in individual cases, can have only little weight. The weight of proof falls almost entirely on the literary traditions which, in Albright's view too, cannot do justice to this task without additional support (1971:135–136).

The denial of the validity of the archaeological evidence by Noth and Weippert, according to Finkelstein, was justified based on the nature of the archaeological evidence at hand—the only evidence available was that obtained from the excavations at the large Canaanite mounds (Finkelstein 1988:17).

Finkelstein postulates, and rightly so, that it is impossible to come to grips with the settlement episode of Israelite history without a thoroughgoing acquaintance with at least one region of the hill country in which the events took place—there must be a combining of excavations and surveys, and in order to do so one must study the archaeological components, the ecological elements, as well as the patterns of occupation during the periods immediately preceding and succeeding the time of the

[51] Noth's comments, in German, are translated into English in Finkelstein's 1988 *The Archaeology of the Israelite Settlement* on page 16. Noth's German work is cited in the bibliography.

Israelite settlement (Finkelstein 1988:21). Finkelstein's position, in regard to the archaeological research evidence taken from the large Canaanite mounds, is that, no matter the quantity, it contributes little to the advancement of the question of Israelite settlement. The starting point is to focus on the direct evidence from the regions of Israelite settlement. Finkelstein's justification for such a conclusion rests on the fact that of the excavations conducted in the Shephelah, coastal plain and northern valleys, all, for the most part, lay outside the boundaries of the initial Israelite settlement (Finkelstein 1988:17). The surveys put in perspective the results found in the excavations of the large Canaanite mounds.

A survey differs greatly from an excavation of a Tell.[52] An archaeological survey, instead of excavating a buried city, covers a wide area, examining the surface for every bit of evidence that might indicate ancient occupation.[53] Occasionally, a small site may be excavated, but not in as detailed a manner as excavations are done at a large-scale major tell. The results of these surveys have often been quite remarkable—surface surveys have revealed, in different parts of the country, settlement patterns of Iron Age I that depart widely from those of the Canaanite period—there are also marked regional variations in the composition and character of material culture (Mazar A 1992:285).

In regard to regional surveys, William Dever notes that one of the most influential works dealing with surveys and Israelite settlement patterns is Israel Finkelstein's 1988 offering (Dever 1991:80; Finkelstein 1988).[54] Dever suggests that it is the most significant work ever published on the subject, one that will revolutionize both biblical and archaeological studies (1991:80). Finkelstein's work will certainly play an important role in the discussion of regional surveys.

Finkelstein, along with an overwhelming majority of archaeologists, views archaeological research data as primary in any study of the Israelite settlement issues.

[52] A Tell is a buried city with different levels of occupation identified as strata.
[53] Staff and volunteers spread out, much like police do in a modern crime-scene movie, and walk the surface.
[54] Dever refers to Finkelstein's 1988 book as a pivotal work (the standard treatment) in the area of studying Israelite settlement patterns.

It is only after consulting and thoroughly investigating and analysing this data that one then attempts to understand the biblical resources and what role, if any, they play.

5.2 Yohanan Aharoni (Upper Galilee)

During the 1950s and 1960s, scholars dealing with the period of Israelite settlement focused their attention on Galilee. Aharoni's survey in Upper Galilee in the 1950s, along with the excavations at Hazor, was a landmark both in the development of survey methodology and in the study of Israelite settlement (Finkelstein 1988:106). For the first time, an attempt was made to understand the history of occupation in a specific historical and geographical zone in light of a modern archaeological survey. During the survey, 17 small sites, the largest being Tel Harashim (two and one-half acres), were dated to the thirteenth–twelfth centuries BC, and pottery of this period was also found at two tells in the area (Aharoni 1957:8–34, in Hebrew). Aharoni, as well as A Mazar, attributed the Iron I settlements to Israelite settlers (Mazar A 1992:285).

For many years Upper Galilee was considered as one of the most densely populated regions during the Bronze Age.[55] Aharoni, in his pioneering work in the field of archaeological surface surveys, first determined the significant historical role of the Upper Galilee area (Aharoni 1957, in Hebrew; Gal 1988:79).[56] However, Zvi Gal's work in surveys of Lower Galilee, partial surveys in Upper Galilee and southern Lebanon revealed that those regions were poorly settled in the Late Bronze Age (Gal 1988:79). The historical and archaeological evidence uncovered by Gal led him to conclude that Upper Galilee was not a major occupied region during the Bronze Age as suggested by Aharoni (Gal 1988:79).[57]

Aharoni's survey of the Upper Galilee highlands, discovered a series of small Iron Age I settlements concentrated around the Mount Merom massif, which he attributed to Israelite settlers (Aharoni 1970:254–267). Within the allotment of Naphtali some

[55] The northern section of Galilee is designated as Upper Galilee since it is more mountainous than the Lower Galilee where peaks rise only to a height of around 1900 feet. Upper Galilee refers to a mountainous area straddling present-day northern Israel and southern Lebanon.
[56] Aharoni's 1957 work is in Hebrew. This is according to Z Gal in his article 'The Late Bronze Age in Galilee: A Reassessment' in BASOR November 1988;79–84.
[57] See also Finkelstein 1988:107.

twenty-five settlements have been identified, all around the Merom range, with a few additional settlements identified in the western Galilee hills overlooking the Valley of Acco (Mazar A 1990:334). Aharoni attempted to present Galilee as a multisite region during the Late Bronze Age. He mentioned six sites that were first settled in the Early Bronze Age, concluding that they had existed throughout the entire Bronze Age (Gal 1988:80; Aharoni 1957:10–16, in Hebrew). However, Aharoni failed to show conclusive archaeological evidence for a continued existence of these sites into the Late Bronze Age (Gal 1988:80). Aharoni's assessment that Early Bronze Age occupation assumed a continued Late Bronze Age occupation is understandable given the limitations of archaeological research in the 1950s (Gal 1988:80). Again, archaeological evidence in support of a dense occupation in Upper Galilee during the Late Bronze Age is lacking (Gal 1988:80).

Aharoni, a proponent of Alt's theory of Peaceful Infiltration (Finkelstein 1988:106), claimed that during the Late Bronze Age occupation in Upper Galilee was concentrated in the flatter, lower and easier area north of Nahal Keziv. When members of the tribe of Naphtali (Aharoni attributed the sites found to them) settled the land they had inherited, they lacked sufficient strength to engage the Canaanite population, and were driven back to the more difficult terrain of southern Upper Galilee, where they devoted their time to overcoming the obstacles presented by nature. Eventually, when sufficient strength was obtained, they engaged the Canaanite cities with Naphtali ultimately prevailing (Finkelstein 1988:106; Aharoni 1957:118, in Hebrew).[58] From the second half of the twelfth century BC, the end of the Canaanite cities began as the clans from Manasseh started to occupy the empty spaces, even though their progress and the firm establishment of their settlements was not achieved without further crises and occasional recessions (Aharoni 1970:265).

The excavation of Hazor began shortly after Upper Galilee was surveyed. A good example of the importance of combining survey evidence with mound-excavation evidence is demonstrated by the debate that arose between Aharoni and Yadin (principal excavator at Hazor) over the ceramic evidence uncovered at the large

[58] Aharoni suggested that an echo of these events is to be found in the biblical description of the war of the Kings of the North in Joshua 11. Finkelstein (1988:98) disagreed, noting that the biblical information about the events that took place in this remote region in Iron I is extremely vague.

Canaanite mound. According to Yadin, the ceramic evidence indicated that Canaanite Hazor had already been destroyed in the thirteenth century BC, much earlier than the date advocated by Aharoni (Finkelstein 1988:106). Further, the pottery from the sites in Upper Galilee was identical to that of Hazor Stratum XII, which was the first Iron I settlement at the site and which, of course, followed the destruction of the Late Bronze city (Finkelstein 1988:106). Aharoni initially dated the destruction of Hazor to the end of the twelfth century BC.

The surveys certainly added to the mix in terms of the interpretation of the Israelite settlement process—rather than clarify, they seemed to present even more questions. Yadin interpreted the settlement process in a manner diametrically opposed to Aharoni. According to Yadin, the Israelites first destroyed Canaanite Hazor, and only subsequently did they settle on its ruins and at the sites of Upper Galilee (Yadin 1972:131). In light of the finds at Hazor, Aharoni proposed elevating the date of the Upper Galilee settlements into the thirteenth century BC—that is, before the destruction of Stratum XII at Hazor (Aharoni 1982a:178).[59] The issue of chronology and the relationship between Hazor and the sites of Upper Galilee was partially resolved; however, the matter of the ethnic identity of the founders of the Upper Galilee sites became even more problematic (Finkelstein 1988:107). Kochavi, based on various elements of the material culture at the sites, suggested connecting them with the southward expansion of the Phoenicians under the protection of fortresses such as the one found at Har Adir (1984:67–68, in Hebrew; Finkelstein 1988:107). Gal raised the possibility that members of the tribe of Naphtali inhabited the sites of the Huleh Valley, while the Upper Galilee sites were inhabited by Tyrian-Phoenician elements (Finkelstein 1998:107; Gal 1982:90 in Hebrew). There was a great degree of similarity between the sites of Upper Galilee and the early Israelite settlements in the central hill country in site size, in paucity of finds and in the phenomenon of

[59] A summary of the debate between Aharoni and Yadin is given by Yadin in his 1979 work, *The Transition from a Semi-Nomadic to a Sedentary Society in the Twelfth Century BCE*. In Cross FM (ed.) *Symposia Celebrating the Seventy-Fifth Anniversary of the Foundation of the American Schools of Oriental Research (1900-1975).* Cambridge: 57–68.

inhabiting areas with hilly and difficult terrain that had never before been so densely populated (Finkelstein 1988:108).

It is likely that, sometime after the destruction of Late Bronze Hazor, Upper Galilee (including the northern part) underwent a process of intensive settlement in regions that had previously had limited occupation (Finkelstein 1988:109). The makeup of these sites was consistent with what was known about Israelite settlement sites, so there was no real problem in attributing them to the tribe of Naphtali (Finkelstein 1988:109).[60]

The Upper Galilee sites may reflect the settlement of the tribes of Naphtali and Asher, and the large site of Dan the settlement of the tribe of Dan. The area may also have been the scene of Tyrian-Phoenician settlement activity, as evidenced by the construction of the fortress of Har Adir (Mazar A 1992:286).

5.3 Zvi Gal (Lower Galilee)

Gal, in a survey of Lower Galilee, found a concentration of some 15 settlements in the Shefar'am Nazareth hills, which he attributed to the tribe of Zebulun (Gal 1982:86, in Hebrew).[61] A Mazar noted that the settlements found in the basaltic Issachar plateau date to the time of the United Monarchy (1992:286).

Early Bronze Age sites are prominent throughout the entire Galilee area, although their distribution is widespread in the southern sub-region. The Early Bronze pattern of settlement was confined to that period alone, whereas a new and poorer pattern of settlement was established during the MBII (Gal 1988:83). The end of the MBII sites marked a period of deterioration and decline in Galilee, which can be seen clearly distinguishing the hill country of Galilee from the valleys, while the highlands remained partially settled by four or five sites in Lower Galilee and an additional one or two sites in Upper Galilee (Gal 1988:83).

[60] At both Hazor and Dan, the most important mounds in the Huleh Valley, occupational strata attributable to the Israelites have come to light. At Hazor, there was a small village (Strata XII–XI on the upper mound (Mazar A 1990:334–335).

[61] Ph.D dissertation by Gal cited by A Mazar 1992:286

The Galilean Late Bronze Age sites, as known archaeologically today, cannot support the view that the list of cities noted by Thutmose III reflected the Galilee region (Gal 1988:83). If this is the case, then it is not surprising that during the El-Amarna period this region was mostly occupied by the ‘Apiru (Gal 1988:83). The known evidence from excavations in northern Palestine may lead one to conclude that the Canaanite cities were destroyed as early as the middle of the thirteenth century BC, thus indicating that Galilee did not play a major role in the conflict between the Israelites and the Canaanites (Gal 1988:83).

5.4 Adam Zertal (Manasseh)—the Central Hill Country of Israel, northern part

Twentieth-century geographic and archaeological surveys in western Palestine concentrated primarily on Transjordan, the Negev and Galilee. Although these are important areas and warrant study in and of themselves, they are actually on the biblical periphery. It is generally agreed by scholars that the origins of Israel should be sought in the central hill country; thus, for this reason and others, the Manasseh survey was begun in 1978, under the direction of Israeli archaeologist Adam Zertal (Zertal 1993:1311–1312).

Surveys in the central hill country of Canaan revealed a sparsely-settled area in the Late Bronze Age, which would have provided the open area for Alt’s theory that the Israelites peacefully infiltrated Canaan (Peaceful Infiltration theory). In fact, in the Iron Age I, over two hundred new sites sprang up in this previously relatively empty central hill country—obviously there was a new population here (Shanks 1992:7).

Zertal led the team that began the survey of the territory of Manasseh in 1978 and continued for the next 12 years.[62] The territory allotted to Manasseh in the western hill country of Canaan is approximately 800 square miles (2,000 square kilometres). Its eastern border is the Jordan River, and its western border is the coastal plain highway sometimes known in Roman times as the Via Maris (the Way of the Sea). To the north,

[62] Stone recognizes Finkelstein as one of the first to compile a comprehensive review of settlement patterns in Canaan; however, he says Zertal’s survey work is the most extensive and will provide vital information for future assessment of the era (Stone 2014:152).

the border is the Jezreel Valley, and to the south Manasseh extends as far as the city of Shechem (Zertal 1991:32).

Finkelstein notes that 'Zertal's survey of the hill country of Manasseh is one of the most important ever undertaken in the Land of Israel' (Finkelstein 1988:89). The geography of the territory of Manasseh, located in the northern part of the central hill country of Israel, is completely different from the regions to the south. In Manasseh, wide valleys and broad areas composed of soft limestone produce a relatively moderate landscape (Finkelstein 1988:80). Thus, the Manasseh region was much easier to settle than the areas to the south.

The importance of the territory of Manasseh is reflected in both the Bible and archaeology. The biblical texts give pride of place to the traditions of the sanctity of Shechem and Mount Ebal, while archaeological surveys have revealed an almost unparalleled site density (Finkelstein 1988:81). Zertal's survey team decided, prior to the start of the survey, to analyse ecological and archaeological facts first, and only later consult the Bible (Zertal 1991:31).

Manasseh is one of the archaeologically richest areas in the hill country of Canaan, with some 39 sites from the Late Bronze Age (the Canaanite period) as opposed to only 5 Late Bronze Age sites found in Ephraim (Zertal 1991:31).[63] After thoroughly surveying about 2,000 square kilometres (800 square miles) 39 Late Bronze (1550–1200 BC) settlements were found, primarily in the better locations; however, Iron Age I (1200–1000 BC) settlements were numerous (136 sites were found) indicating a new population (Zertal 1991:32).[64] According to Zertal, there is no disagreement among scholars as to Iron Age 1 (1200–1000 BC) being the time when the Israelites arrived in Canaan. He further purports that the increase in Iron Age I sites correlates with the biblical account of Israel's entry into Canaan during the same period. (Zertal 1991:33).

Most of the sites were located on the edges of the large valleys of the region (Zertal 1984:49). Zertal goes on to reason:

[63] Manasseh and Ephraim are both equal in territory.

[64] The term 'Iron Age' covers the period between the end of the Late Bronze Age (about 1200 BC) and the destruction of the First Temple in 586 BC, a period that spans the settlement of the Israelite tribes in Canaan and a major part of the biblical history (Mazar A 1992:259).

> The implication is clear. Something must have prevented the Iron I people from fully utilizing the fertile valleys, forcing them to depend instead on the less rich, terra-rossa soil farther up in the hills. The obstacle could have been a different population, which had prior ownership of the richer soil in the valleys—the Canaanites. (1991:32).

This part of the country is characterized by wide and fertile interior valleys, around which Canaanite settlements clustered on mounds such as Tell el-Far'ah, Dothan, and Shechem (Mazar A 1992:286).[65] Iron I people clearly represent a change in the settlement pattern of the area, probably related to the settlement of the tribe of Manasseh, and of the tribes of Issachar, which occupied the northern Samarian hills in the first stage of their settlement.

Zertal makes the case for the new population entering from the east (Transjordan) (Zertal 1991:37); however, Dever (1992:51) purports that his argument is not supported by archaeological evidence, and is little more than Zertal's nostalgia for a biblical past that never existed.[66] It should be noted that while the archaeological evidence may not support Zertal's case, neither does it disprove that the new population was composed of Israelites entering Canaan from the east (Transjordan).

5.5 Israel Finkelstein (Ephraim)

The regional study of Ephraim**,** begun in autumn of 1980, comprised two archaeological projects, the excavation of Shiloh and the survey of the entire territory of Ephraim.[67] The four campaigns in the summer months of 1981–1984 were directed by Israel Finkelstein assisted by Shlomo Bunimovitz and Zvi Lederman (Finkelstein 1988:119). Both projects were undertaken in the heartland of the central hill country, and had a significant influence for the study of the period of Israelite settlement.[68] The survey covers an area of about 1,050 square kilometres (654 square miles) with the limits approximating the territory of the tribe of Ephraim (Finkelstein 1988:121). Of the

[65] 12 Iron I sites were found in the Dothan Valley.

[66] Dever argues that a surface survey alone really does not prove much of anything. On a small site like Zertal's, one might pick up ten to fifteen sherds from cooking pots; however, statistics based on this meagre evidence is meaningless.

[67] The territory of Ephraim is in the 'heartland' of Israelite settlement (Finkelstein 1988:65).

[68] The territory of Ephraim is situated in the central hill country of the land of Israel, in a region that is not very conducive to habitation. The landscape lacks the broad plateaus of Judah and Benjamin and the large valleys of Manasseh.

nine principal sites of Israelite settlement excavated in the hill country, five are located in this region: Bethel, Ai, Kh. Raddana, Shiloh, and ‘Izbet Sartah (Finkelstein 1988:121).

The Ephraim survey recorded one hundred and fifteen settlement sites, the population of which consisted, according to Finkelstein, of local pastoral nomads from western Palestine.[69] These nomads had been living there for centuries before deciding to move up into the hill country (Finkelstein 1988:202–203). However, A Mazar suggests that the more than one hundred settlements show a wave of Israelite settlement (1992:286). Most of the small sites are situated in remote hilly areas, ranging from a few isolated structures to sites as large as five or six dunams/one and one-half acres.[70]

The importance of the territory of Ephraim in regard to the question of Israelite settlement was noted by Albright:

> One of the most important questions in Hebrew history is that of the occupation of Mount Ephraim by the Chosen People. This question cannot be separated from the parallel one: to what extent was Mount Ephraim occupied by a sedentary population in the Bronze Age? (1929:3)

Albright noted that from the surface explorations it appeared that there were very few Bronze Age mounds in Ephraim, with Western Ephraim more destitute of mounds than any other part of Palestine (1929:3, 4). This area’s exceedingly rugged character and abundance of rainfall on the western slope in normal years likely attributed to its being heavily forested in antiquity and not suitable for habitation until the trees were removed. Because of this, Albright concluded that the area must have been occupied by mainly semi-nomadic shepherds (1929:4).

---

[69] Dever notes that Finkelstein, like Zertal, argues that the earliest sites are in the eastern part of Canaan. However, unlike Zertal, he argues that the new settlers came from western Palestine, not from east of the Jordan River (1992:51).

[70] The dunam is an old Turkish or Ottoman unit of measure equal to the amount of land that could be ploughed by a team of oxen in a day. One dunam is equal to 1,000 square metres or about one-quarter acre.

Albright's observations have been backed by later archaeological investigations, surveys and excavations at the central sites of the region helping to clarify the process of settlement in the territory of Ephraim (Finkelstein 1988:204).

5.6 Nelson Glueck and S Mittmann (Transjordan)

The area between Nahal Arnon (Wadi Mujaib) in the south and the Yarmuk River in the north, is the arena of Israelite activity—according to biblical sources, (Num 32; Deut 3:12–20; Josh 12:1–6, 13:8–32; Finkelstein 1988:113). The pioneer of modern research in Transjordan was Nelson Glueck, who investigated hundreds of sites in the course of his major survey during the years 1932–1947. The conclusion drawn from the survey was that as the area was devoid of settlements, there was nothing to indicate settlements during much of the Middle and Late Bronze Ages (Mazar A 1992:297). Following Glueck's work, Mittmann undertook an important survey in the Gilead region from 1963–1966.[71] These two projects, although lacking somewhat in modern methods, still provide the basis for any discussion of the settlement pattern in Transjordan (Finkelstein 1988:112).

Until recent times, the area in Transjordan, from the Mishor Plain north to Bashan seemed to show very little clear evidence of any history of settlement in the Late Bronze/Iron I of the thirteenth and twelfth centuries BC. This was the area and time frame of the initial settlement activity by the Israelite tribes of Reuben, Gad and East Manasseh (Num 32; Deut 3:12–20; Josh 12:1–6, 13:8–32; Kitchen 2003:198). However, more recent surveys have revised the picture set forth by Glueck—specifically showing that there was no gap in occupation in Transjordan, and that in the northern and central zones there were quite a few settled mounds. The series of new settlements, indicating the arrival of new peoples, was likely established by the Ammonites, Moabites, Edomites, and Israelites (Aharoni 1970:254–257).

Modern survey methods have shown that Glueck's survey was superficial—quite simply put, he overlooked hundreds of archaeological sites in his survey of

[71] Mittman's work is in German. Mittman has a full critique (in German) of Glueck's survey work (Finkelstein 1988:112)

Transjordan (Mattingly 1983:252). Glueck also failed to take a balanced approach to the collection of sherds (not devoting enough time to gathering them) and was often inaccurate in his ceramic identifications (Finkelstein 1988:114).[72] Glueck's knowledge of ceramics was also wholly inadequate for the task he sought to undertake, and it was even suggested that his religious convictions unduly influenced his results (Franken and Power 1971:119).

Glueck surveyed some 200 sites in Transjordan, reporting more than 30 Iron I–II sites between Nahal Arnon and Wadi Hisban (1934; 1939) and about 100 sites in the area between Wadi Hisban and the Jabbok River (Wadi Zarqa) (1939); in the northern sector, Glueck surveyed 65 sites of this period between the Jabbok and Yarmuk Rivers (1951)—altogether some 200 (Finkelstein 1988:114).

Small Iron Age I sites resembling Israelite settlements west of the Jordan are chiefly in Gilead, north of the Yabbok between the Yabbok and Yarmuk rivers. South of this region the number of sites declines until in Edom none are found (Mazar A 1992:297). In the Gilead survey ten small Iron I settlements were found, resembling the parallel phenomenon in the hill of Ephraim and Manasseh (Mittman 1970, in German). These settlements may be taken as an expression of the settlement of the half-tribe of Manasseh in the Gilead, after a pattern similar to that found west of the Jordan (Mazar A 1992:298). The overall picture in the Mishor plain, Gilead, and up into Bashan is one of a series of Late Bronze II settlements, some modest, some walled, which passed over into the Iron Age IA phase of occupation that showed new cultural features such as collared-rim jars, four-roomed houses, or both together (Kitchen 2003:198–199).

The features mentioned above, collared-rim jars, four-room houses, are not a guarantee of an Israelite presence, but it remains true that these are characteristics of the Israelite settlement in Canaan (Kitchen 2003:199). Kitchen further notes:

> All this is fully consistent with the biblical tradition that the Hebrews came north from the fringes of Moab proper (south of the Arnon) to the Mishor plains, and defeated the two minor Amorite kingdoms of Sihon and Og that occupied Mishor/south Gilead and north Gilead into Bashan respectively. The Mishor

[72] For a critique of Glueck's survey, see Mittmann 1970:1–3 (in German).

> and environs were a prime sheep-rearing region, as our geographers can still tell us, hence the very natural request of Reuben and Gad to stay on in this area—Numbers 32:1-5, (Kitchen 2003:199).

In time, old rivalries between Moab, the Israelites, and Ammon broke out over who should control the Mishor area. Sihon had taken it from Moab, then Israel took it from Sihon and later Moab took it back, and the seesaw went on. Is it any wonder that some of the Iron Age IA sites ended up being destroyed and burned, some never to rise again? Thus, whatever minor gaps currently appear in our total documentation (so for Heshbon, as at Jericho), the overall picture in Numbers/Deuteronomy and Joshua makes very good sense, and fits well the known archaeological and related context (Kitchen 2003:199). It should be noted that Israel did not originate on the desert fringe of Moab, but further back where Egypt and the Sinai have claims.

The remains from survey work done over three seasons (1979, 1981, 1982), investigating only a small portion of biblical Edom, produced only a handful of sherds from the Middle and Late Bronze Ages (MacDonald 1979:58–59). An examination of 585 sites in Moab between Wadi Mujib and Wadi Hesa (the biblical rivers of Arnon and Zered) again yielded only a small amount of archaeological data from the Middle and Late Bronze Ages (Miller 1977:89). In Moab, some sherds and flimsy architectural remains have been found at Heshbon and Dibon (Mazar A 1992:297). Attributing ethnicity to these sites is extremely difficult, due to the complex history of the region.

The large site in the land of Ammon (Sahab) is located some 12 kilometres (seven and one-half miles) east of Amman. It is a large site (250 dunams/60+ acres) and was likely occupied during the Late Bronze and the Iron Age I periods (Mazar A 1992:297). The material culture of the Iron Age I probably represents the Ammonites (Mazar A 1992:358). Our knowledge of the material culture of Transjordan in the Iron Age I comes from a small number of surveys and excavations. Two major sites of the Jordan Valley have been excavated: Tell es-Sa'idiyeh, tentatively identified with biblical Zaphon, and Tell Deir 'Alla, east of the Damiyah bridge, identified by some as Succoth (Mazar A 1992:297).

The Madaba Plateau Region (MPR) forms the traditional territorial boundaries of Reuben (Josh 13:15–23). This territorial boundary must have somehow also reflected

a cultural boundary as well (Cross 1988:46–65). Herr carefully qualifies his conclusions concerning the identity of the inhabitants of the MPR, while noting that the most likely candidate remains the Reuben tribal group (Herr 1999:64). This group headed a tribal confederacy called 'Israel' (the same as the 'Israel' of Merneptah). In this construct, the Israel of Merneptah and the Israel of the Monarchy represent quite different social entities (Herr 1999:64).

It is difficult to obtain a clear idea from Glueck's work of the settlement pattern in Transjordan that would stand up to the scrutiny of modern research methodology. Surveys of the regions previously examined by Glueck, conducted in the 1970s by Ibach revealed dozens of Iron I sites in the vicinity of Hesbon, and Iron I pottery reported at nearly 30 sites (Ibach 1976:122; 1978:206–209). Mittmann (reporting in German) surveyed the area between the Jabbok and Yarmuk Rivers visiting 300 sites, only four of which had been investigated by Glueck, and reporting 73 Iron I sites, as opposed to 15 Late Bronze sites and 49 of Iron II date (Finkelstein 1988:116). Survey results and excavations on the Transjordanian plateau indicate that during the Late Bronze period, the number of major urban centres was quite limited (Sauer 1986:6).

Certainly, knowledge of Transjordan is far less than that of Israel. The findings from Transjordan do not present a clear picture of the Israelite settlement pattern; however, the pattern of settlement in Transjordan has a direct bearing on the debate concerning the process of Israelite settlement (Finkelstein 1988:117). Dever is of the opinion that there was no movement from east to west that created the settlement sites in the hill country of Canaan (1992:51); however, he is willing to grant that a small nucleus of people who became Israelites had originally been in Egypt (1992:54).[73]

5.7 The Judean Hills and the Shephelah

Little is known about the settlement process in the Judean hills and the Shephelah.[74] Results from surveys were in no way similar to the ones mentioned above. It is

[73] Dever concurs with Baruch Halpern that the only way to save the literary tradition of the Exodus is to allow for the possibility of a small nucleus from Egypt, otherwise, it would have to be completely jettisoned (Halpern 1992:90–91).

[74] The Shfela, or Shephelah, (literally, 'lowlands') is a transitional region of soft-sloping hills in south-central Israel stretching over six to ten miles between the Judean Mountains and the Coastal Plain. The Bible assigned land in the Shfela to the tribes of Judah and Dan.

conceivable that many of the fortified towns of Judah grew out of settlement sites that can only be discovered by systematic excavations (Ben-Tor 1992:286). Such excavations have been conducted at only a few sites, among them Beth Zur and Tell Beit Mirsim—at both sites an Iron Age I stratum was discovered that may be considered Israelite (Ben-Tor 1992:286).

The importance of the Judean Hills for understanding the process of Israelite settlement comes from both its geographical location and historical considerations (Finkelstein 1988:47). In terms of geographical location, it is bounded on two sides by arid regions very suitable for occupation. Furthermore, most of the biblical traditions describing the conquests of Canaanite cities that were not part of the unified conquest narrative are connected with this region; this demonstrates the importance of this area for understanding certain issues associated with the Israelite settlement of the entire land of Israel (Finkelstein 1988:47).

Excavations at Khirbet Rabud (Debir), Hebron, Beth-Zur, and Giloh were conducted in the Judean Hills. Kochavi conducted two short excavations (1968–69) at Khirbet Rabud declaring it was inhabited in the Late Bronze Age fourteenth and thirteenth centuries BC (1974:2–33). He identified four occupation strata and an Iron I overlaying the Late Bronze remains. However, the limited area to excavate made it impossible to draw any definite conclusions. Excavations at Hebron by Hammond (1964–65) yielded no new material of value. Beth-Zur, identified with Khirbet et-Tubeiqah (1931, 1957), determined that there were inhabitants from the Iron I period. Again, the limited size meant that no definite conclusions could be rendered. Giloh, in southwest Jerusalem, yielded more important findings as reported by A Mazar who excavated there in 1978–79 (1981:6).

Giloh was a single period site with a large portion of the site excavated. It was a difficult place to inhabit, according to A Mazar, because of its rocky landscape, lack of soil, distance from a water source, and exposure to strong winds. A sparse amount of ceramics was found at the site. Despite these factors, A Mazar, in a 1981 article, written in Hebrew, gave the finds at Giloh a place of particular importance in the debate over the character of the process of Israelite Settlement (1981:36).

Biblical Hebron is located at Jebel Rumeideh, south of the centre of the present city. Hammond undertook three seasons of excavations there in 1964–1966. Excavations were renewed under the Institute of Archaeology of Tel Aviv University under the direction of Ofer. The principal find of the American team was a massive MB IIC fortification wall; however, some remains from the Late Bronze (only burials) and Iron I periods were discovered.[75]

Surveys in the Judean Hills yielded 22 sites attributed to the Israelite Settlement period, but there is no mention of whether they yielded pottery specifically indicative of Iron I (Kochavi 1972:20–21, 83, in Hebrew). There were no Iron Age sites found in the hills west of Jerusalem and no specific mention of pottery. Ofer estimated the number of Iron I sites in the Judean Hills to be 10 to 12, most located north of Hebron (Ofer 1994:102; Finkelstein 1988:51).[76]

Finkelstein notes that it is hard to imagine that the Israelites settled in the Shephelah since there is no hint of their presence in the archaeological record (Finkelstein 1988:53). There was a dense population of Canaanites during the Late Bronze Age which continued into the twelfth century BC. Only two sites on the eastern edge of the Shephelah, at the foot of the hill country, offer any indication of a possible brief occupation by Israelites following the destruction of the Canaanite cities, but prior to the advent of the Philistines (Finkelstein 1988:53). The Philistines began to inhabit the land during the second quarter of the twelfth century BC.

Kochavi points out that the excavation at Tell Beit Mirsim by Albright (1926–1932) was on the slope of the Judean Hills, and that Albright incorrectly identified the site with biblical Debir (Kochavi 1974:2–33). It is difficult to determine whether or not there had been a phase of silos that preceded the structures with Philistine pottery. In Stratum B2 it is hard to decide the ethnic affiliation of the populace, in part because the excavation report provides no quantitative data about the Philistine pottery of that level (Finkelstein 1988:54–55).

[75] These remains had been disturbed by the activities of the Iron II and later inhabitants.
[76] Finkelstein heard this at a lecture given by Ofer at Tel Aviv University in December 1985

The excavation at Tel Beth-Shemesh by Elihu Grant (1928–1931) revealed a situation similar to that described for Tell Mirsim: Silos 515 and 530 were found under the walls of Stratum III, which was the Philistine level at the site. The excavation report by Grant and Wright placed these silos at the end of Stratum IVb, the last Canaanite city, which had been destroyed by fire. The finds were too few and too inconclusive to permit a resolution of this sensitive and important issue (Finkelstein 1988:55). Surveys conducted up to 1988 have not revealed Iron I sites with clear evidence of Israelite Settlement (Finkelstein 1988:55).

In summary, the Judean Hills during the Late Bronze Age had only two sites certain—Jerusalem and Khirbet Rabud. Another dubious settlement was identified at Beth-Zur and three burial grounds with no corresponding occupation (Finkelstein 1988:52; Kochavi 1972, in Hebrew). The general picture of Iron I, arising from the excavations and surveys over a large area, is one of relatively few sites. This is surprising in contrast to what is known of the central hill country to the north of Jerusalem. In terms of chronology, the published pottery from Beth-zur and Giloh seems to belong, at least in part, to the early phases of the Iron I period (Finkelstein 1988:53).

5.8 Arad and Beersheba Valleys

During the Late Bronze Age the Arad and Beersheba valleys were not occupied. However, in the Iron Age I, settlements were established, and most of them have been excavated. These include Tel Masos, Tel Esdar, Arad, and Beersheba (Mazar A 1992:286). The excavators at Tel Masos believed it to be the centre of Israelite settlement activity in the northern Negev (Mazar A 1992:286).

Seven major sites were excavated from 1968–1988. Finkelstein (1988:37) quotes Aharoni:

> At every place in the Negev where archaeological excavations have been conducted, the beginning of Israelite occupation has been fixed at the end of the 13th or during the 12th centuries BCE. (1982a:202).

Finkelstein notes that Aharoni's appreciation of the intensity of Israelite Settlement in the valley seems to have been influenced by the overwhelming impression created

by the large and well-developed settlement uncovered at Tel Masos (the largest and most important Iron I site in the valley). Aharoni based his chronology on the relatively early ceramic material found there in Stratum III and especially on a scarab that was first dated to the time of Seti II (Giveon 1974:75, 76). At Tel Masos, it was the first time that four-room houses and public buildings had appeared together. Tel Masos was identified as an Israelite settlement associated with biblical Hormah. Aharoni and Fritz based their views of the Israelite settlement process on the excavation evidence from Tel Masos (Kempenski and Fritz 1977:155).

Finkelstein points out that Kochavi (Kochavi 1982:4, in Hebrew), was the first to object to Tel Masos as an Israelite settlement site, identifying it as the city of Amalek mentioned in I Samuel 15:5 (Finkelstein 1988:45). B Mazar proposed connecting the phenomenon of Tel Masos to the floruit Philistine coastal cities (Finkelstein 1988:45,46).[77]

Finds at Tel Masos and the settlement pattern of the Beersheba valley and the southern hill country support the rejection of Tel Masos as an Israelite Settlement site (Finkelstein 1988:45). According to Finkelstein, the extremely sparse Israelite settlement began in the Beersheba valley only in the eleventh century BC with the establishment of two small sites (1988:46). The turning point did not come until the tenth century, when the large fortifications of Arad, Beersheba and Tel Masos which were constructed in the Beersheba valley became the southern fortified boundary of the Monarchy as well as the centre of activities in the desert regions of the south.

Finkelstein's approach to sharing finds by region is to start in the north and work toward the south describing the results of excavations first and then the survey material found. He does not deal, in depth, with material found in territories outside the limits of Israelite Settlement—the Canaanite and Philistine areas of the Coastal Plain, the Shephelah and the northern valleys. He only discusses occupation debates over the question of when Israelite activity began in these areas. Discussing both excavations and surveys, Finkelstein notes briefly the situation before and after the

[77] Finkelstein heard B Mazar lecture at the 10th Archaeological Congress in Jerusalem in 1983.

Settlement process. He views the before and after information as very important to the understanding of Israel's Settlement.

5.9 The Judean Desert

In a 1968 survey, twenty Iron I sites were reported—they consisted mostly of isolated structures and round or elliptical enclosures (Bar-Adon 1972:92–149, in Hebrew).[78] There was no pottery found, not even a sherd and no sites with permanent occupation were found in the Judean Desert during the Iron I period (Finkelstein 1988:53). In 2010, a survey of the Judean Desert highlands, north of Arad, was conducted prior to drilling for a seismic survey (Shmueli 2010:1). Cemeteries, tumuli, encampment sites and a building were found in the survey. The finds are characteristic of the southern region of the Judean Desert highlands, and indicate that most of the activity in the region was that of nomads (Shmueli 2010:3).

5.10 Benjamin

In reference to the Iron I period, the plateau of Benjamin is delimited by Jerusalem in the south and Bethel in the north—this is one of the best-known areas in the country. Assemblages of this period have been excavated at Tel el-Ful, Tell en-Nasbeh, Khirbet ed-Dawara and Gibeon. Most of the events of the time of Samuel and Saul took place in this region, and are described in relatively great detail in the Bible (Finkelstein 1988:56).

The population centres of the hill country, all in Benjamin, are Bethel, Mizpah, Gibeah and Gilgal. Each of these sites has been absolutely identified (Finkelstein 1988:56). The Bible relates that in the central and western parts of the hills of Benjamin there were four Gibeonite cities, while to the south, Jerusalem remained a Jebusite city until the time of David. The question remains as to whether or not it is possible to distinguish archaeologically the non-Israelite elements of the area, and to establish to what extent the Gibeonite cities and Jebusite Jerusalem influenced the regional settlement pattern at the beginning of the Israelite Settlement (Finkelstein 1988:56).

[78] PhD dissertation in Hebrew (see Finkelstein:53)

Excavations at Tel el-Ful, generally identified with biblical Gibeah (Albright 1924:7–8) found it impossible to place architectural remains into a clear historical and chronological framework (Finkelstein 1988:57). At Tell en-Nasbeh, biblical MIzpah, Aharoni argued that the Israelite settlement had begun there in the thirteenth or even the fourteenth century BC, based on the few Canaanite vessels (1982a 174). Prominent features influencing Aharoni's claim were pillared-houses and stone-lined silos.

Survey work in Benjamin found eight Iron I sites—seven of them in the eastern part of the region, in the desert fringe (Finkelstein 1988:65) The single Iron I site up on the ridge at Khirbet el-Burj, biblical Beeroth, constituted only three percent of all the sites examined in that topographical region (Yeivin 1971:140–144).

In summary, the evidence collected from Benjamin, combined with the biblical descriptions of the days of Samuel and Saul, indicate that the main Israelite activity in Benjamin in Iron I was concentrated on the eastern part of the ridge and on the desert fringe. Benjamin likely divided along ethnic lines with the Hivites in the west and Israelites in the east. However, it is very difficult to differentiate between the material culture of the Hivites and the Israelites. Further, it is not known when the Hivites entered the region or how their cities later became Israelite settlements (Finkelstein 1988:65).

5.11 Summary of Chapter Five: Archaeological Data: Regional Surveys

It is obvious that the injection of the archaeological data recovered from the regional surveys greatly enhanced the discussion relating to early Israelite settlement patterns in Canaan. The survey information brought fresh conceptual innovations to Biblical Archaeology, but, ironically, it also eroded its connection with the Bible (Bunimovitz and Faust 2010:45). The surveys surfaced people without any history, tended to demonstrate a long-term settlement process, rather than a rapid occupation of the land, and, for the first time, brought into play the previously ignored environmental and ecological factors helpful in understanding the cultural changes taking place and the socio-political organizations in ancient Canaan and Israel (Bunimovitz and Faust 2010:45).

Advancements in technology and collected data also made it possible to correct some previously erroneous assumptions. For instance, early investigators, such as Noth (1938) and Weippert (1971) had suggested that the archaeological evidence, in regard to attempting to trace the Israelite settlement pattern, was sparse and did little to help the search. The weight of proof, in Weippert's estimation, fell almost entirely on the literary traditions. The abundance of archaeological data collected over the period of time the surface surveys were conducted conclusively negated the observations set forth by Noth and Weippert.

Chapter five of this thesis has attempted to illuminate the role the regional surveys occupy in the discussion of Israelite settlement patterns. Upper Galilee, Lower Galilee, Manasseh, Ephraim, Transjordan, the Judean Hills and the Shephelah, the Arad and Beersheba valleys, the Judean Desert and Benjamin are the survey areas examined. Although the surface surveys contributed immensely to the overall knowledge of the land, they also, rather than clarify matters, seemed to present even more questions.

In the survey of Upper Galilee, for the first time, an attempt was made to understand the history of occupation in a specific historical and geographical zone in the light of a modern archaeological survey. The inclusion of the excavation at Hazor, along with the ongoing regional surface survey yielded invaluable information. Some seventeen small sites, the largest of which was only two and one-half acres, were found and dated to the thirteenth and twelfth centuries BC. Questions still remained following the survey as to whether or not this area was densely populated during the Bronze Age. Another twenty-five sites were identified within what was identified as the allotment of Naphtali.

The Lower Galilee survey found a concentration of fifteen settlements in the hills of Nazareth and attributed them to the tribe of Zebulun. Gal reported that the known evidence from excavations in northern Palestine might lead one to conclude that the Canaanite cities were destroyed as early as the middle of the thirteenth century BC, which in turn indicates that Galilee did not play a major role in the conflict between the Israelites and the Canaanites (1988:83).

The central hill country of Canaan, Manasseh, is believed to be the most likely area that the Israelites settled first when they entered the land of Canaan (Zertal 2004:8).

Surveys in this area revealed a sparsely-settled landscape during the Late Bronze Age. Finkelstein noted that the survey of the hill country of Manasseh is one of the most important ever undertaken in the land of Israel (1988:89). Thirty-nine sites from the Late Bronze Age were identified in Manasseh and 136 Iron I sites were found—indicating an influx of a new population as the Late Bronze Age came to an end. Proposals have been made suggesting that these new settlers came from the east of the Jordan River into Canaan or from western Canaan into the hill country.

The regional study of Ephraim, located in the heartland of the Israelite settlement, recorded 115 settlement sites identified by Finkelstein as occupied by pastoral nomads (1988:202–203). Most of these sites were situated in remote hilly areas and were no more than a few isolated structures of up to a one and one-half acre site. Finkelstein concurs with Albright's early assessment that there were very few Bronze Age mounds in Ephraim (1929:3–4; 1988:204).

Transjordan was the subject of a superficial survey early on by Glueck in which he concluded that the area between Nahal Arnon (Wadi Mujab) in the south and the Yarmuk River in the north demonstrated that it was devoid of any settlement activity. Later work, and more advanced technological survey methods, have shown that the small Iron Age I sites, resembling Israelite settlements, were west of the Jordan chiefly in Gilead. In the Gilead area, the settlements are considered to reflect the settlement of the half-tribe of Manasseh. As noted previously, knowledge of Transjordan is far less than that of Israel, and no clear picture of the Israelite settlement pattern emerges from the survey data. Certainly, the question of whether or not Israel moved from the east to the west cannot be conclusively determined by the Transjordan surveys.

Little is known about the Israelite settlement pattern process in the Judean Hills and the Shephelah. Excavations were conducted at Khirbet Rabud (Debir), Hebron, Beth-Zur and Giloh. Twenty-two sites in the Judean Hills were attributed by Kochavi to the Israelite settlement period (1972:20–21, 83, in Hebrew; Finkelstein 1988:51). No Iron Age I sites were found in the hills west of Jerusalem, nor any specific pottery. There was ten to twelve Iron I sites in the Judean Hills, mostly located north of Hebron, according to Ofer (1994:102). Due to the dense Canaanite population in the Shephelah, it is hard to imagine that the Israelites initially settled in this area—surveys

up to 1988 have not revealed Iron I sites with any clear evidence of Israelite occupation (Finkelstein 1988:53). The Judean hills during the Late Bronze Age had only two sites for certain—Jerusalem and Khirbet Rabud.

The last three surveys discussed in this chapter, the Arad and Beersheba valleys, the Judean Desert, and Benjamin did not yield an abundance of evidence of Israelite settlement patterns. In the Arad and Beersheba valleys, apparently there was no occupation during the Late Bronze Age, and most of the Iron I sites have been excavated: Tel Masos, Tel Esdar, Arad and Beersheba (Mazar A 1992:336). In the Judean Desert twenty Iron I sites were reported, mostly isolated structures and round or elliptical enclosures (Bar-Adon 1972:34). The plateau of Benjamin is delimited by Jerusalem in the south and Bethel in the north—eight Iron I sites were identified in Benjamin—seven of them in the eastern part of the region on the desert fringe (Finkelstein 1988:56).

CHAPTER SIX

EMERGENCE MODELS FOR ISRAEL'S ARRIVAL IN CANAAN

6.1 Introduction to the Models

In regard to the question of how and when ancient Israel entered the Land of Canaan, two major models (theories or proposals) dominated the academic scene from the early twentieth century until the 1970s. The first, championed by the orientalist William Albright, was referred to as the Conquest Model, which basically followed the biblical story set forth in the Book of Joshua.[79] A second model, the Peaceful Infiltration Model, was proposed by German scholars Albrecht Alt and Martin Noth.

The advent of new archaeological methods, primarily the major surveys in the highlands in the north and the south of Israel in the 1970s and 80s, brought forth new data and a more precise picture of the settlement patterns of the new population explosion in these areas at the end of the Late Bronze Age (LBA) and beginning of the Iron I period. Some scholars attributed these new settlements to the Israelites coming from Cisjordan into Canaan (Zertal 1991:36), while others disagreed, noting that no conclusive evidence exists for such a conclusion (Finkelstein 1988:90).

As a result of the new data from continued excavations of major Canaanite mounds and the surveys, the Conquest Model and the Peaceful Infiltration Model were significantly discredited, giving rise to new ideas concerning the origin of Israel in Canaan.[80] As chinks in the armour of both the Conquest Model and the Peaceful Infiltration Model developed, several other settlement models were proposed. One such new model, the Peasant Revolt Model (PRM), was set forth by George Mendenhall and greatly expanded on and elaborated by Norman Gottwald. It was not long before other suggestions also surfaced: the Symbiosis Hypothesis of Volkmar

[79] see Joshua chapters 1–12.

[80] Along with the new data that discredited the Conquest and Peaceful Infiltration Models, the death of such a well-respected scholar as Albright cleared the way for the expression of new ideas.

Fritz and Israel Finkelstein, and the Auto-Ethnogenesis Model advocated by Shlomo Bunimovitz, Zvi Lederman, and William Dever.

In this chapter, I will explore more deeply each of the models, highlighting both their strengths and weaknesses and their relationship to the archaeological evidence and the written sources, specifically the Hebrew Scriptures. Each model will be fleshed out and evaluated as to the role, if any; it may have played in the origin of ancient Israel in Canaan.

6.2 Albright: The Conquest Model

The Conquest Model held sway until the 1960s. It is considered the earliest, because, in its non-scholarly form, it simply makes the assumption that the Bible correctly records ancient history, and is thus close to what many people have traditionally believed about the Bible. It primarily follows the biblical narrative found in the Pentateuch and Joshua, which Albright believed was based on underlying history (Hawkins 2013:30). It should be noted that scholars who supported this model did not take every detail of the biblical story as literally true (McDermott 1998:37).

Albright's theory rests upon the assumption that the story in the Pentateuch and Joshua is based on an underlying history; the Israelites came out of the desert and invaded Canaan from the east—however, he stood ready to amend his viewpoint on the general accuracy of the Bible if external evidence demanded it (Albright 1965:95). Further, he recognized that the story exaggerates some of Joshua's military exploits, and that people from both inside and outside Canaan joined the Israelites (McDermott 1998:37). Albright was convinced that there was more to the biblical account than critical scholars before his time had detected—specifically, he saw in the nearly-universal destruction at the end of the Late Bronze Age, archaeological evidence of a military conquest of Canaan by the Israelites, much along the lines of the biblical account (Merling 1996:88). However, Albright was acutely aware of the difficulty associated with the task of determining the origin of ancient Israel as reflected in his 1935 article in BASOR 'Archaeology and the Date of the Hebrew Conquest of Palestine':

> There have been few problems in the field of the historical interpretation of Palestinian archaeological data which have fascinated scholars so much as the one described in our title. At the same time, there have been few problems which have seemed so elusive (Albright 1935:10).

Even though Albright recognized some difficulties with the Conquest Model, he defended it from the 1920s until his death in 1971 (Dever 2003:41). However, with the onslaught of new archaeological data, the question of Israelite origins grew more and more intractable.

According to Albright's theory, the Israelites entered Canaan as a unified group[81] and conquered the land (Faust 2006:172). Albright used the appearance of the name Israel on the Merneptah stele, which he dated to 1219 BC, in correlation with the archaeological destruction layers at Tell Beit Mirsim, Bethel, Lachish and Hazor to date the Conquest in the thirteenth century BC (Albright 1963:30). Albright believed the invading Israelites were ethnically and religiously distinct from the indigenous population of Canaan; the Canaanites themselves being 'crude and depraved' (1963:26).

Albright brought to the subject of Israelite settlement by conquest certain credibility founded in archaeology. By 1935, Albright had already become the authority in American archaeological circles. In his 1935 article, mentioned above, Albright dealt with the Israelite conquest/settlement through synthesizing the then available evidence combined with what he referred to as 'Historical Conclusions' (Merling 1996:21). Albright was convinced at the time of the article's writing that the preliminary conclusions reached in regard to the work at Jericho, Bethel, Lachish, and less importantly, Tell Beit Mirsim where he excavated in 1926, 28, 30 and 32, presented enough evidence to finally frame a chronological outline of the Israelite conquest/settlement (Albright 1935:10). Albright concluded that a military campaign had been launched by the Israelites to obtain Canaan as a homeland. This campaign was actually multiple incursions into Canaan by the Israelites, with one group (the tribe of Joseph) arriving with the 'Khabiru' (Albright's spelling) during the Amarna period,

[81] unified but loosely organized (Albright 1939:22)

and the Moses group participating in an exodus somewhat before 1290 BC, which then began a conquest of Transjordan about 1250 BC (Albright 1935:15–17).

Albright attached a date of mid-fourteenth century to the destruction of Jericho, while associating Bethel with Ai and Lachish in the later part of the thirteenth century or early twelfth century BC (Albright 1935:15; 1939:15–17). His association of the destruction of Jericho with the mid-fourteenth century meant that he had to maintain his position expressed earlier that at least some of the Israelites had made their way into Canaan in the sixteenth and fifteenth centuries and settled in the thirteenth and twelfth centuries (Albright 1935:10–14). In all, Albright saw at least four different Israelite groups which eventually amalgamated to form a large whole.

As the unified Israelites carried out this conquest, Albright interpreted the biblical narrative as if the invaders had attacked numerous cities, not just Jericho, Ai, and Hazor. He sought to tie destructions of Canaanite cities with the invasion. Hazor appeared to have a destruction layer that dated to about 1400 BC, but no such burn layers could be found in the same time frame at Jericho or Ai. A number of other sites, such as Bethel, Debir, Eglon, and Lachish, seemed to have been destroyed in the thirteenth century BC. This led him to conclude that this was evidence of the conquest which must have occurred in the thirteenth century rather than the fifteenth century BC (Albright 1939:18–19). The progress of the excavation and of philological interpretation of inscriptions made it certain to Albright that the principal phase of the Conquest must be dated in the second half of the thirteenth century (Albright 1939:20–22).

Albright was adamant in his belief that the archaeological evidence clearly demonstrated that the main thrust of the Israelites came at the end of the Late Bronze Age and, therefore, their most significant invasion was at that time. A former student of Albright, John Bright, also concurred that the archaeological evidence of a brutal conquest at the end of the thirteenth century was ‘impressive’ (Bright 2000: 132).[82] Albright always maintained that the Israelites invaded Canaan around 1220 BC with an earlier destruction of Jericho and Bethel (Albright 1971:108–109). He saw a distinct difference between the Bronze Age Canaanite strata, with large complex buildings and

[82] Bright does go on to say that as impressive as the evidence is at many points, it is still ambiguous—even confusing (1981:129)

superior ceramics, and the Iron Age Israelite strata of simple buildings and primitive pottery (Albright 1971:99).[83]

The main bulk of the Israelites could have entered the land in the vicinity of the eastern entrance of the Wadi Far'ah, moving into the eastern slopes of the hill country of Ephraim and Manasseh, where the earliest settlement sites appear. Joshua's attacks neutralized the ability of the city rulers to act against the new settlers. Stone notes that this is only a suggestion, but that it does cohere reasonably well with the text and what is known of the archaeological record (Stone 2014:163).

God made it clear, through the writings of the Israelite leader Joshua, that he (God) would give them the land in spite of the fact they were failing to live up to the commandments given them by God through Joshua.[84] The theological component is clear, God keeps his promises:

> Israel was also a people who still had much to do because they had, even in their best days, refused to follow God completely and carry out his instructions, preferring to argue and feud among themselves and to follow the paths of the gods of the land along with the God of the exodus and conquest. Thus Israel had to look forward to a new Joshua, who would bring the people to follow God all his days and to confess once and for all that this God fulfilled all his promises to his people (Butler 2014:156–157).

Moses' lieutenant, Joshua, who was the human agent in Israel's gaining possession of the land of Canaan continuously encouraged and challenged the people of God to fulfil their part in the equation, allowing God do the rest. Not only is Joshua a theological book, it is also represents a mature reflection of the people of Israel upon their own identity (Butler 2014:156).[85] Albright's work rested on archaeological data recovered from several large Canaanite cities showing evidence of destruction at the end of the Late Bronze Age: Debir, Bethel, Hazor and Lachish. Even at cities, Jericho and Ai specifically, which archaeologists claimed were not inhabited at the time of the

[83] Albright noted that Canaanite civilization was in some ways highly developed but in others startlingly crude.
[84] see Joshua 1:1–9.
[85] The Conquest Model will be visited again in chapter seven as this paper looks at the patterns of warfare by the Israelite army in relation to the Symbiotic Model.

supposed conquest, Albright pronounced that his model still worked, explaining that the evidence of Late Bronze Age habitation had eroded away (McDermott 1998:37). Albright noted that the results of excavations can be ambiguous and sometimes in apparent contradiction with the biblical tradition (Albright 1950:15). In the case of Ai, Albright stated that the biblical story of the conquest of Ai was a transferred story that was originally about nearby Bethel. (1939:17–20).

By 1937 Albright's view of the Conquest and settlement had crystallized. The Israelites had arrived in several groups, with at least one arriving in the late thirteenth century (1950:15). As the Israelites expanded, they destroyed the indigenous culture and replaced the culture with their own less sophisticated culture.[86]

By the 1970s, the majority of scholarship viewed the Conquest Model as having been totally debunked. While there appears to be compelling evidence (biblical and archaeological) in favour of the Israelites conquering many of the Canaanite cities as Joshua and the Israelites entered Canaan in the late thirteenth century BC—there is also convincing evidence from the biblical text itself (the book of Joshua) that sets aside the Conquest Model as the means by which Israel completely occupied the land of Canaan and became the dominant political and military force. Boling and Wright rightly conclude that in the case of archaeological evidence one should note that it can at best be quite ambiguous (1982a:21). It is also noteworthy that a significant number of scholars also have little or no confidence in the historicity of the biblical text.

Because of its content, the book of Joshua occupies a unique place apart from other books of the Old Testament canon. The significance is clear from Joshua's position in the canon, namely, directly after the Pentateuch (Goslinga 1986:5). In a certain sense, Joshua functions as a transition between the five books of Moses and the other books of the Old Covenant. In it, Joshua demonstrated how the entire conquest of Canaan and all that it entailed corresponded with the arrangements already delineated by Moses at God's command.[87]

[86] Israel's pottery and building style was primitive in comparison to the Canaanite culture of that period.

[87] see Joshua 8:31; 11:15; 13:8, 15, 32–33; 20:2; Deut 31:3–8.

In order to understand the book of Joshua, and its apparent contradictory nature when it comes to how the Israelites took or were given Canaan, one must recognize that Joshua is a theological writing intended to demonstrate the faithfulness of God in keeping his promise made to Abraham. What shines through the reading of Joshua is the Lord God of Israel's faithfulness in fulfilling promises he had made to the forefathers (Josh 21:43–45).[88] God provided the land of Canaan (the Promised Land) to the Israelites in spite of their failure to follow his commands by taking the land and destroying the wicked inhabitants (Goslinga 1986:6) .

6.2.1 Reasons to Reject the Conquest Model

As already noted, Albright rightly conceded that it is no easy task to reconstruct the details of the Conquest—noting that the extant Israelite tradition is not uniform, and our biblical sources vary considerably (1950:15). Further, Albright said that the results of excavations are ambiguous and sometimes in apparent conflict with the tradition (1950:15).

Joshua 1:1–12 is seen by some scholars (Albright, Yadin, and Bright) as the story of a blitzkrieg-like conquest in which Israel invaded Canaan, rapidly destroying many cities and towns, slaughtering their populations and wresting the land from its native inhabitants in order to possess and settle in the land.[89] However, it is clear from the biblical text that the chosen people of Israel failed to complete the conquest of Canaan as God had intended—at least in regard to an immediate and total military victory over all the inhabitants of Canaan. Auld correctly notes that Israel's struggle in Canaan, begun under Joshua's leadership, was to be moral and religious and not just military (1984:11). Stone also argues that following on the heels of the story in Joshua 1–12, chapters 13–24 quite frankly, and without censure, admit that much of the territory was not taken under control by the Israelites (2014:130). In addition, Stone notes, and rightly so, that Judges 1:1 through 2:11 repeats the partial settlement story, with minor alterations of Joshua's text, and with some passages taken verbatim from Joshua's

[88] Younger argues that the Conquest Model was doomed from the beginning because of its literal, simplistic reading of Joshua (1999:179). Younger is on target, if one concedes that the theological component of the text is overlooked or unrecognized.

[89] It should be noted that these (Albright, Yadin, and Bright) and others also recognize and point out the fact that it was not a complete success, since Israel failed to secure the entire land during their initial entrance into Canaan.

account (2014:45). Manor correctly agress with the assessment that given Israel's failure to follow through with the dictates from God, by default the other models became contributing elements to Israel's unfolding history (2013:109).

The Promised Land was already controlled by enemies when Israel approached, and rather than settling in uninhabited areas, which offered no opposition, Israel was commanded to overcome opponents in order to acquire the land. Joshua commanded the officers of the people to get ready for battle, for within three days they would pass over the Jordan River and take possession of the land that the Lord God was giving them to possess (Josh 1:10). From the biblical narrative (Josh 13–24) and the archaeological surveys, it is clear that Israel chose, after a limited military foray into Canaan, to settle primarily in uninhabited areas.[90]

In Joshua chapter 9 the account of the deception by the Gibeonites shows that Israel failed to take the entire land, although the deception cost these Canaanites dearly.[91] Furthermore, in Joshua chapter 13, Joshua, advanced in years (now Joshua was old…), reminded the people that there was still much land to possess—documenting the regions and peoples not yet conquered (Josh 13:1–7). Butler suggests that the book of Joshua refers to both the boundaries of the land where the people actually lived and to the boundaries of the land promised; the conquest narrative covers only the first boundary (Josh 10:41; 11:17, 22; 13:2–7), but the promise was for more (2014:213).[92]

Most scholars conclude that the archaeological evidence negates the idea of a biblical 'Israelite Conquest' as an historical event. In fact, Younger went so far as to say that 'the conquest model was doomed from the beginning because of its literal, simplistic reading of Joshua' (1999:179). Dever is on record as saying that archaeology was no longer the handmaiden of the Bible (Hawkins 2013:60). However, A Mazar recognizes that the biblical story may shed light on various ways in which memories of actual situations and events rooted in the second millennium BC,

[90] limited only in the sense that they did not take all the cities nor destroy all the Canaanite people.
[91] The punishment for their deception was that they would serve the Israelites as wood cutters and make sure there was a supply of water for the camp.
[92] Butler notes that behind each of the border descriptions stood a specific historical reality.

aetiologies and invented stories all found their way into the later ‘melting pot’ we today call the Pentateuch and the book of Joshua (Finkelstein and A Mazar 2007:65).

Along with the fact that the biblical text clearly shows that the Israelites did not take the land of Canaan as God intended, Chaney points out that there is no evidence of a large group of intruders who lived in the desert as nomads or semi-nomads who eventually invaded Canaan (Chaney 1983:45). If the material culture of Israel’s earliest settlements was intrusive into the Canaanite world—where did it come from? Where is the evidence that it came from outside Canaan entering from the east? Again Chaney notes that no antecedents have been found outside Palestine in a manner parallel to that such as the Philistines (1983:45). Further, according to Lapp, proponents of an Israelite invasion are forced to admit that within Palestine the basic general topology is virtually identical in the thirteenth and twelfth centuries BC (1967:295).

In general, Palestinian archaeologists have tended to explain changes in material culture as created by the intrusion of new peoples from outside Canaan (Chaney 1983:46). Chaney accepts this tendency as understandable, since much of the hard-won stratigraphy of historical times is fixed by destructions which are attributable to foreign invasions known from literary sources (1983:46). However, the broader perspective of important modern theories of socio-cultural revolution regards technological innovation as a far more frequent and powerful engine of social change than the intrusion of whole new populations (Gottwald 1975:89–100).

Another problem in regard to the Conquest Model is that the biblical narratives of the conquest have been treated very selectively when linked with the archaeological evidence; so much so that archaeology has remained necessarily mute on most of the text, and openly embarrassing with regard to Jericho, Ai, Gibeon and Arad (Chaney 1983:46). No one denies that there were Late Bronze Age/Iron Age I destructions, and many of them—the question is what evidence is there that these destructions were the results of an Israelite invasion (Merling 1996:61). Only parts of Joshua chapters 10–11 and Judges chapter 1 can be connected with the evidence of material remains (Chaney 1983:46). The evidence of the sites will hardly bear the historical burden imposed upon it by the Albright theory of Conquest (Callaway 1985a:32). More

archaeological evidence must be explained away in order to maintain Albright's position than can be called upon to support it (Miller 1977:87).

> The case for the Conquest Model seems sound enough, almost overwhelming, but only as long as evidence is selected with suitable discrimination. When the whole body of biblical and extra-biblical data is examined, far-reaching objections to the Conquest Model arise (Gottwald 1979:196).

According to Finkelstein, it is inconceivable that the Conquest narratives were invented by the late-monarchic writers; rather, he believes they were the product of Deuteronomistic-historians who used old folktales and fragmented memories to create Israel's conquest history (Finkelstein and Mazar A 2007:55)

While Albright and his followers seized upon the destruction of large Canaanite cities as ample testimony to the historicity of the biblical account of a planned campaign by Joshua, archaeological evidence is mute and ambiguous at best with no clear indication of the agents of destruction (Coote and Whitelam 2004:118). The cities which presented archaeological evidence of having been destroyed at the end of the Late Bronze Age are, for the most part, not the ones which figure prominently in the biblical conquest traditions—these Late Bronze Age destructions may have been due to localized causes (Hawkins 2013:32; Miller 1977:236–237).

An important obstacle for the Conquest Model was the perceived relationship of Albright with the Bible, and his apparent dogmatic fundamentalist stance which caused some to see it as parochial and apologetic (Merling 1996:26–28). Unfortunately, this perception of Albright was not accurate. Far from being a fundamentalist, he once described himself as a biblical sceptic. Albright characterized himself as an adherent of neo-orthodoxy, a movement in which Scripture was viewed not as the Word of God, but as the vehicle for the Word of God (Schnucker 1991:331–333). Nevertheless, an eventual component of the demise of the Conquest Model was Albright's propensity not to support his biblical interpretations with archaeological evidence or any other corroborating information (Finkelstein 1988:88). Thus, his interpretations were more seen as aligned with general Bible studies, although Albright's relationship with the Bible was unique and often misunderstood (Merling 1996:27)

Another argument against the idea of a conquest in Canaan by the Israelites is based on the fact that very few excavated sites have revealed destruction layers identifiable with an emerging force (Israel) in the late thirteenth century–early twelfth century BC. Even where destruction has been found, aggressive arguments have been made that these cannot be identified as the product of the Israelites. Dever asserts that most of the sites listed in Joshua chapter 12 revealed no signs of destruction associated with the time of Israel's emergence, although the identities of a number of sites remain elusive (1992b:552).

6.2.2 Conquest Model: The Final Verdict

Even after the revisions and rethinking of the Conquest Model by Albright, Wright and others, the Conquest Model failed to demonstrate that it was the one single factor that brought about the emergence of Israel into the land of Canaan. The Israeli archaeologist Yigael Yadin continued to stand by Albright's model noting, '…in its broad outline the archaeological record supports the narrative in Joshua and Judges as Albright said' (Yadin 1982:19). However, before his death, Albright admitted that 'at present we cannot propose any safe reconstruction of the actual course of events during the period of the Israelite Settlement in Palestine' (Albright 1965:95). It should be noted that even those scholars who were sympathetic to portions of the Conquest Model reasoning, still rejected it as the single source of the origin of ancient Israel in Canaan (Lapp 1967:299).

6.3 Albrecht Alt—the Peaceful Infiltration Model

Between the World Wars, European scholars searched for alternatives to the Conquest Model as set forth by Albright. In stark contrast to the Conquest Model is the theoretical opposite proposed by Albrecht Alt, and his student Martin Noth. Alt and Noth proposed a new theory concerning the origin of Israel in Canaan based on the form-critical presuppositions of Hermann Gunkel. Assuming the narratives of Joshua were late compositions written as literary constructs, rather than historical accounts, Alt and Noth postulated a peaceful entrance into Canaan (the Peaceful Infiltration Model) by a group that would come to be known as Israel. This group, entering from the desert, settled among the resident Canaanite populace and eventually gained ascendancy.

Central to the Peaceful Infiltration argument is the need to resolve the problem of the nature of the biblical narratives, especially the discrepancy between the Israelite blitzkrieg in Joshua chapters 1–12 and a more complex and gradual process of settlement described in Judges chapter 1 and elsewhere in Joshua (Coote and Whitelam 2010:13).

Alt, a leading German Protestant theologian, argued that the origin of Israel in Canaan was due to a peaceful infiltration/migration over a period of time. The basis of the theory is that the Canaanite hill country was both geographically and politically separate from the lower-lying areas of Canaan (Alt 1989:136, 149–157). Alt sought to use extra-biblical sources contemporary with the time of Israel's settlement in order to build a history of the territorial divisions of the land of Canaan (Hawkins 2013:36). Using mainly Egyptian sources, he concluded that Shechem was the only significant city-state left in the hill country between Jerusalem and the valley of Jezreel in the fourteenth century BC. This is the sparsely populated region in which the biblical tradition places the initial settlements of the Israelites.

Before the historic periods of the Iron Age, the plains and foothills of Canaan were ruled by a city-state system. Under this system, the larger city dominated the small region around itself with a similar city-state located not far away. The area had a large number of districts, each centred on a city with a hereditary prince as ruler (Alt 1989:145). The hill country, according to Alt's thinking, did not lend itself to such an organization pattern as found in the city-state system in the lower-lying plains. The underdeveloped status and its isolation were more conducive to larger territorial formations (Alt 1989:145). It was the more wide-open territorial terrain of the hill country system that allowed the Israelites to settle there without causing any great disturbance to local everyday life. Such an arrangement allowed Israel to maintain her uniqueness from the Canaanites in the hill country and the plains below (Alt 1989:159–160).

Alt, working out his theory long before the period of archaeological surveys began in the West Bank, had no specific evidence of Israelite settlements but simply followed the biblical tradition that the initial settlements of the Israelites were in the hill country between Jerusalem and the valley of Jezreel (Hawkins 2013:37). The intensive

archaeological surface surveys revealed an entirely new settlement pattern (Mazar A 1990:334). Hundreds of new small sites were inhabited in the mountainous areas of Upper and Lower Galilee, in the hills of Samaria and Ephraim, in Benjamin, in the northern Negev, and parts of central and northern Transjordan (Mazar A 1990:334).

Although Alt saw the arrival of the Israelites in Canaan juxtaposed with the coming of the Philistines—his view of the Israelite adventure is one of a gradual, unorganized and long-term process—it was in 'thinly populated areas' or 'gaps' in the city-state system of territorial division that, according to this theory, settlement occurred (Alt 1989:175). In the case of the Philistines, he viewed their arrival as a sudden, one-part event with their coming as a cohesive unit, which contributed immensely to their success in building cities (1989:174). Alt offered no specific evidence for the infiltration or the settlements he imagined the Israelites founded, but instead his reconstruction is based on analogy, and he hypothesized that the Israelites were not a unified people who had entered Canaan in a blitzkrieg, but a mixture of unrelated and disparate nomadic or semi-nomadic peoples from the surrounding regions, all of whom worshipped different gods (Alt 1989:15–86).

While recognizing the contribution Alt made to the discussion of the origin of Israel, this thesis agrees with the majority of scholarship that the Peaceful Infiltration Model is not the singular model that demonstrates how ancient Israel emerged in Canaan. Alt's thesis did not have the luxury of modern archaeological methods, particularly the regional surface surveys that added so much to the discussion of Israelite settlement patterns in the Late Bronze and Iron Age I period. Had Alt had access to this information, he would likely have come to a different conclusion.

6.3.1 Martin Noth

Albrecht Alt's student, Martin Noth, further probed the Peaceful Infiltration Model in *The History of Israel* (1960). He, like Alt, understood the Israelite entrance into Canaan as a lengthy peaceful process in which they followed their herds, summering in the hill country and wintering in the desert until, when they finally found permanent homes in the highlands, they ceased to return to their winter pastures.

Noth measured the length of the peaceful process from its beginning some time after the Amarna period until its end at least 100 years before Saul was crowned king; he reasoned that if Israel had come into Canaan prior to the Amarna period there would have been some mention of their presence in the Amarna tablets (1960:69).

Noth envisioned the Israelites as semi-nomadic people who slipped into the central hill country of Canaan and remained there almost unknown until they made it their permanent home (1960:69). Further, Noth viewed the Israelites' settlement in the land as not in isolation, but rather as part of the larger Aramaean movements of peoples (1960:83). Far from being a fighting people, Noth saw them as living in isolation on patches of mountain wilderness.

Archaeology, according to Noth, added colour and plasticity, while at most it was still prehistory and the text was history (1960:48). Even though Noth considered the text as the primary source for theories of Israel's emergence in Canaan, he did concede that a history of Israel could not be written without archaeology.

6.3.2 Yohanan Aharoni

A devotee of Alt's theory, the Israeli archaeologist Yohanan Aharoni suggested that the fact that so few of the Iron Age I settlement sites were fortified indicates the peaceful nature of the settlement; he further noted that the biblical accounts of the conquest repeatedly show that the tribes of Israel were unable to pit themselves against the strong cities of the plain (Josh 17:18), and that is why they initially settled in the highlands (1971:94–128).

Aharoni and Yadin, both respected, leading Israeli archaeologists, took opposite views on the origin of Israel. As noted above, Yadin followed the Conquest Model as set forth by Albright; Aharoni followed the views of Alt and Noth. The lives of Aharoni and Yadin illustrate well how certain biases may affect one's reasoning process. Neil Silberman argued that Yadin's and Aharoni's positions were far more than just dispassionate scholarly alternatives—in their differing reconstructions of the Israelite conquest, they both implicitly expressed their own understanding of modern processes of territorial conquest and nationhood (1993:237). On the one hand, for Yadin the decisive military victory under the unified command of an innovative leader resonated

with his own understanding of Israel's victory in 1948.[93] On the other hand, Aharoni, rooted in the kibbutz movement, allied with the left wing of labour Zionism, which had envisioned land seizure via settlement as preferable to seizure through war (Silberman 1993:228).

Aharoni saw the new Iron I settlements all through Galilee and the hill country as evidence of this new community's arrival and their need for land (1971:94–128). Further, he suggested that the Israelites experienced the transformation from transhumant to sedentary because of a 'vital compulsion and as strong ambition' (1979:193). The change in metamorphism did not occur in the same manner and at the same rate among the tribes. Each tribe and family changed as environmental conditions dictated (Aharoni 1979:193).

6.3.3 William Dever and Norman Gottwald: Peaceful Infiltration Model and Nomadism

According to the Peaceful Infiltration Model, those who settled the highlands of Canaan, or western Palestine, in the thirteenth–twelfth centuries BC, had originally been nomadic tribes—people of the semi-arid regions of Transjordan (Dever 2003:50). However, there is nothing in the archaeological record to suggest that any elements of the Iron I population of Palestine (with the exception of the Philistines) had either a pastoral-nomadic background or extra-Palestinian origins (Dever 1990:61). In fact, the Peaceful Infiltration Model, according to the American school, was too radical and tended to ignore the progress of archaeology (Dever 1990:53). However, later nomadic studies have shown that ancient Near East pastoral nomads were not land hungry nor did they live in isolation from or hostile to settled societies (Noth 1960:69). The relationship of nomads was generally close and symbiotic (Chaney 1983:43). In short, there was no source of nomads in the steppes that could have supplied the peaceful infiltrators to Canaan (Finkelstein and Mazar A 2007:75).

Gottwald affirms that a close examination of the biblical narratives, in context, clearly shows that pastoral nomadism diminishes to the rank of one minor component in ancient Israelite socioeconomics (1978:4). Most of the movements of the patriarchal

[93] Yadin previously served as head of the operations branch of the Haganah, chief of operations of the Israeli Defence Forces in 1948, and then as the IDF's chief of staff.

families were migratory rather than seasonal treks (Gottwald 1978:5). In fact, it seems clear to Gottwald that pastoral nomadism in ancient Canaan was a subsidiary offshoot of the agricultural village, marked by its transhumant (seasonal migration of livestock, and the people who tend them, between lowlands and adjacent mountains) specialization in sheep, goat and ass breeding (1978:5). According to Gottwald, there is nothing in the socioeconomic details of the traditions of ancient Israel that argues for Israel entering Canaan in a state of 'transition' (1978:5).

Volkmar Fritz developed this idea further than others, proposing what he calls a 'symbiosis hypothesis' pushing the date of entry of Israel into Canaan back to the fourteenth or even the fifteenth century BC (1981:71). Fritz also notes that the infiltration hypothesis fails to explain the fall of the Canaanite city-states, especially since the collapse of the Late Bronze Age culture presents no precondition for the settlement (1981:71).

In regard to the Israelites as nomads, Dever notes that there is no evidence in the material culture that would indicate that these Iron I villages originated outside Palestine, not even in Transjordan, much less in Egypt or the Sinai (1992b:552). Rather than pastoral nomads, there is evidence suggesting that the Israelites were skilled and well-adapted peasant farmers, long familiar with local conditions in Canaan—in fact, the combination and adaptation of existing material cultural elements by the Israelites shows a strong continuity with Late Bronze Age Canaan, especially in the pottery (Dever 1992:552–553; Finkelstein and Silberman 2001:338).[94]

6.3.4 Richard Hess: Peaceful Infiltration Model and Amphictyony[95]

Hess notes that one problem with the Peaceful Infiltration Model is found in its view of the religious association of the tribes of Israel, based on the number 12 and on a common sanctuary (1993:127). Classical Greece has been shown to be an anachronism incompatible with the evidence from the Bible and from archaeology (Hess 1993:127). Even so, this does not deny the presence of a federation of tribes

[94] Pottery continuity will be discussed in greater detail in chapter six of this thesis.

[95] In the archaic times of Greek history, an amphictyony, a 'league of neighbours', or Amphictyonic League was an ancient religious association of Greek tribes formed in the dim past, before the rise of the Greek polis. Any of the league of states, especially the league of Delphi, united for mutual protection and the worship of a common deity.

and a common worship centre as may be found in Joshua 8 and 24 and in I Samuel (Hess 1993:127-129).

6.3.5 Joseph Callaway: The Peaceful Infiltration Model

Callaway considered the Alt/Noth hypothesis the most appealing of the proposals, except that he interpreted the people movement associated with the Israelites in a new arena (1985a:33). Contrary to Alt/Noth, he saw no infiltration of nomads from the east but rather a peaceful infiltration of farmers who came to the highlands with fixed cultural patterns of village life. The fact that these farmers were able to settle in this marginal, even inhospitable land, was due to bell-shaped rock-cut cisterns and the introduction of agricultural terraces (Callaway 1985a:33). Callaway based his conclusions on surveys of the archaeological sites, their location and the remains found.[96]

6.3.6 Manfred Weippert: The Peaceful Infiltration Model/Peaceful Migration

Weippert, like Callaway, also found the Peasant Migration Theory more objective than Albright's Conquest Model (1971:145). Weippert claimed that the objective nature of the Peaceful Migration Theory is shown in that it is not influenced by either the Bible or archaeology (1971:145). According to Weippert, a major difference between Alt/Noth and Albright, with reference to their models/theories of the emergence of Israel in Canaan, was Noth's placement of archaeology on the back burner of importance, while Albright brought the archaeological data to the forefront. Albright saw archaeology as the test of the validity of Bible stories; Noth saw his own interpretation of the Bible as the test for both the Bible and archaeology (1960:81).

6.3.7 Joshua/Judges: The Peaceful Infiltration Model

Alt gave no credence to the book of Joshua's account of a pan-blitzkrieg event, but rather saw the emergence of Israel in Canaan as a gradual movement of single tribes and bands, which may well have lasted for several centuries (Alt 1989:175). His student, Martin Noth, envisioned that the events in the stories of the Judges would have needed no less than 100 years before the monarchy in order to take place (1960:81). While he would have preferred to locate the primary Israelite intrusion

[96] More about the so-called ethnic markers will be explored in chapter seven.

during the thirteenth century BC, there was insufficient evidence to do so, forcing him to allow broader time boundaries (1960:80–81). The fact that the early settlements, attributed to groups that later would become Israel, were in sparsely-inhabited territory was proof for Noth that Joshua's account of a 'warlike encounter' did not occur between the Israelites and the Canaanites (1960:68). The Israelites were peaceful semi-nomads, who were yearning for a more settled life, not a warring people seeking to conquer a land for themselves (Noth 1960:69).[97]

Noth viewed the biblical texts as the only sources for theories concerning the origins of Israel; however, he did concede that it was no longer feasible to describe the history of Israel based simply on the written record—archaeology was a type of pre-history necessary to write the history of Israel (1960:42). The biblical texts for Noth, as well as Alt, were of limited usefulness (Alt 1989:35). In the final analysis, Alt and Noth viewed the Bible and archaeology as not providing enough data to explain the Israelite presence in Canaan—paradigms developed in other times and cultures were needed (Merling1996:33).

6.3.8 The Peaceful Infiltration Model: The Verdict

The idea of a peaceful infiltration is not totally appropriate, since there surely were instances of conflicts between the Israelites and their Canaanite neighbours. Further, any theory that proposes a picture so different from the biblical account must provide a plausible explanation of how the biblical picture arose (Bimson 1989:7). This researcher in is agreement with the majority of scholarship that this has not been adequately accomplished by proponents of the Peaceful Infiltration Model.

6.4 George Mendenhall: The Peasant Revolt Model

The Peasant Revolt Model was offered by Mendenhall and expanded by Gottwald. Unlike the first two models, the Peasant Revolt Model does not view Israel as having come from outside Canaan, but rather having arisen out of the Canaanite population already dwelling in the land.

[97] The Israelites were serving at God's command to punish the evil that God had long tolerated and also to receive the Land of Promise (Genesis 15:16)

The gist of the Peasant Revolt Model, also known as the Social Revolution Model, according to Mendenhall, is that the indigenous Canaanite peasantry rebelled (non-violently) against their Canaanite overlords and retreated to the central hill country where they met a small band of slaves escaped from Egypt who had experienced a theophany of Yahweh in the Sinai wilderness (Hawkins 2013:40; Mendenhall 1976:155–156). According to Mendenhall, it was this Yahwistic faith revealed at Sinai rather than ethnicity, that bound together the new social organization (1962:74; 1976:155; 1973:226).

In regard to the biblical text, Mendenhall considered the stories of Israel that are recorded as happening prior to the experience at Sinai as nothing more than myths—Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and Joseph were stories penned at a later time by members of the Israelite cult in order to create a history of blood ancestors. According to Mendenhall it was not until the time of Ezra and Nehemiah that the idea of ethnic unity was developed to explain the existence of Israel (1973:5). However, he focused on the possibility that there was some history behind the biblical stories of the exodus and the wilderness wanderings—noting that it was the religious view of the people involved that created the new Yahwistic community in the highlands (Hawkins 2013:41; Mendenhall 1973:24–26).

Thus, religion played a large role in the formation of the nation of Israel arising from the Peasant Revolt and its synthesis with the smaller band of slaves coming to Canaan from Egypt. Rather than ethnicity binding the people together as the nation of Israel, it was this new faith in YHWH that brought them together in this new social organization, Israel. The people who became Israel were related by experience, not ethnicity (Mendenhall 1973:26–28). Mendenhall offered the cultural continuity between the Late Bronze Age and the Iron Ages as evidence that the inhabitants of Canaan were homogeneous—a people held together not by familial bond, but by their common religious experience (1973:180–183).

The larger Canaanite group rejected the society they had left and joined the emerging religious community of Hebrews; therefore, the early Israelites were essentially indigenous, formed through revolution and conversion (Hawkins 2013:40). According to Mendenhall, the Sinai experience demonstrated that there was an

alternative to blind allegiance to a human state that required absolute obedience. The alternative was the religion of YHWH (1973:21). In the double sense of responsibility to man and YHWH, set forth in the worship of YHWH, this revolutionary insight produced in the escaping slaves their sense of community. However, the full-blown fire of revolution was ignited in Palestine. It should be noted that nowhere is there any documentation for internal 'systems collapse' anywhere on the eastern Mediterranean littoral (Rainey 2007:43).[98]

In his 1962 article, 'The Hebrew Conquest of Palestine', Mendenhall took the discussion of Israelite origin in an entirely new direction. From the outset he made it clear that his intention was to offer an alternative model to that of Albright's Conquest Model and Alt's Peaceful Infiltration Model (1962:66–67). Rejecting the basic assumption of both Albright and Noth that Israel came from outside the land, he, instead, interpreted Israel's formation within the turbulent context of the Late Bronze Age–Iron I transition. Mendenhall proposed that indigenous Canaanite peasantry rebelled against their Canaanite overlords and retreated to the central hill country. This rebellion did not involve any violence. Upon arrival in the hill country, these freedom-seeking Canaanites met, and joined forces with a small band of slaves who had escaped from Egypt. This small contingent of slaves had experienced a theophany of Yahweh while in the Sinai Wilderness. Mendenhall rejected the idea that either group was nomads, noting that the emergence of Israel cannot be explained as nomads settling down in the land (1962:67; 1976:156).

In regard to nomads, Mendenhall went so far as to claim there were never any nomads in the Near East. He came to this conclusion through applying his own definition of the 'Apiru to the Israelites. Mendenhall's understanding of the 'Apiru became one of the pillars of the Peasant Revolt Model. For him, the 'Apiru were drop-outs from normal society who became bandits preying on regular citizens still following the system. He concluded that nearly all scholars agreed that the term 'Apiru had no ethnic significance but rather designated a social or political status (1962:71). He considered the biblical David as the best example of one who was an 'Apiru among

[98] On the shore or in the region of the ocean.

Israel, divorcing himself from Israel and joining another political entitiy—the Philistines (1 Sam 27:1–7).

In every society, at every juncture of history, there has been, and probably always will be, those individuals or groups that do not fit well within the mainstream of social order. Call them rebels, wanna-be rebels, or misfits—they exist on the fringe of societal order and appear to be in a constant state of unrest. It is no different when one examines the biblical data. In the case of David he was a historical figure who attracted socially marginalized people.

> And everyone who was in distress, and everyone who was in debt, and everyone who was bitter in soul, gathered to him. And he became captain over them. And there were with him about four hundred men (1 Sam 22:2)

In a short time the number grew to six hundred men (1 Sam 23:13). One writer described this group as '…men who have suffered some kind of loss or deprivation that has left them embittered; he is now champion of the disconnected, the disenchanted and the mistreated' (McCarter 1980:357). Having come from the same common stock and the object of unjust pursuit by King Saul, David probably was intrinsically sympathetic to the plight of the oppressed and would have resonated with the socially and economically disenfranchised (Manor 2013:106).

Having failed to complete the mission of annihilating the resident Canaanite population upon entry into Canaan—God's chosen people were forced to live alongside the heathen Canaanites. It is a given that there were a number of the Canaanite population with a propensity for living on the fringe of their society as marginalized people. Thus, it is likely that this group might gravitate toward the Israelite way of life.

In Mendenhall's view, the massive influx of new settlers into the hill country was the result of 'internal revolt' by beleaguered peasants against the Canaanite city-states (Mendenhall 1962:73). Thus the early Israelites were seen as native peasantry of Canaan withdrawing from the oppressive regime of the city-state system (Bimson 1989:9). To support his thesis, Mendenhall used a number of passages from the Amarna Letters that mention the 'Apiru (*habiru*), a term often mistakenly associated

with the early Israelites (Rainey 2008:46). Seven of the letters in the Amarna archive are from Abdi-Heba, a king of Canaanite Jerusalem, to his overlord, the Pharaoh (king) of Egypt (Moran 1992:325–334). In these letters the Canaanite king complains to the Pharaoh that the *habiru* have taken the very cities of the king, and if the Pharaoh does not send archers the land of the king will desert to the *habiru* (Moran 1992:325–334). To quote Mendenhall:

> The fact is, and the present writer would regard it as a fact though not every detail can be proven, that both the Amarna materials and the biblical events represent politically the same process: namely, the withdrawal, not physically and geographically, but politically and subjectively, of large population groups from any obligation to the existing political regimes, and therefore, the renunciation of any protection from those sources (1962:73).

In Mendenhall's mind there was no statistically important invasion of Palestine at all at the beginning of the twelve tribe system of Israel (1962:73). Neither was there any radical displacement of people, no genocide or any other type of population removal from Palestine. According to Mendenhall, what happened was a peasant revolt against the network of interlocking Canaanite city-states (1962:73).

Mendenhall identified the *habiru* with the early Israelites in the hill country, assuming these terms to be synonymous and defining them to mean someone who has renounced any obligation to the society in which he formerly had some standing (Bimson 1989:9). In so doing, Mendenhall produced a radically new insight into Israelite origins (Bimson 1989:9). The fact of the matter is that the term 'apiru is not an ethnic designation, but rather a reference to a social element—clearly understood from the plethora of references to *habiru* from over a 600-year period from the eighteenth to twelfth centuries BC (Rainey 2008:52). An 8.5-inch tall square cuneiform prism was recovered from Anatolia that lists 438 names of *habiru.*

Even though there is a similarity of sound between *habiru* and Hebrew, there is absolutely no relationship. It is linguistically improbable to equate *habiru* and *Ivri* (the Hebrew word for 'Hebrew')—and besides, the word *habiru* was not used to describe a single ethnic group but an array of disenfranchised social groups that inhabited the

fringes of Bronze Age Near Eastern society (Rainey 2008:53). Further, the *habiru* are never described as pastoralists, as are the Hebrews, and they are never referred to as belonging to tribes (Rainey 2008:53). Despite Rainey's concrete assertions concerning the *habiru*, it should be noted that the jury is still out on the matter.

According to Mendenhall, the Hebrew conquest of Palestine took place because a religious movement and motivation created solidarity among a large group of pre-existent social units which were able to challenge and defeat the dysfunctional complex cities which dominated the whole of Palestine and Syria at the end of the Bronze Age (1962:84–87). A group of slave-labour captives succeeded in escaping from an intolerable situation in Egypt finding themselves without any protection or support, thus establishing a relationship with a deity, Yahweh (Mendenhall 1962:73). Consequently, entire groups revolting against the Canaanite city-states identified themselves with the oppressed group from Egypt—the Yahwistic faith transcending tribal religion functioning to create a community above the tribal level (Mendenhall 1962:74). The appearance of this small religious community of Israel polarized the existing population all over the land; some joined others, primarily kings and their supporters, fought against it (Mendenhall 1962:81).

Mendenhall postulated that one feature, readily observable in humanity, is that fashion constantly changes. Every tenth generation, roughly every 250 to 300 years, the pressures of society build to the point of eruption and the rhythmic pattern of history continues to produce macro changes in society, while micro changes are the natural product of life (1973:216–217). It was during one of these cycles that the Peasant Revolt of the Canaanites took place. A new cycle, the invasion of the Israelites into Canaan, sparked the response from those on the fringe of society—a sort of 'peasant/marginalized people' revolt that led some, or perhaps many, to move their allegiance toward the incoming Israelites (Gottwald 1979:214). In Mendenhall's judgment, the process resulted in the forming of the new social organization, Israel—during the framework of the Late Bronze Age. It was a time when the socio-economic situation was ripe for such an upheaval to occur (Mendenhall 1976:154).

6.4.1 Norman Gottwald: The Peasant Revolt/ Social Revolutionary Theory

Mendenhall's student, Norman Gottwald, surpassed his teacher in the scholarly discussion of the Peasant Revolt Model in the 1970s, as evidenced by his massive work *The Tribes of Yahweh*. In regard to the Peasant Revolt or Revolution theory, Mendenhall's one short article pales in comparison to the 916-page work *The Tribes of Yahweh* published by Gottwald (1979). While maintaining support for the basic tenets of Mendenhall's theory, he organized the thesis around a more recent political paradigm (Merling 1996:39).

Gottwald developed his own unique approach from his own sociological experiences in the civil rights movement, the anti-war movement against Vietnam, criticisms of North American Capitalism, as well as church and school politics (Gottwald 1979:xxv). Further, he took as his model the medieval period of European writing using language such as 'serfs', 'lower class', 'aristocrats', 'free citizenry' and 'Canaanite feudalism' (Gottwald 1979:213–214).

Gottwald agreed with his mentor that the ancestors of the Israelites were not nomads, semi-nomads or even pastoral nomads (1979:436). He, Gottwald, also had serious doubts, as did Mendenhall, about the homogeneity of the Israelites who left Egypt (1979:xxv). Like Mendenhall, he proposed that the repressed classes threw off the bondage of the city-state structure through a series of rebellions. These rebellions were free agrarian and lacked a state form of government and class system.

Gottwald departed from Mendenhall in rejecting the Mosaic covenant and its religious ideology as a significant factor in Israel's emergence from Canaanite society, expressing strong doubts about the historical value of the Exodus-Sinai traditions (1979:35). He noted that ancient Israel was not spawned by religious experience, but rather by political unrest steeped in class struggle (Hawkins 2013:41).

Gottwald's assessment diverged significantly from Mendenhall's portrayal of Israel as an apolitical theocracy bound in covenant relationship with Yahweh (Coote and Whitelam 2010:12). Instead, Gottwald focused more on the internal process, the role of the lower-class Canaanites, and less on the Exodus group that may have inspired them to revolt (Hawkins 2013:41). Gottwald dropped the use of the term Peasant Revolt, as did Mendenhall, because it invited an association with European peasant uprisings (2008:134). In regard to the role any kind of 'Peasant Revolt' or 'marginalized

society people' played in the emergence of Israel as the dominant power in Canaan, Gottwald's position that politics had more to do with the origin of Israel than did religion seems to fit better in any position allowing for the misfits on the fringes of Canaanite society joining with and eventually becoming part of the Israelite nation ruling in Canaan.

In terms of the process, whereas Mendenhall portrays it as a rather overnight happening, Gottwald extends the process, supplementing the 'peasant rebellion' model with one of social revolution—the latter ebbing and flowing over two centuries (Dever 2003:53). The Iron I settlements in the central hill country were the work of rebel groups withdrawing to the regions of lowest resistance. Gottwald doubted that the early Iron I destructions, which Albright saw as the basic conquest and settlement period, can be proved to be the work of the Israelites. Instead, Gottwald suggested that such wide-ranging destructions more accurately support other conclusions than a one-nation conquest (1985a:153). Mendenhall suggested that the settlers in the central hill country were rebels who withdrew not physically and geographically, but politically and subjectively from the existing regimes (1962:73; Bimson 1989:9).

In regard to the biblical text, Gottwald says that while wishing it were not the case, the primary source of knowledge about Israel's beginnings is still the Hebrew Bible. He goes on to say, 'Without it we should not even have guessed from all the other sources combined that so energetic and unique a people as Israel appeared in Canaan at the dawn of the Iron Age' (Gottwald 1979:26).

While acknowledging the Bible as the primary source of information concerning the emergence of ancient Israel in Canaan, Gottwald demonstrated that he had very little confidence in the details of the biblical stories. The biblical text, according to Gottwald, is so obscure that to understand the stories as they read is not possible (Gottwald 1979:198). With this in mind, Gottwald suggested that what scholars must do is sift the material and supply a spatio-temporal framework (1979:30).[99] Gottwald saw his

[99] Gottwald's spatio-temporal framework is basically parallel with Mendenhall's model with some adjustments.

work on the Peasant Revolt Model as one of shoring up areas of his mentor's work that were not as convincing as they could be. He wrote in 1979:

> Personally I believe that there is ample evidence for the revolt model to make it a serious proposal; but in order for it to attain theoretical adequacy, it requires further elaboration and application, and even some modification (Gottwald 1979:219).

In regard to the 'Apiru, Gottwald saw them, as did Mendenhall, as a socio-political movement, not an ethnic or economic unity (1979:401). They were, in Gottwald's assessment, roving bands only loosely integrated into the general society, more like military mercenaries or renegade robbers and armed infantry. Other names he used to describe them were outlaws, traitors, conspirators and enemies (1979:404).

Also, according to Gottwald, the 'Apiru were closely associated with the village pastoralists, depending upon them for work and living products in order to survive. As the 'Apiru grew in strength and number, the lower-class city dwellers joined with them providing the strength to control whole regions of Canaan (Gottwald 1979:408). Gottwald noted that it was from within this context that the Hebrews developed. Accordingly, the Canaanite 'Apiru lived in a feudalistic world, with society divided into socio-strata. They lived outside the dominant society of Canaanite feudalism offering an alternative for the serfs (Gottwald's language) to rebel and join with them' (Gottwald 1979:408).

Gottwald's conclusion was that a mixed group of people, basically unrelated, left the melting pot of the eastern delta of Egypt and arrived in Canaan to find a feudalistic society with major tension between social organizations. The conflicts were caused by tension between urban-based statism and rural-oriented tribalism (1979:475). When the fleeing Egyptian slaves appeared in Canaan, they caused coagulation with the undercurrent unrest of the serfs.

While noting that Gottwald essentially agreed with Mendenhall's thesis, it should be pointed out that when his magisterial book *Tribes of Yahweh: A Sociology of the Religion of Liberated Israel, 1250 -1050 B.C.E.* appeared, Mendenhall was virulent:

> What Gottwald has actually produced is a modern version of the ancient myth-making mentality. Utilizing both the terminology and the driving ideas of a nineteenth century political ideology, he proceeds blithely to read into biblical history whatever is called for in the program of that nineteenth century ideology (1983:91).

Some viewed the nineteenth-century ideology critiqued by Mendenhall as Gottwald's imposition of modern historical assumptions (Marxism) on ancient times (Merling 1996:43; Hawkins 2013:42). Gottwald explicitly acknowledged that the revolutionary thoughts of the 1960s and 1970s moulded his interpretation of the Peasants' Revolt (1979:xxv).

Mendenhall viewed the Israelite movement as much more a cultural and ideological revolution rather than a political one as suggested by Gottwald (Mendenhall 1983:92). Gottwald disagreed with Mendenhall's assessment that the Sinai experience was the core Israelite experience shared by all, and the source of their unity. Gottwald perceived the core experience as a struggle for the 'Apiru, serfs, and mixed multitudes against Canaanite feudalism (1989:29, 33). In his opinion, both Albright's Conquest Model and Alt's Peaceful Infiltration Model suffered from an overdependence on religion as an explanation for Israel's emergence in Canaan (1983:6). In the end, Gottwald tried to distance himself from Mendenhall's proposals, even renaming his theory the Social Revolution Theory (1983:92; Gottwald 1989:26).

Gottwald saw some truth in both the Conquest Model and the Peaceful Infiltration Model; however, they both lacked the social motivation found in his take on the Peasant Revolt Model (1983:5).

6.4.2 Peasant Revolt Model: The Final Verdict

The modifications produced by Gottwald removed some of the serious weaknesses of the theory, so that criticisms which could be levelled at Mendenhall did not apply to his more recent version of the theory (Bimson 1989:9). While Mendenhall's theory offered the best explanation of how the biblical tradition arose, since he is able to point to a group which actually did come out of Egypt, become a covenant community at Sinai and migrate to Canaan, Gottwald tried to discover clues from within the biblical tradition which indicate that Israel's origins were at least in part indigenous—making

use of snippets such as Joshua 6:25 and 9:3–15 (1979:214–216; Bimson 1989:9). Bimson, however, argues that the evidence presented cannot bear the weight which Gottwald places on it (1989:9). In reality all it shows is that once Israel arrived in the land, it assimilated with certain Canaanite groups. This is a long way from saying that Israel was in essence autochthonous (indigenous aboriginal) and originated in a peasant revolt (Bimson 1989:9).

The Peasant Revolt Model is forced into a laborious explanation of the conducive conditions and reorganization, without being able to give sufficient reasons for this development or taking into account archaeological data (Fritz 1987:84). Not only is there no evidence for a retreat from the cities to the hill country, the archaeological evidence is too ambiguous to draw such conclusions (Halpern 1992a:1132–1135).

Finkelstein argues that Mendenhall and Gottwald dealt with the environmental aspect of the country only in theory, virtually ignoring both settlement patterns and material culture. Thus, the model of Israelite settlement constructed by Mendenhall and Gottwald is utterly divorced from the socio-ecological reality of its environment:

> Mendenhall's article could just as easily concern some other geographical—and perhaps even historical—setting, while Gottwald's work never comes 'down to earth,' as it were, and the few examples he adduced are essentially irrelevant to our region (Finkelstein 1988:308).

However, a careful reading of Gottwald's *The Tribes of Yahweh* clearly demonstrates (contrary to Finkelstein's assessment) his continued references to the material culture (archaeological data) as it bears on the validity of the Conquest Model and the Peaceful Infiltration Model (Gottwald 1979:193). Furthermore, Gottwald did not have access to the survey literature of Finkelstein and others, since his work was produced some ten years earlier.

The Peasant Revolt Model Gottwald spoke of in 1979 was yet to be fully developed. In Gottwald's own words:

> Although it has yet to be fully developed as the other two models, it does offer a serious third possibility. Whether it will prove to have the durability of the older models depends upon how it stands up to a more systematic analysis

> than it has yet received. Indeed, it is part of my intention for this study to extend the systematic analysis of the revolt model beyond the present frontiers of biblical scholarship. In this context, I do no more than lay out the model, with supporting and opposing evidence…(1979: 210).

Although Gottwald made serious improvements on Mendenhall's original theory, he also basically disregarded the available archaeological evidence, opting to use only the hackneyed evidence from the large Canaanite tells (Finkelstein 1988:308). However, Finkelstein's criticism of Mendenhall and Gottwald, particularly Gottwald, is anachronistic. Gottwald, in his lengthy discussion of archaeology, does justice to the evidence available at the time—namely the large Canaanite tells (1979:194).

Gottwald employed anthropological literature of his day to demonstrate that 'nomadism', or more particularly 'pastoral nomadism' was not the evolutionary forerunner of agriculture but rather a specialized offshoot of agriculture undertaken to reduce the risk in the event of crop shortage or failure—common to the arid Middle East (Coote and Whitelam 2010:13). He identified the emergence of Israel with the rapid settlement of the hill country at the end of the LBA stressing the relations of power, and the demands and struggles of the peasantry in their fight to throw off the yoke of their Canaanite oppressors (Coote and Whitelam 2010:13).

Clearly Gottwald's decisive arguments against the nomadic factor were widely received as one of the most convincing aspects of his treatise (Coote and Whitelam 2010:12). However, Gottwald's groundbreaking work using anthropological data in regard to agriculture does not negate the fact that there is no evidence to support any such revolt by the indigenous Canaanites. There is no indication of a total disruption in Canaanite city-states, as assumed by some (Dever 2003:113), which would have driven a vast component of the rural, agrarian peasantry to seek refuge in the hill country (Rainey 2007:43). Even Dever's stamp of approval on the Peasant Revolt theory (as the one most in line with the archaeological data) does not override the evidence against such a theory as being the origin of the Israelites from within Canaan (Dever 2003:178). Dever broke with the PRM in that he does not see the flight of the Canaanites as one leaving intolerable conditions or a Yahwistic fervour, but rather a

quest for a new society, a new lifestyle. Put simply, there is no archaeological evidence for a 'peasant revolt' occurring in Canaan (Dever 2003:212).

Coastal Canaanite cities such as Acco, Tel Keisan, Tel Yoqne'am, and Tell Qiri, as well as Megiddo, were continuously occupied from the thirteenth to the eleventh centuries BC (Rainey 2008a:44). However, it should be noted that this criticism, in and of itself, does not necessarily negate the possibility of a revolt or social revolution—since the revolt would have been directed more at the ruling classes and not the buildings and walls of the cities. A revolt of this nature would leave behind little evidence of destruction (Mussell 1993:5–9). According to Halpern, while the movement certainly may have consisted of groups of people who originated from the direction of Haran, as well as peoples east of Jordan—when the textual and archaeological evidence are taken together, they point to an origin for the early Israelites from outside the land of Canaan (1992a:1139). There were not enough Late Bronze settlements in the lowlands to supply a sufficient number of withdrawing people—in fact, many of the Late Bronze sites continued to be inhabited in the Iron I (Finkelstein and Mazar A 2007:75).

In the case of the collared-rim jar and the four-room house, neither is characteristic of the Late Bronze Canaanite centres; however, they are typical of Israelite settlements in the Iron Age in both Cisjordanian and Transjordanian sites (Halpern 1992a:1133). It has also been noted that from an archaeological perspective, the assumption that every ethnic group must have a distinct, archaeologically observable culture is not well founded (Hess 1993:130).

Perhaps the most important criticism levelled against the PRM is that it fails to offer a sufficient explanation for why the Hebrew Bible gives an account at such variance with the reconstruction of the theory (Hawkins 2013:42). Any theory which proposes a picture so different from the biblical one must provide a plausible explanation of how the biblical picture arose (Bimson 1989:6). Mendenhall appears to be on the right track in suggesting that the major symbolic expressions of divine aid, the Exodus and Sinai covenant, emphasized in the biblical accounts, were embraced by all the highlanders (1962:87). Thus Mendenhall's position is that the mainstream of tradition emphasized what all had in common instead of particular acts or experiences of a single group

(1962:87). The problem with this position is that it does not recognize that an element of Canaanite society—withdrawn either peacefully or as result of revolt—could just as easily have been felt by the Canaanites as that one element that brought about Yahweh—if not, why not? Further, why would it not have been included in the biblical account?

Mendenhall's response, in regard to the question concerning experiences, referred back to the official version of Israelite history composed during the Monarchy. He suggests that it would have been '…understandably loath to describe the process by which villagers rejected the sovereignty of the kings who ruled over them' (1962:22). The response, in my assessment, is weak and does not negate the fact that there is no biblical attestation for this model. Mendenhall's thesis is badly stated and inadequately documented, leaving it wide open to criticism (Bimson 1989:9).

The Peasant Revolt Model influenced leading Bible scholars to make more use of the social sciences and focus attention on the Canaanites as the possible source from which the Israelites emerged. One argument proffered is that the PRM helps explain why the material culture of the Iron Age I Israelites is so similar to that of the Canaanites. For example, it has been argued that the break between LBA and Iron I cultures, predicted by both the Conquest and Peaceful Infiltration Models, has not been proved. The continuity between the cultures of the LBA and Iron Age demonstrated that the highland villages must have been populated by people who had left the cities during the degeneration of Canaanite culture (Mussell 1993:222). Again, there is no sound archaeological data to prove this assertion.

The Mendenhall/Gottwald Peasants' Revolt Theory provides many helpful suggestions in the discussion of the Israelite conquest/settlement (Merling 1996:44). For one thing, they clearly reflect the general scholarly consensus about the ancient 'Apiru and tried to incorporate biblical events (especially Mendenhall) into their overall theory (Merling 1996:44).

6.5 Volkmar Fritz: The Symbiosis Hypothesis

Examination of the archaeological data, demonstrates that the occupation of the land of Canaan by the Israelite tribes occurred in a very similar way to the so-called

Peaceful Infiltration Model (Fritz 1987:98). The various groups that settled in the country from the twelfth century onward cannot merely be regarded as nomads—there must have been periods of sedentary life interspersed with the nomadic lifestyle (Fritz 1987:98). If this did not occur, then the wide-ranging adoption of Canaanite culture during the last phase of the Late Bronze Age cannot be explained (Fritz 1987:98). Based on these conclusions, Fritz called his new theory the *Symbiosis Hypothesis* (1987:98).

Fritz represents a middle ground between earlier proposed models with his Symbiosis Hypothesis (1987). In this new theory, Fritz observes that there are both similarities and differences between early Israelite and Canaanite material culture (1987:98). He proposed that the arrival of Israel likely occurred in a way similar to the so-called infiltration hypothesis, but with modifications.

One component that the model needed to accommodate was the tradition of a mobile-type society coming from the desert (Manor 2013:100). Gottwald notes that:

> A perspective shared by virtually all commentators on Israelite origins prior to 1960 was the scheme of early Israel as a pastoral nomadic people who penetrated Canaan from the desert, and who, in the course of settling down on the land, underwent massive transition to an agricultural economy and, more slowly and unevenly, moved through village organization toward urbanization (1979:435).

In Gottwald's mind, these Iron I settlers were semi-nomadic tribes who came from a culture interdependent with Canaanite city-dwellers (Bloch-Smith and Nakhai 1999:68). This early close relationship with the LBA Canaanites was typical of the symbiotic relationships between semi-nomads and urbanites known as an enclosed nomadism (Rowton 1974:22).

Scholarly studies during the 1950s, 60s and 70s, focusing on pastoral nomadism, have shown that the model of Israel as pastoral nomads cannot be defended (Gottwald 1978:2–3). Portraying Israel as emerging out of its primitive nomadic womb in the desert, and reaching its civilized agricultural maturity in Canaan is no longer a viable option (Gottwald 1978:3). It is far more likely that the Israelites were, in effect, living

farms or factories on the hoof that moved into Canaan without symbiotic relationships with sedentary peoples (Krader 1968:458). On the one hand, a certain symbiosis is present in the negotiation with the settled Canaanites concerning grazing and water rights. On the other hand, given the location of the majority of the Iron I settlement patterns, the Israelites were far from the major Canaanite cities, and it is likely that agreements were not necessary. Early Israel had little to do with the cities except to overthrow their rulers and the state apparatus, so that the Israelites could live productively and safely in their rural settlements—archaeology has neglected this germinative early Israelite rural heartland (Gottwald 1979:584–587).

When the biblical narratives are carefully examined in the context of nomadism, it is clear that pastoral nomadism diminishes to the rank of one minor component in ancient Israelite socioeconomics (Gottwald 1978:4). Again, biblical passages referring to agricultural practices and products give considerable support to the notion that the patriarchal communities engaged in diversified and intensive agriculture (Gottwald 1978:4). Certainly Israel brought a major change to Canaan, but the change does not suggest a new population of pastoral nomads (Gottwald 1978:326). Conquest enthusiasts, as well as Immigration Model proponents, were in agreement in positing Israel as an original socioeconomic base of pastoral nomadism and an original or transitional territorial base in the desert steppes to the south and east of Canaan (Gottwald 1978:6).

The major battle between the Conquest Model adherents and the Immigration theorists did not hinge on socioeconomic mode or territorial origins, but was rather over methods and the timing of Israel's entrance into Canaan. Did the pastoral nomads come as military conquerors, or did they infiltrate peacefully and gradually overthrow the Canaanites? The varying answers to these questions affected how the theorists conceived the process of Israelite nomadic acculturation to settled life, but did not alter their basic presupposition: Israelites came as pastoral nomads from the desert steppes (Gottwald 1978:2). The internal dissolution and collapse of the large Canaanite city-states dealt a crushing blow to agriculture, which in turn destroyed the fragile symbiotic balance between the nomadic pastoralists and the sedentary population—setting in motion the forces that led to sedentarization (Finkelstein 1988:342–348).

Fritz pushes the arrival of the ancestors of Israel back to the fourteenth or even the fifteenth century BC, thus allowing for a longer period of contact between Israel's ancestors and Canaanite society of the LBA. This occurred before the semi-nomadic groups eventually became sedentary at the beginning of Iron I. Only then did they become visible archaeologically, since semi-nomads leave few traces of their existence (Bimson 1989:8).

Fritz contends that the symbiosis hypothesis of the occupation of the land of Canaan can be supported by three texts whose historical accuracy withstands critical examination: (1) the Merneptah stele, (2) the Song of Deborah in Judges 5, and (3) the so-called list of unconquered cities in Judges 1 (1987:99).

6.5.1 The Merneptah Stele

In the case of the Merneptah Stele, which dates from the last decade of the thirteenth century BC, Fritz maintains it provides indisputable evidence of Israel defined as a people (1987:99).[100] This early reference, the earliest known outside the Bible, comes from the late thirteenth century BC, occurring in the final stanza of a hymn celebrating the victories of Pharaoh Merneptah, inscribed on what has come to be known as the Israel Stele. The stele dates from the fifth year of Merneptah's reign, namely 1207 BC of the nineteenth dynasty of Egypt. It is this relative dating of this reference to Israel and the earliest Iron I settlements which vitiates Fritz's and Finkelstein's Symbiosis Hypothesis (Bimson 1989:12). It seems clear that Israel originated during the third and fourth quarters of the thirteenth century BC (Coote and Whitelam 2004:116).Coote and Whitelam also suggest that Merneptah's inscription may not refer to any social group directly ancestral to monarchic Israel (2004:118). However, one cannot dispose of such evidence simply because it does not fit a particular theory of the Israelites' origins; instead, the theory must be adapted to fit the evidence (Bimson 1989:14).

Obviously the origin of Israel must be sought before the beginning of Iron I—something Fritz certainly suggests. The traditions of Israel's early history cannot and should not be relegated in cavalier fashion to an exilic or other late date in the way that some do (Bimson 1989:14).

[100] Fritz does note that there is no mention of the whereabouts of these people or their way of life.

6.5.2 The Song of Deborah

According to Fritz, the Song of Deborah recorded in Judges 5 clearly demonstrates that Israelite tribes had already adopted a sedentary way of life with the battle mentioned taking place around 1100 BC (1987:99). The celebration of a victory of two tribes over an undefined alliance of Canaanite cities shows the solidarity of the Israelite tribes, yet does not suggest any form of tribal union at this point (Fritz 1987:99). There was definitely a form of co-existence between the Canaanites and the Israelites, with any attempt to change the balance resulting in military action.

6.5.3 The Unconquered Cities

The so-called unconquered cities of Judges 1:27 likely originated in the time of Solomon. This is consistent with the fact that forced-labour is expressly mentioned in Solomon's time (1 Kgs 9:21–23). At any rate, the list presupposes the conditions existing in the pre-state period. Fritz sees the Israelite cities developing primarily under the rule and reign of Solomon. According to Fritz, this demonstrated co-existence of the 'original' inhabitants and the Israelite tribes can only be explained by the fact that the country was not conquered but occupied by a process of settlement that took place over a longer period of time (1987:99).

6.5.4 Israel Finkelstein: The Symbiosis Hypothesis

Israel Finkelstein's theory concerning the transition from the Late Bronze Age to Iron Age I put more substantial teeth into the Symbiosis Hypothesis with his extensively documented work, which drew heavily on settlement pattern studies (1988). However, unlike Fritz, Finkelstein's symbiotic relationship occurs between indigenous nomads and the sedentary people, whereas Fritz's nomads came from outside the country in a fashion similar to the Infiltration hypothesis.[101]

Fundamental to Finkelstein's interpretation is the belief that the causes that produced the Israelites were not extraordinary. In other words, the supernatural directives did not lead to the arrival of a new external group of people in Canaan.

[101] Finkelstein uses symbiotic in the adjectival sense of two interdependent groups living together to their mutual benefit.

Instead, the Israelites were an evolutionary development of the land and political climate:

> An additional failing of quite a few of the scholars who have dealt with the Iron I period in recent years is their strictly superficial acquaintance with the region. This has affected their research adversely, because the process of Settlement was intimately connected with the nature of the land itself—the landscape, climate, and economic potential (Finkelstein 1988:9–17).

Environmental conditions made the origins of Israel predictable, given the pressures of Late Bronze Age Canaan (Merling 1996:49; Coote 1990:1).

Like the Mendenhall/Gottwald (Peasant Revolt Model), the Symbiosis Hypothesis also does not see the Israelites as ethnically related, but rather circumstantially related (Merling 1996:49). Finkelstein characterizes the Israelites as simply those hill country residents who were living there during Iron Age I and were in the process of changing their lifestyle. He wrote, '…Israelites in Iron I are those people who were in a process of sedentarization in those parts of the country that were part of Saul's monarchy, and in Galilee' (1988:28). He sees them as not only unrelated, but a generation or two earlier they would not have seen themselves as Israelites (1988:28).

Albright (Conquest Model) saw in the new material culture of Iron Age I a shadow of the newly-arrived Israelites, whereas Finkelstein saw those differences as evidence of the Israelites being transformed by their environment (Finkelstein 1988:312–313). For Finkelstein, the Israelites were actually the lost population of MBIIC (Merling 1996:50).

Estimates of the population during the LBI were that the sedentary population was about one-half the size of the MBIIC population. Finkelstein proposes that the number of people did not diminish, they became transhumant and, thus, invisible:

> During the transition from the Middle Bronze to Late Bronze periods, the number of people in the country did not actually shrink in half. Rather, there was a change in the proportion of sedentary dwellers to pastoralist groups, but only the reduced ranks of the former category are reflected in archaeological field work and, consequently, in population estimates (1988:343).

Finkelstein reasons that in the Iron Age I period Israel re-emerged from the MBIIC remnant that had lived as pastoral groups during the Late Bronze Age (Finkelstein 1993:124). Thus, in the Iron Age I period these re-emerging Israelites became sedentary and visible again to the archaeologists.

Finkelstein's argument in favour of their semi-nomadic status prior to the beginning of the Iron Age is much more rigorously developed than Fritz's (Bimson 1989:11). He makes four points in favour of viewing Iron I settlements as evidence of a sedentarization process. First, Iron I villages were established on the central ridge and in the small intermontane valleys—the best areas for grazing and dry farming.[102] This pattern indicated, according to Finkelstein, that the settlers had a pastoral rather than an urban or rural background. Second, the layout of many of the Iron I sites resembles the layout of the duwwar tent encampments of nomadic groups, and is to be seen as a development from them. Third, an extensive use of subterranean storage silos by the Iron I villagers is a characteristic of nomadic societies settling down. And, fourth, the simple four-room pillared houses (broadroom houses) develop from the Bedouin-style tent, indicating the nomadic antecedents of the Iron I settlers (Bimson 1989:11).

Finkelstein's theory is indebted to Alt/Noth in its dependence on transhumant population (Finkelstein 1988:302–306).[103] The significant difference between Noth's nomads and Finkelstein's nomads is that Noth's were desert dwellers who migrated into Canaan, while Finkelstein's were indigenous dwellers in Canaan, who were in symbiotic relationships with the sedentary peoples (1988:45). In 1991, Finkelstein moderated his view to allow the possibility of new-to-the-area settlers in his equation (1991:54).

Finkelstein's in-country nomads are credited with the styles of architecture found in the excavations of the settlements. He notes that the changes taking place in the lives of these in-country nomads, moving from nomadism to sedentarism, dictated the design of their dwellings. The very existence of the Israelites has to do with the

[102] Intermontane is a physiographic adjective describing a wide valley between mountain ranges.

[103] Transhumant (adj.) from transhumance, is a type of pastoralism or nomadism, a seasonal movement of livestock between fixed summer and winter pastures. In montane regions, it implies movement between higher pastures in summer and lower valleys in winter. Herders have a permanent home, typically in valleys.

changes nomads experienced during Iron Age I period (Finkelstein 1988:238; 1991:54).

The creator of the Israelites, according to Finkelstein, was not YHWH who called them from Egypt, as the Bible declares, but rather the pressures exerted on the pastoral peoples of the Canaanite hill country during Iron Age I. However, he does admit that early Israel may have had diverse origins, and concedes that there is probably a historical kernel to the tradition of an exodus from Egypt, but he believes that the vast majority of Iron I settlers were indigenous (Finkelstein 1988:33; Bimson 1989:11).

Finkelstein has suggested that the Transition Theories have become the normative theories, noting that the research on the origins of Israel shows more lines of consensus today than at any time in the past (1991:56). The mainstream view includes five points: (1) a political force named Israel was not known before the late eleventh century BC, (2) those who became Israel originated from different social and economic backgrounds, (3) the process by which Israel gained the land was peaceful, (4) the people were not ethnically related (their relationship came together as their political needs grew), and (5) the Bible tells the story as the late monarchical force understood the story rather than how it really occurred (Finkelstein 1991:56).

6.5.5 The Symbiosis Hypothesis:

As with previous models, the Symbiosis Hypothesis assigns a relatively late date to the formation of an entity called Israel. Accordingly, Israel did not even begin to take shape, whether you refer to the entity as 'invisible' (Fritz and Finkelstein) or as proto-Israel (Dever 1998:44), until a group or groups embarked on the process of settlement in the highlands, as evidenced by archaeology—in other words, there was no Israel before the beginning of the Iron Age I, and perhaps not for some time afterwards (Bimson 1989:11).

Further, like other models discussed earlier, the Symbiosis Hypothesis fails to deal with the question of the theological formation of Israel, the very factor that was probably the catalyst pushing them toward nationhood as indicated by the theophoric name Israel (Bloch-Smith and Nakhai 1999:68, 70). The archaeological models used

provide descriptive but not explanatory frameworks. Bloch-Smith and Nakhai summarize well the position of the Symbiosis Hypothesis:

> While the Symbiosis Model may best describe our current understanding of the physical relationship of the new Israelites to the extant indigenous settlements, it fails to explain how and why early Israel emerged (1999:68, 70).

In fact, the precipitation of settlement in the central highlands cannot be explained by any direct archaeological data, and the Bible does allude to the difficulties inherent in turning the hills into viable farmland—Joshua 17:17–18, (Bloch-Smith and Nakhai 1999:74).

While Fritz's Symbiosis Hypothesis saved the Infiltration theory, with respect to the archaeological evidence and nomadism studies, it does not avoid the problems raised in respect of the biblical traditions (Bimson 1989:8). Finkelstein's elaboration on Fritz's initial hypothesis also faces the same problem. While Finkelstein does use the term Israelite to describe the Iron I settlers, he stresses that in doing so he is simply using it as a '*terminum technicus*' for 'hill country people in a process of settling down' (1988:28). The fact is that Finkelstein does not believe there was any such thing as Israelite identity as early as the sedentarization stage:

> The formation of the Israelite identity was a long, intricate and complex process which, in our opinion, was completed only at the beginning of the monarchy (1988:27).

It is the opinion of this thesis, in agreement with Bimson (1989:11), that this evaluation is unacceptable, even if one shares Finkelstein's disregard for the biblical traditions as a-historical.

6.6 Bunimovitz, Lederman, and Dever: The Auto-Ethnogenesis Model

The study of ethnogenesis is a study of the formation of ethnic groups (Faust 2006:7). 'When did the people known as Israel know they were Israel?' is an often-asked question. In a paper presented at Faulkner University in Montgomery, Alabama in the spring of 2012, and published in 2013, DW Manor coined the term 'Auto-Ethnogenesis' referring to a permutation of the Peasant Revolt Model (Manor 2013:100). Manor's contention is that advocates of this model essentially operate from

the premise that what became Israel was a *self*-generated people definition that emerged from the resident Canaanite society (2013:100). Manor sees two tracks characterizing this model—track one represented by Dever, and track two by Bunimovitz and Lederman.

6.6.1 William Dever: Auto-Ethnogenesis Model—Track One

In regard to the emergence of Israel in Canaan, Dever, one of the most prolific writers on early Israel, long built his case along the lines of the Peasant Revolt Model. Dever argues for Canaanite unrest leading to societal dissatisfaction with Late Bronze Age life under the rule of the Egyptian Amarna period (2003:175–182). In his opinion, Israel emerged from the indigenous population of Canaan, occurring when disaffected Canaanites withdrew to the hill country during and after the transition from the Late Bronze Age to Iron Age I, ultimately coming to see themselves as Israelites (2003:191–210). Dever breaks ranks with the Peasant Revolt Model proponents in that he does not see the flight of the Canaanites as people leaving intolerable conditions, or as a Yahwistic fervour, but rather a quest for a new society, a new lifestyle; they simply wanted to start over, founding a kind of utopia, which was in the end revolutionary (2003:178).

Several examples of other analagous rural revolutionary developments are cited by Dever as cogent for understanding his idea of an early Israelite utopian community. The Oneida Community of the 1800s in New York was founded as a perfectionist society on principles of absolute equality. Another experiment in rural communal living was carried out in the early 1800s at New Harmony in south-western Indiana. Again, in New York the eighteenth-century AD Shaker movement was characterized by a commitment to absolute equality, temperance and simplicity in all things (Dever 2003:189). The Amish have probably been the most successful example of this kind of withdrawal.

Dever proposes that all these movements, and that of early Israel, were based on the principles of land reform and shared agricultural production (2003:188). However, Hawkins correctly notes, that these movements were all founded expressly as religious groups, basing their formation on biblical concepts, not agrarian reform

(2013:47). Contrary to Dever's assertion, the driving force behind the emergence of early Israel was not land reform and agrarian production.

The surveys mentioned early in this thesis make it quite clear that there was a noticeable demographic change which occurred in the central hill country of Canaan during the transition from the Late Bronze Age to the Iron Age I. The change was so dramatic that it cannot be attributed to natural birth rates, but must instead reflect a major influx of new population elements (Hawkins 2013:137). Stager's comments express the case well:

> This extraordinary increase in population in Iron I cannot be explained only by natural population growth of the few Late Bronze Age city-states in the region; there must have been a major influx of people into the highlands in the twelfth and eleventh centuries BCE…That many of these villages belonged to premonarchic Israel…is beyond doubt (1998:134, 135).

The major debate addresses the questions of the origins and ethnic identity of these newcomers. Since the nineteenth century it has been assumed that specific peoples could be linked with the artefacts they used; the forms these artefacts took were understood to be ethnic markers, and used in identifying ancient peoples (Hawkins 2013:137). According to Dever, the continuity between Late Bronze Age and Iron Age I material decisively supports the conclusion that ancient Israel emerged from the indigenous Canaanite population (2003:121).

6.6.2 Shlomo Bunimovitz and Zvi Lederman: Auto-Ethnogenesis Model—Track 2

A second track is suggested by the work at Tel Beth-Shemesh overseen by Shlomo Bunimovitz and Zvi Lederman. The foundation of their premise is that people were forced or compelled to carve out their identity during times when their very existence or identity was threatened by another group (2009:124; Manor 2013:101). Canaan was left to its own destiny for some 200 years, with the end of the Egyptian hegemonic-control in the twelfth century BC. This period allowed ample time for the arriving entities to establish themselves in Canaan and negotiate their identities through a variety of social and cultural processes (Weinstein 1992:142–150). The argument set forth by Bunimovitz and Lederman hinges on the indigenous Canaanites reacting to the arrival

of the Philistines. In essence, they assert that the Canaanites occupying Beth-Shemesh made a conscious decision to identify with (become) Israelites, based on the threat posed by the incoming Philistines (Bunimovitz and Lederman 2011:37). In so doing, they were subscribing to something totally different from the Philistine invaders, thus maintaining their own sense of distinctive ethnicity. The basic premise is a comprehensive explanation for the beginnings of Israel in Canaan (Manor interviewed by researcher, June 2016).

The interaction between the Egyptians and the Philistines resulted in a containment policy and identity demarcation. The Philistines succeeded in carving out a territory for themselves in southern Canaan at the expense of the Egyptians and their Canaanite vassals (Bunimovitz and Lederman 2011a:255). However, the interaction between the Philistines and the Canaanites was more complex and carried significant consequences for both sides (2011a:256).

While the Egyptians and Philistines maintained their separate territories, the Canaanites and the Philistines interacted for hundreds of years—down to the conquest of Philistia by the Babylonians in 604 BC (Bunimovitz and Lederman 2011:256). The interaction between the Philistines and the Canaanites was in the form of either sharing settlements or living next to one another on neighbouring sites (2011:256).

Accordingly, Bunimovitz and Lederman assert that the Canaanites occupying Beth-Shemesh, located in the Sorek Valley at the northern outskirts of Philistia, made a conscious decision to resist being identified with or overcome by the aggressive Philistines. This resistance manifested itself in their subscribing to something totally different from the Philistine invaders in order to maintain a sense of distinctive ethnicity. Thus, they dropped pork consumption from their diet as well as avoiding the use of bichrome Philistine pottery (2011:258).

The process of hybridization, brought about by the close proximity of the Canaanites with the encroaching Philistine culture, contributed to their zealous pursuit of ‘otherness’—or in other words, their attempt to maintain a distinctive ethnicity untarnished by the Philistines. The time frame, number of years, for this otherness culminating in the indigenous Canaanites identifying as Israelites is neither known nor estimated (Manor interviewed by researcher, June 2016).

In a sequence of four successive Iron Age I levels exposed at Beth-Shemesh by the present excavation (1990–present) Canaanite cultural traditions appear to be dominant in architecture, pottery, bronze production and more. In regard to Philistine items such as pottery—they are missing (Bunimovitz and Lederman 2011:258). Furthermore, pork consumption was completely avoided at Beth-Shemesh in contrast to its heavy usage in the cuisine of adjacent Philistine sites (Bunimovitz and Lederman 1997:48–49; Faust 2006:36). Bunimovitz and Lederman argue that this conspicuous distinction between closely neighbouring sites cannot be related to economic and ecological factors but must be interpreted within a cultural perspective (2011a:258). Unlike at other Canaanite sites in closer proximity to the Philistine cultural sphere, the people of Beth-Shemesh took advantage of their location and resisted Philistine hegemony (2011a:258).

Bunimovitz accepts Finkelstein's resedentarized nomads model, based on long-term settlement history, but he nuanced it considerably, particularly the notion of shifting frontiers (Dever 2003:149). Bunimovitz argued that:

> Even though the frontier of the Late Bronze Age expanded into all the regions of Palestine, there were periods of ebb and flow, in accordance with the constant changes in the power of Egyptian government. The withdrawal of the shepherds/nomads (and other non-sedentary elements) from the lowlands in the beginning of the Iron Age I, and their sedentarization in the highlands can also be explained in line with the shifting frontier model (1994:200).

Bunimovitz agreed with the picture of pastoral nomads (and others) settling down in the hill country, but not with Finkelstein's overwhelming and almost exclusive numbers, nor moving from east to west (Dever 2003:149).

The work led by Lederman and Bunimovitz at Tel Beth-Shemesh has debunked the scholarly myth perpetrated by the original work of Duncan Mackenzie from 1911–1912 and Elihu Grant (1929–1931).[104] In those first two cycles of excavations in the early years of the twentieth century, Philistine pottery was considered as marking Philistine dominance of the site; however, the renewed work of Bunimovitz and Lederman

[104] The myth was further sustained by the excavations of Elihu Grant (1929–1931).

(1990–present) has demonstrated that the presuppositions and intuitive assumptions of earlier interpretation and reports cannot stand up to the scrutiny of today's refined archaeological fieldwork and quantitative analyses of the data retrieved—ancient Beth-Shemesh was not dominated by the Philistines (2011:41–42).

Bunimovitz and Lederman clearly make the case for Iron Age I Ain Shems, identified with biblical Beth-Shemesh, being occupied by an indigenous Canaanite population.[105] Likewise, Grant and Wright recognized that there was a prolongation of Canaanite life at Beth-Shemesh from the Late Bronze Age into the Iron Age I (Grant 1931:37). However, because of Mackenzie and Wright's over-estimation of the amount of and importance of the bichrome Philistine pottery found at the site, the idea of Philistine dominance of Beth-Shemesh held sway until the 1990s.[106]

In regard to the Philistine bichrome pottery, since it was thought to carry a symbolic message conveying group identity as Philistines, the Canaanites at Beth-Shemesh avoided using it as a boundary-maintenance strategy, presumably because of the pottery's symbolic load (Bunimovitz and Lederman 2009:124; Gilboa et al. 2006 321–326). This is evident especially when its spatial distribution is quantitatively examined (Gilboa et al. 2006:321–326). The only viable explanation for the decline in Philistine pottery, clearly the finest available Iron Age I tableware in Canaan, beyond the borders of Philistia, is a deliberate avoidance presumably because of the pottery's symbolic load (Gilboa et al. 2006:323).

Wright was so anxious to reconcile the archaeological record from Beth-Shemesh with the relevant biblical passages, he was willing to forego coherency. While advocating that the Iron I settlement at Beth-Shemesh was governed by the Philistines, according to scripture it was an Israelite town—strangely, the town supposedly dominated by Philistines was populated by Israelites (Bunimovitz and Lederman 2011:41).

The introduction of the consumption of pork meat was brought by the Philistines during the period from the mid-twelfth century BC. On the one hand, pork consumption

[105] Ain Shems (Ein Shams) in Arabic means Eye of the Sun or House of the Sun.
[106] Bunimovitz' and Lederman's renewed excavations debunked the idea of Philistine domination at Beth-Shemesh.

in Philistine centres climbed to levels of about 20%, while, on the other hand, analysis of over 12,000 animal bones from Iron Age I Beth-Shemesh shows that pork was entirely avoided at the site (Bunimovitz and Lederman 2011:44). Accordingly, the Canaanite population inhabiting the territories occupied by the Philistines was closely exposed to the idiosyncratic cultural habits of its foreign masters and may have undergone a process of hybridization (Bunimovitz 1990:210–222).[107] Rather than give in to becoming like the Philistines, the Canaanites at Beth-Shemesh resisted by emphasizing their 'otherness', ceasing to eat pork in contrast to the Philistine dietary habits (Bunimovitz and Lederman 2011:46; Faust 2006:35–40). In this way, the Canaanites were emphasizing their 'otherness' by avoiding pork consumption. This 'otherness' led to their becoming Israelites.

In what they term the 'border effect', Bunimovitz and Lederman claim that the Canaanites occupying ancient Beth-Shemesh reacted to the geopolitical and cultural changes that accompanied the Philistine governance of the region—direct dominance within the line and resistance outside the line (or on the border) (2011:45). Philistine impact on the indigenous Canaanites of Beth-Shemesh grew in tandem with the expanding Philistine political dominance. At the end of the Late Bronze Age, the southern coastal plain and the Shephelah were dotted with dozens of Philistine sites—undoubtedly the most densely populated area in the entire country at that time. However, in the Iron Age I the number of sites fell dramatically (Finkelstein 1996:225–242). Since it is hard to believe that the entire Canaanite population of the southern Shephelah was completely annihilated by the Philistines, a reasonable alternative is a purposeful policy of synoecism (Bunimovitz 1998:107–109).[108]

A major problem with the Ethnogenesis theory is the reasonableness of advocating the Canaanites' removal of pork from their diet. It is hard to comprehend why a group of people, living in a period of time when a meagre diet was the norm, would drop such an important source of protein from their daily subsistence. Further, since the

[107] Hybridization, in chemistry, describes the bonding atoms from an atom's point of view or the mixing of atomic orbitals into new hybrid orbitals. It appears that Bunimovitz is using the chemistry term to refer to what he sees as a mixing of two cultures with the Philistine idiosyncratic cultural habits being bonded in the Canaanites that now identify as Israelites.

[108] The joining together of several towns or villages into one community; an urban nucleation (the first step in the formation of a new structure via self-assembly or self organization.

production of pork, raising pigs, is a relatively easy enterprise and certainly a good source of food—to suggest the Canaanites would discontinue eating pork just because their neighbours ate pig does not seem a reasonable explanation.

In regard to the cessation of eating pork at Beth-Shemesh, it certainly represents an apparent abrupt change—stratigraphically at one level pig bones are present, but in the next level they are not (Manor interviewed by researcher, June 2016). The question that cannot be answered with certain accuracy is just what the time lag was between the levels. It was likely not longer than 50 years, but even if it were 20 years, this is a fair amount of time for thinking or allegiance shifts to occur (Manor interviewed by researcher, June 2016).

It is the opinion of this thesis that it is also a stretch to suggest that the origins of the early Israelites can be explained from the excavation of a single site, Beth-Shemesh. In fact, Faust demonstrates that the question of the origin of Israel is secondary to the question of Israelite ethnogenesis:

> Whether the ancestors of the Israelites were slaves in Egypt, semi-nomads in Transjordan or in the central highlands, Canaanite peasants, or a combination of some or all of the above is of lesser importance to the question of Israelite ethnogenesis—the moment the Israelites began to see themselves as distinct (2006:28).

Again, the origin of ancient Israel seems much more complicated than just an attempt to avoid being identified with the Philistines. Bunimovitz and Lederman, to my knowledge, do not offer any further evidence that this process was repeated throughout the land of Canaan.

Another point, not addressed by Bunimovitz and Lederman, as far as I know, is the ideological shift from Canaanite worship (religion) to the monotheistic worship of Yahweh. Again, is it reasonable to postulate that the oncoming Philistines facilitated the shift from one religion to another, almost in its entirety? Where did the religion of Yahweh come from, and what explanation is there for the shift? It is generally a slow process shifting from one ideological stance to another (Manor interviewed by researcher, June 2016). The importance of Yahwism has often been underestimated

or dismissed in favour of materialistic explanations for the origins of Israel's tribal unity (Herion 1986:22). In regard to Bunimovitz' and Lederman's approach, as well as others, Frick hits the nail on the head:

> Positivism and reductionism have generally seen religion as dependent upon social processes rather than causing them, and religion has generally been seen as but one aspect of the culture of early Israel, 'the expression of a particular cultural identity rather than its sole foundation' (Frick 1979:234; Hawkins 2013:200).

However, ethnographic studies suggest that religion tends to play a much more central role in domestic-scale cultures (Hawkins 2013:200).

6.6.3 The Auto-Ethnogenesis Model: The Final Verdict

The people of Beth-Shemesh in the Iron Age I were not Philistines but Canaanites, descendants of the indigenous Canaanite population inhabiting the site during the Middle and Late Bronze Ages (Bunimovitz and Lederman 2011:47). During the period of resistance, brought on by the coming of the Philistines, Canaanites living at the periphery (border towns such as Beth-Shemesh) of Philistine territory showed remarkable persistence and resistance. This eventually led to changes in their previous way of life and identity, eventually leading to their becoming somewhat different from 'normative' Canaanites (Bunimovitz and Lederman 2011:48).

6.7 TL Thompson: The Conquest by Imagination Theory—Minimalists

TL Thompson, a leading proponent of the Conquest by Imagination Theory, contends that it is difficult to critique this theory due to the fact that proponents use a specialized, pliable vocabulary. This, according to Thompson, means that one cannot read any one supporter of this theory to understand its intent or use past works as a guide for more recent explanations (1995:695). Postmodern scepticism is in full bloom as one reads the ideas set forth by Thompson.

Thompson's conclusion, from the paragraph above, should lead one to conclude that the minimalists' theory is not worthy of being discussed in the same light as the

top five theories for Israel's emergence in Canaan already discussed.[109] However, it needs to be noted. Thompson epitomizes the view of what is known as the minimalist school. The scepticism in this school of thought has led to a crisis in historiography. Thompson, and others, have moved progressively toward a loss of confidence in the historical value of the biblical narrative, as well as most modern histories of Israel (Thompson 1992:9).

Uncomfortable with archaeology, Thompson sees it as tainted by chronologies that are totally inadequate (1997:12). William Dever reviewed Thompson's 1994 book, pointing out that the 'denigration or outright rejection of archaeology as a source of history writing leaves most biblical scholars as historians with no historical facts' (1995:63). Thompson's position leaves him no choice but to pick and choose in archaeology what is supportive of his theory, while rejecting that which does not confirm his conclusions. One clear example is the manner in which he approaches the Merneptah Stele. In essence, Thompson made it the responsibility of other 'historians' to figure out why his theory and Merneptah's Stele do not mesh (Thompson 1997:12).

6.7.1 The Conquest by Imagination Theory: The Final Verdict

The conclusion reached by the Minimalist School is basically that no history whatsoever is to be found in the Bible. Therefore, the beginning of Palestinian history is to be found in the neo-Assyrian period. The Israelites were thus born from a painful experience of the indigenous Canaanite peoples as a literary creation in the process of putting together their history. I concur with Thompson in regard to understanding the Conquest by Imagination Theory—it is difficult.

6.8 Summary of Chapter Six: Models for Israel's Arrival in Canaan

In chapter six, models/hypotheses/theories which have been set forth over the past ninety-plus years have been discussed, noting positive contributions to the question of the origin of ancient Israel in Canaan, as well as the negatives. Each of the models

[109] The labels minimalist and maximalist were coined in the debate about the historical reliability of the Bible. The name itself indicates the position a minimalist takes in regard to the Bible. Most minimalists believe the Bible has no historically reliable information.

cited has been examined in light of the archaeological data and the biblical texts associated with each one.

Each model's strengths and weaknesses were highlighted exploring their relationship to the archaeological data and the written sources, specifically the Hebrew Scriptures. An attempt was made to flesh out and evaluate each model as to the role, if any; it may have played in the origin of ancient Israel in Canaan. As noted, there were positive and negatives associated with all five of the major models considered. A sixth model, Conquest by Imagination, which is basically the minimalists' position that no history of Israel can be discovered, was not given any consideration since it has no role in determining the origin of ancient Israel in Canaan.

As this thesis moves toward its culmination, the first six chapters (chapter six playing a pivotal role) will be called upon to define and set forth the major premise that has loomed on the horizon since the beginning of this thesis. This pivotal chapter will play an important role in establishing the end product of this thesis, namely a new perspective, a new offering, a new model.

CHAPTER SEVEN

THE SETTLEMENT OF ISRAEL IN CANAAN: A NEW PERSPECTIVE

7.1 Introduction

As noted several times over the course of this thesis, ethnography[110] (primarily the texts of the Bible) and empirical data[111] (primarily archaeological material finds) have been on a collision course since Albright first introduced the Conquest Model as the definitive manner in which Israel settled in and took from the Canaanites the land promised by God to Abraham. Other models followed, some more favourable to the biblical text playing a role in their enquiry, some less favourable and others denying any role at all for the Bible.

Following an introduction and outline of the proposed thesis at hand in chapter one, chapter two presented an overview of the scholars who have proposed theories (models) for the emergence of Israel in Canaan. Each model/theory was reviewed, with very little space given to the content of each of the six models proposed.[112] In chapter six, the models mentioned in chapter two were reviewed, noting the major tenets of each theory's approach to how Israel emerged in Canaan. In the current chapter, chapter seven, a more detailed presentation of the models follows—especially noting weaknesses, reasons for rejection and the models' contribution, if any, to the question of how Israel emerged in Canaan. This information is very important to the overall conclusion of the thesis.

Within the framework of the discussion of the models, a more succinct view of the importance of the regional surveys (chapter five) and the excavation of the Canaanite

[110] Ethnography is the systematic recording of human cultures; a descriptive work produced from such research. This thesis holds a higher view of the biblical text than this definition presents—it is the inspired Word from God given through human instruments.

[111] Empirical evidence is information acquired by observation or experimentation; scientists record and analyse the data; this process is a central part of the scientific method. One should be reminded that archaeology, while using more and more technological gadgets, etc., is still not a pure science.

[112] Only five of the six models are given serious consideration since, as noted, the minimalist point of view does not merit any consideration at all.

mounds (chapter four) will be set forth. The source documents (chapter three), relevant biblical texts, will also be examined in light of their convergence or possible 'tightness of fit' with the empirical evidence .[113]

Interspersed at relevant points in this chapter will be discussions germane to the issue of the origin of ancient Israel, such as pottery patterns, ethnic markers,[114] and the noted continuity of the Late Bronze material culture on into Iron Age I. This material will be reviewed with an eye toward the significance of their roles, if any, in determining the manner in which Israel took or settled in Canaan.

In the end, this thesis will show that the preponderance of evidence is in favour of there being a significant 'tightness of fit' or convergence in so many scenarios, that the thesis' final conclusion will be substantially supported and play a role in future enquiries regarding the manner in which ancient Israel emerged in Canaan.

7.2 The Conquest Model

Albright was acutely aware of the difficulty associated with the task of determining the origin of Israel, as reflected in his article in BASOR, 'Archaeology and the Date of the Hebrew Conquest of Palestine' (1935:10). While recognizing some difficulties with the Conquest Model he proposed, Albright continued to defend it from the 1920s until his death in 1971 (Dever 2003:45). However, with the onslaught of new archaeological data the question of Israelite origins grew more and more intractable.

The Conquest Model is considered the earliest because, in its non-scholarly form, it is simply the assumption that the Bible correctly records ancient history and is thus close to what many people have traditionally believed about the Bible (McDermott 1998:37).[115] Albright's Conquest Model was a combination of war stories from Joshua and archaeological evidence from large Canaanite excavation sites. Albright's approach to interpretation is clear in this statement:

---

[113] 'tightness of fit' is a term used by one philosopher in regard to the close proximity of elements such as when ethnography (biblical texts) and empirical data (archaeological data) coincide.

[114] So-called ethnic markers; there are those who argue that certain types of pottery, house designs, cisterns, etc., are proof of Israelite presence. This is not accepted by all archaeologists.

[115] It should be noted that scholars who supported the Conquest Model did not take every detail of the biblical story as literally true (McDermott 1998:37).

> The ultimate historicity of a given datum is never conclusively established nor disproved by the literary framework in which it is embedded: there must always be external evidence (1939:12).

Albright's model attempted to blend the Bible and archaeology, using archaeology as the 'external source' in interpreting the biblical stories (Merling 1996:30). The Conquest Model rested on the assumption that the stories in the Pentateuch and Joshua are based on an underlying history–the Israelites came out of the desert and invaded Canaan from the east. It is clear that Albright viewed the archaeological data as superior to the biblical texts in regard to interpretation—a view that would not be supported by many conservative Christians (Merling 1996:32). Albright stood ready to amend his viewpoint on the general accuracy of the Bible, if external evidence demanded it (Albright 1939:30).[116]

The Conquest Model championed by Albright, Yadin, Wright, and Bright, to name four, enjoyed some support on into the 1980s and even into the mid–1990s. Alternative models began to surface in the 1950s, and by the 1970s most archaeologists viewed Albright's Conquest Model as deeply flawed and not an adequate description of the origin of Israel in Canaan (Hawkins 2013:32; Miller 1977a:213–214). The archaeological evidence produced by way of better techniques and expanded knowledge, especially from the regional surveys, made it more and more difficult to accept the earlier conclusions advocated by Albright, Yadin, Wright and others.

Even Albright, himself, a few years prior to his death, recognized the need for revision of the Conquest Model, since the emerging archaeological picture was difficult to mesh with the biblical account. In his own words Albright noted, 'at present we cannot propose any safe reconstruction of the actual course of events during the period of the Israelite settlement in Palestine' (Albright 1965:95). One of Albright's well-known students, John Bright, agreed with Albright's conclusion (Bright 2000:129).

In addition to Bright, G Ernest Wright, who earned his PhD under Albright's supervision, and is probably the best spokesman for the Conquest Model wrote this concerning the Conquest:

[116] Of course, the external evidence he refers to is the archaeological data.

> It has now become necessary, however, to modify the common scholarly view. For one thing, a closer reading of the Deuteronomic historian's work in Joshua makes it quite clear that while he claims spectacular success in overrunning the country for Joshua, he is quite aware of much left to be done (cf. 11:13, 22) (1962:69).

It should be noted that tempering or adjusting the Conquest Model did not mean redefining what conquest meant—it remained just that, a belief that Israel acquired the land of Canaan by means of war. Yadin said that 'in its broad outline the archaeological record supports the narrative in Joshua and Judges as Albright said' (1982:18).

In the early 1970s and foward, the archaeological surface-survey engendered a new dynamic in the overall enquiry. Along with the new survey work, new excavation techniques were applied at renewed excavations of some Canaanite sites. The surveys and new techniques and improvements in excavation methods brought about a significant tension between the biblical text and archaeological data. The result was that more and more archaeologists were inclined to jettison the importance of the biblical role in seeking to understand how ancient Israel settled in (took) the land of Canaan: again, with some archaeologists concluding that the Bible is irrelevant to any enquiry concerning Israel's settling in Canaan.

Shanks, in an interview with Yadin in 1983, pointed out that readers of the publication he edited at that time (*Biblical Archaeological Review*) often referred to how uncertain archaeological evidence really is, how often archaeologists argue from silence, from the absence of evidence, and sometimes there are explanations other than that the Bible which are wrong (1983:16). Yadin responded to Shanks' comments with a definition of archaeology, (not his originally), '… archaeology is the science that examines the mind of man to the extent it is reflected in material or has been expressed in material' (1983:16).

7.2.1 Conquest Model: The Book of Joshua

As noted in chapter three, the book of Joshua has a unique significance that sets it apart from other books of the Bible, because of its content and location directly after the Pentateuch (Goslinga 1986:44). In a certain sense, Joshua forms a transition between the five books of Moses and the other books of the Old Covenant. In Joshua,

one observes that the entire conquest of Canaan and all that it involved corresponds with the arrangements already set forth by Moses at God's command (Josh 8:31; 11:15; 13:8, 15, 32–33; 20:12; Deut 31:3–8).

The Conquest Model, the biblical model, was the intended plan of God given to Joshua for execution using military force and God's divine assistance. The nation of Israel is portrayed in Joshua at a high point but simultaneously at a crossroads in its life—there is a glad report that Israel continued to serve God faithfully, even after the death of Joshua (Josh 24:31), but, it also does not hide the fact that the people's hearts basically remained the same (Josh 7:1–26; 18:3).

In Joshua and Judges, it is obvious that the remnant of Canaanites still in the land were a snare to Israel (Josh 23:13), and Israel would not be able to maintain herself on the pinnacle where the Lord had placed her (Josh 23:15–16; 24:19–20) (Goslinga 1986:6). Joshua makes it clear that the whole land of Canaan (the Promised Land) was not realized until the time of David, as noted in 1 Kings 4:21 (Hess 1996:88).

The book of Joshua is an historical book with an extremely important theological component—a line of reasoning given to demonstrate God's faithfulness to his promises made to Israel's forefathers (Josh 21:43–45). In Joshua, one reads of God's faithfulness to his promise in spite of the continued failure of the Israelite nation to carry out his commands to destroy the wicked inhabitants (Goslinga 1986:45).

The Conquest Model, the biblical model, was the impetus of the beginning of Israel's move toward possession of the land of Canaan. Joshua describes a single entrance by Israel from the east into Canaan with the data from both Transjordan and Canaan itself favouring a thirteenth-century entrance (Hess 1996:153). Upon entering the land of Canaan they engaged the city of Jericho where God gave them a great victory—likely intended to demonstrate to the other Canaanite cities (which it did) the power of Israel's God; and further to demonstrate to the people that God was with them and with their leader Joshua. However, even with this great divine demonstration, Israel failed to carry out the full punishment of the Canaanite people intended by God, and were unable to take the land—instead, they lived among the heathen Canaanites, constantly threatened and influenced towards evil.

7.2.2 Conquest Model/Canaanite Mounds: Jericho

Albright's work rested on archaeological data recovered from several large Canaanite cities showing evidence of destruction at the end of the Late Bronze Age. One such site was Jericho. Kathleen Kenyon's renewed excavation at Jericho began in 1952 and continued until 1958. As noted earlier, she corrected some erroneous conclusions suggested by J Garstang, and then added her own interpretation to the archaeological data surfaced by her team.

One of Kenyon's significant conclusions, germane to the origin of the Israel question, concerns the non-occupation of the site in the Late Bronze Age. During excavations at Jericho very little Late Bronze pottery was found, and according to Kenyon, there was no strongly-fortified city at Jericho in the Late Bronze Age for Joshua to conquer (Wood 1990:49; Kenyon 1957:262). Dever concluded that Kenyon's findings were a crushing blow to the Conquest Model (Dever 2003:45).

Even though Kenyon concluded there was no city for Joshua to have conquered, Albright pronounced that his Conquest Model still had merit, explaining that the evidence of the Late Bronze Age habitation had likely eroded away (McDermott 1998:37–38). Albright further noted that the results of excavations can be ambiguous and sometimes in apparent contradiction to the biblical tradition (Albright 1963:27). Furthermore, Albright astutely observed:

> It does no justice, either to the biblical text or to the archaeological data, to allow evidence not uncovered, which was not recovered from the excavation of a small percentage of a tell's area, to 'establish' or 'disprove' a biblical event (1939:13).

Manor notes that Kenyon concedes that apparently there was some kind of occupation at the site 'in the second half of the Late Bronze Age, but nothing more than that' (2013:95; Kenyon 1981:371). Manor correctly observes that it would be fairer to point out that no evidence of occupation has been located at Jericho rather than to argue definitively that it was not occupied at the time (2013:95).

Yadin suggested that there is enough evidence, even in Kenyon's excavations, and also in the earlier excavations of Garstang—to show that at Jericho there is no

necessary contradiction to the Bible (Shanks 1983:17). Whereas Kenyon found no evidence of a strongly-fortified city at Jericho in the Late Bronze Age (Wood 1990:49), Yadin points out that in many cases the Late Bronze Age period people did not actually build new fortifications but, rather, reused Middle Bronze fortifications, strengthening them where necessary—interpreters often overlook this fact, and it may have an important bearing on the case of Jericho (Yadin 1982:22).

While there are certainly reasons to reject the Conquest Model proposed by Albright as the one definitive answer to the origin of Israel in Canaan—there remains an abundance of scenarios where the biblical text and archaeological evidence, if not in strict alignment, at least do not negate the fact that Israel engaged in a fair amount of warfare as they entered Canaan. As alluded to earlier in the thesis, an understanding of the biblical writer's theological intent in Joshua demonstrates clearly that there was not a lightning-fast blitzkrieg in which the Israelites raced across the land destroying all the Canaanite cities and their inhabitants. It was God's plan that Joshua lead Israel in a military conquest of the land of Canaan destroying the wicked inhabitants while serving as God's instrument of punishment on a sinful people.[117]

God's commandment to take the land of Canaan and destroy its inhabitants was not carried out by the nation of Israel–thus their disobedience led to years of problems living near and among the heathen nations in constant conflict.[118] However, there was definitely a military component to the eventual conquest of Canaan by Israel. No one denies that there were Late Bronze Age/Iron Age I destructions, and many of them—the question is what evidence is there that these destructions were the results of an Israelite invasion (Merling 1996:42). Coote and Whitelam suggest that the archaeological evidence used by Albright and his followers is mute and ambiguous at best with no clear indication of the agents of destruction (2004:118). Miller claims that the cities which present archaeological evidence of having been destroyed at the end of the Late Bronze Age are, for the most part, not the ones which figure prominently in

[117] God had allowed more than sufficient time for the Canaanites to change their ways (repent of their wickedness and turn to God). Joshua 11:12 demonstrates the role Israel played as God's instrument of punishment in fulfilling the command given by God's servant, Moses; also see Genesis 15:1–16.

[118] The book of Joshua has the theological component whereby God emphasizes keeping the promise made to Abraham by giving the land of Canaan to Israel; Judges portrays the problems and conflicts between Israel and her Canaanite neighbours because of her refusal to follow God's command.

the biblical conquest traditions—these Late Bronze Age destructions may have been due to localized causes (1977a:256). Fritz notes that the only case in which one can be reasonably sure of the conqueror is Gezer, where, in all probability, Stratum XIV was destroyed by the Egyptian pharaoh (1987:89).

It seems that Fritz has also made a good argument for allowing the possibility that the destructions could have been perpetrated by Israelite military action. One should keep in mind that Israel's failure to carry out the directives of God does not negate the evidence, both archaeologically and biblically, that they did fight for the land. Since there is no evidence that Israel did not destroy the cities in question, and no one can conclusively prove that someone other than the Israelites did—destruction by the Israelites remains a viable possibility. In terms of archaeological evidence presented against the Israelites conquering certain cities, it should be noted that archaeological evidence at best can be quite ambiguous (Boling 1982:76).

If one is so inclined to count, then it is apparent that the word 'ambiguous' has often been associated with archaeological evidence. This is another reason this thesis cautions against absolute statements when the evidence is ambiguous or even silent on the matter of an Israelite conquest. One should also caution against arguments from silence—the reality is, finding nothing is not negative evidence but non-evidence:

> Absence of evidence is not, and should not be confused with, evidence of absence. The same criticism is to be levelled at the abuse of this concept in archaeology: the syndrome: 'we did not find it, so it never existed!' instead of the more proper formulation: 'evidence is currently lacking; we may have missed it or it may have left no trace'; particularly when 5 percent or less of a mound is dug, leaving 95 percent or more untouched, unknown, and so, not in evidence (Kitchen 1990:48).

7.2.3 Conquest Model/Canaanite Mounds: Ai

As noted earlier, according to the biblical text Ai was the second city the Israelites attacked after entering Canaan. The first attack was a failure with some thirty-plus Israelite soldiers killed in the encounter (Josh 7:5). Like Jericho, Ai presents a problem for Conquest theory advocates in that, ostensibly, no Late Bronze Age material has

been found to corroborate the existence of Ai at the time Joshua and the Israelites supposedly attacked the city.

Both Marquet-Krause in the 1930s and Callaway in the 1960s concluded there was no city at Ai for Joshua to have attacked. Faced with this evidence, Albright suggested that the biblical description referred to a conquest of nearby Bethel rather than Ai, while others argued that the biblical description of Ai was purely etiological—a late biblical author's attempt to glorify Israelite history (Yadin 1982:23). Callaway considered Albright's explanation unconvincing, and the idea of the story being a late fictional addition to enhance Israelite history equally unacceptable. Instead, Callaway proposed that the Ai incident occurred in the Iron Age when there were two cities at Ai—one a Hivite city which Israel conquered.

As in the case of Jericho, there is no concrete evidence that anyone other than the Israelites conquered the city. In fact, there is a question as to the veracity of the site in question actually being ancient Ai. The site has been traditionally identified with the site of Khirbet et-Tell near Bethel. The names of both towns (Bethel and Ai) purportedly mean the same thing—'ruin'—Ai is from Hebrew and et-Tell from Arabic, thus the rationale for the identification (Manor 2013:95). Callaway noted that excavations at et-Tell yielded no remains at all from *c.*2400 BC to *c.*1220 BC, and that the latter date is not a level of conquest but of resettlement (Callaway 1993:44–45.

Studies of biblical data relative to the topographic and geographic descriptions of biblical Ai, along with some early pilgrim itineraries and distances, imply that perhaps biblical Ai should be identified with a location other than et-Tell (Bimson and Livingston 1987:46, 51). Dever, while affirming that most of the sites listed in Joshua 12 show no signs of destruction associated with the time of Israel's emergence, concedes that the identities of a number of sites remain elusive (1992b:547–548). Dever's statement needs to be more carefully nuanced (Manor 2013:96) keeping in mind that according to Scripture (Joshua and Judges) only five sites suffered physical destruction at the hands of Israel: Jericho (Josh 6), Ai (Josh 7–8), Hazor (Josh 11:11–13), Jerusalem (Judg 1:8), and Laish (Judg 18:27–29). That these five sites are specifically mentioned in the Bible as suffering physical destruction does not preclude physical destruction at other sites, but the text does not identify them (Manor 2013:96). However, it should be

remembered that the Bible describes a displacement of the population, not a wholesale destruction of the cities (Josh 24:13).

As was the case with Jericho, a thorough investigation of the biblical and archaeological data does not necessarily confirm no existence of a Late Bronze Age city conquered and destroyed by Israel. It should be cautiously pointed out that much of the site identified as Ai remains unexcavated (Manor 2013:95).

7.2.4 Conquest Model/Canaanite Mounds: Hazor

The initial Israelite conquest of Canaan under Joshua included three cities that were destroyed and put to the torch—Hazor (Josh 11:10–11) was the third city after Jericho (Josh 6:21–24) and Ai (Josh 8:18–19). Yadin excavated Hazor from 1955–1958 and 1968–69, documenting the great conflagration that accompanied the total destruction of the final Late-Bronze Age city, which he believed to have occurred most likely around 1233 BC (1972:108).[119] The lower city, the smaller-scale domestic and cultic buildings were not similarly burned or violently destroyed, though the campaign did include the decapitation of basalt statues of gods and kings, and probably also the smashing of ritual vessels found in the temples (Ben-Tor 1998:465) This desecratory destruction is normally attributed to the Israelites, as argued by both Yadin and Ben-Tor (Yadin 1993:603) and Amon Ben-Tor and Maria Rubiato (1999:39). Kitchen agrees with the assessment by Yadin and Ben-Tor declaring 'that neither the Egyptians, Canaanites nor Sea Peoples destroyed LB Hazor—the early Hebrews remain a feasible option' (2003:185). Yadin went so far as to claim that the destruction in the Late Bronze Age city is doubtless to be ascribed to the Israelite tribes, as related in the book of Joshua (1993:603).

It was only natural that Joshua and the Israelite army would set their sights on Hazor. Hazor enjoyed an exalted status in Canaan from the middle of the fourteenth century BC through the second third of the thirteenth century BC, a period of over one hundred

[119] Evidence of the destruction consisted of layers of ashes, burnt wooden beams, cracked basalt slabs, mutilated basalt structures, and fallen walls. Renewed excavations under current excavator Ben-Tor corroborated the existence of a fierce conflagration that was also mostly limited to public buildings. This included monumental cultic edifices and the administrative palatial buildings, all of which served as the foci of religious and civil power and wealth at the height of Canaanite Hazor in the thirteenth century BC (Zuckerman 2007:24).

years. Thus, Hazor represented the most imposing national threat to the Israelites in the Promised Land (Petrovich 2008:4). Hazor's might throughout the Canaanite era is confirmed by the epigraphical evidence from the Amarna Letters, in which Hazor's king is the only Canaanite ruler referred to as a king in letters to the Egyptian pharaoh (Moran 1992:235, 289).

The biblical text, Joshua 11:11, clearly notes that Joshua burned the city of Hazor with fire. This thesis concludes that there is ample reason to believe, or at least allow for the possibility, that it was the nation of Israel under the leadership of Joshua which burned the Late Bronze Age city, and with religious fervour attempted to eliminate any thought of worshipping Canaanite gods or Canaanite kings. Since there is no iron-clad evidence, either epigraphy or archaeological data, to show someone other than the Israelites was responsible for the destruction--it seems appropriate to allow for this opinion.[120]

7.2.5 Conquest Model/Canaanite Mounds: Lachish

As noted in chapter four, Lachish was an important city, second only to Jerusalem, located twenty-five miles southwest of Jerusalem in the region of Judah known as the Shephelah (King 2005:36). Hearing of the defeat of Ai by the Israelites and their making peace with nearby Gibeon, Adoni-zedek, king of Jerusalem, called for an alliance of city-state kings to come with him to lay siege to Gibeon—Japhia, king of Lachish, responded to his call and went up to join forces with the alliance (Josh 10:1–5).[121] The people of Gibeon asked for help from Joshua and the Israelites, encamped at Gilgal (some nineteen miles northeast of Gibeon), and Joshua marched his army all night to engage the Amorite consortium (Josh 10:6–43).[122] So, as one reads the

[120] Most archaeologists who accept the historicity of the biblical account link the massive conflagration of the final Late-Bronze-Age city of Hazor to the fiery destruction accomplished under Joshua.

[121] Five kings of the Amorites, the king of Jerusalem, the king of Hebron, the king of Jarmuth, the king of Lachish and the king of Eglon came together and encamped against Gibeon

[122] Amorites and Canaanites—the term Amorite and Canaanite seem to be used interchangeably, Canaan being more general and Amorite a specific component among the Canaanites who inhabited the land .

account in Joshua 10, the five kings are eventually captured in a cave and executed by Joshua after a symbolic show of the power of God's force, and eventually the cities involved in the siege against Gibeon were destroyed—among them Lachish.[123]

As noted earlier, Lachish reached its zenith toward the end of the Late Bronze Age; it may have been the largest city in Canaan after the fall of Hazor in the thirteenth century BC (Ussishkin 1993:899). Lachish's Level VI archaeological evidence suggests that Egypt was firmly in control of Lachish, giving it needed protection. Traces of destruction were discovered at every point at which remains from Level VI were uncovered—the site was abandoned for two centuries, only to be resettled by the Israelites in the tenth to ninth centuries BC (Ussishkin 1987:35).[124]

The evidence of the devastation of Level VI points to a strong and resolute enemy, but the archaeological data does not provide any clue as to the nature and identity of that enemy or to the immediate circumstances surrounding the city's downfall (Ussishkin 2004:71). Three possible candidates have been proposed as the military force responsible for the fall of Lachish: 1) the Egyptian army, 2) the Israelite tribes and 3) the invading Sea Peoples.

The suggestion made that Lachish was destroyed as the result of a punitive raid by the Egyptian army is unlikely. The data, especially the hieratic inscriptions, indicate some degree of Egyptian administration and alliance with Egypt rather than a state of enmity. Further, no evidence is extant which would suggest punitive Egyptian raids on Canaan after the reign of Ramesses III (Ussishkin 1987:36).

Support for the destruction of Lachish by the Sea Peoples (Philistines) is an attractive idea, as Finkelstein notes, because of the founding of the large Philistine centres at nearby Gath and Ekron, the diffusion of Philistine pottery in the region and the complete change in settlement patterns (Finkelstein 1996:225–242). Ussishkin, not

[123] Libnah, not one of the original Amorite kings, was also destroyed by Joshua—during a mopping-up campaign (the southern campaign) any Canaanite city was fair game. Even the people of Gezer tasted the sword of Israel when King Horam came to assist Lachish (Josh 10:33).

[124] The Israelite city is contained within Level V and little is known about Lachish at this time, except that it was not fortified (Ussishkin 2004:59).

only categorizes the evidence as ambiguous—prior to noting the probability of the Sea Peoples destroying Level VI at Lachish—he does so in spite of any direct evidence:

> Thus, **despite the absence of direct evidence**, it seems probable that Lachish Level VI was destroyed and its population liquidated and/or exiled by the Sea Peoples who immigrated to and settled in the Coastal Plain (2004:72).

Once again, one notes the rejection of the possibility of the Israelites destroying Lachish Level VI, even though the biblical data and the archaeological time-frame seem to coincide well, and rather accepting as probable the Sea Peoples as the invading force without any direct evidence.

The rejection of or non-consideration of Israel as the destroyers of Lachish Level VI rests upon the question of the historicity of the biblical account found in Joshua 10:31–32: 'Joshua passed from Libnah, and all Israel with him, unto Lachish, and encamped against it, and fought against it. And the Lord delivered Lachish into the hand of Israel, which took it on the second day, and smote it with the edge of the sword, and all the souls that were therein'. Ussishkin notes that:

> This description indeed fits the archaeological data: a central Canaanite city conquered and destroyed: the conquest of the city on the second day of the attack, which hints at the absence of fortifications; and the annihilation of the populace. The adoption or rejection of this possibility depends first and foremost on whether or not Josh. 10:31-32 is accepted as a reliable historical source and on the interpretation of the character and date of the Israelite settlement, complex historical questions which are beyond the scope of the present report (2004:71).

This thesis would be more inclined to give some credence to Ussishkin's probability position for the Sea Peoples as the destroyers of Lachish, if it were based even on some ambiguous evidence—rather than being based on **no direct evidence** at all. As in 2004, in an earlier (1987) article in *Biblical Archaeology Review*, Ussishkin noted that '… the conquest of Lachish stands out as a unique event in the Biblical story of the Israelite conquest of Canaan and the archaeological data fit the Biblical text in every detail' (1987:38).

As was the case with Jericho, Ai and Hazor, once again the evidence does not negate Israel as the military force destroying Lachish Level VI. To argue that this would mean that because there was a period of time between the destruction of Hazor and Lachish it eliminates Israel, is not valid, if one holds, as does the writer of this thesis, that Israel did not conquer Canaan in a non-stop, blitzkrieg fashion.[125]

7.2.6 Conquest Model/Canaanite Mounds: Leshem/Laish (Josh 19:47 Judg 18:29), Dan (Josh 19:47)

In Joshua 19, the seventh lot drawn in the allotment-of-the-land process went to the tribe of Dan. The territory given to the clans of Dan included Zorah, Eshtaol, Ir-Shemesh (Beth-Shemesh), Shaalabbin, Aijalon, Ithlah, Elon, Timnah, Ekron, Eltekeh, Gibbethon, Baalath, Jehud, Beneberak, Gath-rimmon, and Me-jarkon and Rakkon with the territory across from Joppa (Josh 19:40–47). Without relating any of the details, Joshua 19:47 simply notes that the territory of the people of Dan was lost to them,[126] and they went up and fought against Leshem (Laish). After defeating the people of Leshem (Laish) they settled there and built their city, renaming it Dan after the name of their ancestor.

There was no king in Israel at the time the people of Dan were seeking an inheritance (Judg 18:1). Butler notes that Judges presents the power of the Amorites as pressing back Dan, thus punishing Dan (2014a:187). However, the emphasis (18:1) is on the subsequent victory of Dan, given within a setting that simply notes their territory 'had fallen away from them'. Joshua presents, it could be termed, seven lazy tribes who lack the courage or will to go against the Canaanites. This is in stark contrast to the most powerful tribes, whose representatives demand more territory (Josh 17:17–18). Joshua recognized the grit and determination and manpower of Ephraim and Manasseh, advising them to go forward with their need for more territory.

The tribe of Dan took the city of Laish, occupied by a people described as quiet and unsuspecting, struck them with the edge of the sword and burned the city with fire

[125] Ussishkin offers this reasoning concerning the destruction of Hazor and the later destruction of Lachish (2004:72).

[126] Judges 18:1 seems to indicate that Dan was unable to secure the allotment given to them and thus they looked elsewhere for a place to settle finding a place with no connection to others and far from Sidon—a place easily taken. Six hundred Danites were sent to take Leshem (Laish).

(Judg 18:27).[127] Interestingly, Hawk suggests that Dan's attack on the northern city of Laish was an act of raw aggression born out of unrealized expectations—entirely on their own initiative—with God not included in the action at all (2010:137). Biran notes that the Danites appear to have been a semi-nomadic group at this time, moving from south to north (Shanks 1987:14).[128] Butler understands the Dan event as a reminder that even under the conditions of lost property or territory, God was able to give his people an inheritance in the land—even if a tribe lost its original lot, God replaced it (2014a:187).[129]

The theory making the circuit at the time of Biran's interview with Shanks (1987) was that there were not very many Late Bronze Age cities in Israel—including Dan (Shanks 1987:14). However, Biran[130] recognizes that the fact that they found a Late Bronze Age tomb necessitates that there was a Late Bronze Age city whether it has been found or not (Shanks 1987:14). He goes on to share with Shanks that indeed, this very year of excavation, remains of walls and structures were found indicating there was quite a city here during the Late Bronze Age (Shanks 1987:14). Biran concludes that the many pits found in the Late Bronze Age city indicate that there was a period of time during which the Danites used them for storage while they were continuing to destroy the remains of the Canaanite city that existed before them (Shanks 1987:14). It was the continual digging of these pits, by the Israelite tribe of Dan, that likely destroyed much of the Late Bronze Age stratum originally at the site.[131]

In the case of no Late Bronze fortifications having been found at Laish/Dan—the same argument may be made as was suggested by Yadin in his assessment of the lack of Late Bronze fortification walls at Jericho—namely, that the Middle Bronze fortification walls continued to serve the cities well on into the Late Bronze Age (Shanks 1987:17; Yadin 1982:22). Thus, based on Biran's twenty-year excavations at Dan, it seems perfectly legitimate to conclude at least the high probability that the

[127] Laish was one of only five cities the Bible mentions as suffering physical destruction at the hands of Israel; the others were Jericho (Josh 6), Ai (Josh 7–8), Hazor (Josh 11:11–13) and Jerusalem (Judg 1:8).
[128] Biran notes that as a matter of fact, the Bible refers to *mahaneh* Dan, the camp of Dan, when they were moving south to north.
[129] Butler goes on to note that this event was of particular importance to the readers of the ultimate history in exile. They had lost all their inheritance. They had no more loot.
[130] Avraham Biran excavated at Tel Dan for twenty years beginning in 1966.
[131] The excavators uncovered more than twenty pits in one area alone–some as deep as six feet.

Israelite tribe of Dan moved from the south to the north in search of a place to build their city and establish a permanent homeland—and eventually, after reconnaissance missions, took the city of Laish from a docile and isolated population and renamed the city after their ancestor, Dan.

Some have suggested that the continuation of the Canaanite-material culture into the Iron Age is what one finds at a site such as Laish (Dan). However, the question that must be asked, and logically answered, is 'why should the people of a highly developed civilization (the Late Bronze Age people) suddenly leave their high-class city and move into tents and huts and dig pits for disposal and storage'? (Shanks 1987:17).

7.2.7 Conquest Model/Canaanite Mounds: Jerusalem

Following the death of Joshua, the people of Israel asked the Lord who would lead them against the Canaanites, to fight them (Judg 1:8)? The Lord gave the land to Judah and told him to take it; Judah then solicited his brother, Simeon, to come with him to fight against the Canaanites in his territory, and he would reciprocate by fighting with Simeon in his allotted territory (Judg 1:3). Eventually the men of Judah fought against Jerusalem and captured it, struck it with the edge of the sword and set the city on fire (Judg 1:8). Thus, Jerusalem joins the other four cities that the biblical text indicates were subject to physical destruction as well as the slaughter of much, if not all, of the populace.

In the case of Jerusalem, the biblical text indicates that the Jebusites who lived in Jerusalem apparently quickly recaptured their section of Jerusalem as indicated in Judges 19:10–12;[132] when the Levite returning with his concubine would not spend the night in the city of the Jebusites (19:11). The biblical text notes that the Israelites lived with or among the Jebusites (Judg 1:21).

It is important to remember that the city of Jerusalem started out as a small city built on a low rise above the spring known as the Gihon Spring. The southern end of the

[132] The conquest of Jerusalem mentioned in Judges 1:8 after the victory over Adoni-bezek/-zedek was the most isolated and short-lived event of the thirteenth century or the twelfth century, since the city figures in Judges 1:21 as having remained unconquered, and not until the time of David was it, in fact, deprived of its independence and subjected to his rule (Weippert 1971:54).

city continued downward until it reached a point where three valleys converged.[133] As noted in an earlier chapter, the principal remains of the biblical city of Jerusalem have been uncovered in the area referred to as the City of David, the south-eastern hill overlooking the Gihon Spring in the Kidron Valley (Negev and Gibson 2001:260).

According to Shiloh, principal excavator of the City of David, only a few scattered remains were found of the Iron Age I city (1200–1000 BC) the final phase of the Jebusite city prior to its conquest by David around 1000 BC (1993:702). It appears that the Jebusites lived in a small walled city on the Hill of Ophel, erecting their fortifications in particular on the stronghold of Zion, where they ruled over a small territory which separated the tribal area of Judah from that of Benjamin and constituted a foreign enclave in their midst (Mazar A 1993:699). It is likely that Warren's Shaft,[134] dug by the Jebusites to protect their water supply, was eventually the cause of their downfall, as David's commander, Joab, gained entrance to their enclave through it (Shiloh and Kaplan 1979:38).

As noted earlier by Manor, 'with the modern overburden of the ruins in ancient Jerusalem, it would be difficult to locate where the destruction might have occurred in addition to the possibility that the burning may not have engulfed the entire site' (2013:96). Contrary to any conclusive data to dismiss the possibility of the Israelites having taken the city, setting fire to it, at least for a brief time—this thesis sees no reason to totally dismiss the biblical account of the taking of Jerusalem and burning at least some portion of the small city. The archaeological data and the biblical text seem to fit nicely (convergence) with this scenario. The geographic elements of the small area of the city of David, demonstrated by the excavations of Shiloh, seem to coincide with the biblical record of the Jebusites having a sufficient stronghold to resist Israelite pressure for some two hundred years or until the time of King David.

7.2.8 Summary of the Conquest Model/Canaanite Mounds

Clearly the archaeological data/evidence and the biblical texts do not appear to be as far apart as some would suggest. Issues associated with the Canaanite mounds have been addressed, and in the majority of cases there appears to be a high degree

[133]The valleys were the Kidron, the Tyropoeon, and Hinnom; these valleys continued southward as one.
[134] The shaft was named after the British engineer, Sir Charles Warren, who discovered it in 1867.

of coherence or convergence between the text and the material data. The final word on the role, if any, the Conquest Model has in the overall question of the emergence of Israel in Canaan will be addressed in the final analysis of chapter eight.

7.3 The Peaceful Infiltration Model

Failing to see evidence for a widespread conquest, Albrecht Alt[135] in 1925 followed by his student Martin Noth, proposed a new theory for the emergence of Israel in Canaan. As an alternative to the Conquest Model, they postulated a peaceful entrance into Canaan by a group that would eventually become known as Israel. In their opinion, this new group came from the desert, settled among the resident Canaanites and eventually gained the ascendancy (Manor 2013:98). Dever had this to say about this new Peaceful Infiltration Model:

> But the solution of Alt and his disciples to the conquest-settlement problem seemed too radical to adherents of the American school, and moreover tended to ignore the progress of archaeology (1990:53).

Alt saw the peaceful infiltration as one by individual clans or confederacies of clans of nomads with a few cattle who, during the winter rainy season and the spring, lived with their herds in the border territory between the desert and the cultivated land and who were forced, when the vegetation became scarce in summer, to penetrate further into the cultivated land and to come to an understanding with the owners of the land about summer pasturage in the harvested fields and in the woods (Weippert 1971:6). The peaceful process of transition on the part of the nomads to a sedentary life was the real process of settlement. Gradually, at a second stage, the Israelites expanded also into the fruitful plains and valleys which had long been occupied by closely-packed groups of Canaanite cities (Weippert 1971:6).

A problem facing the Peaceful Infiltration Model is its failure to offer an explanation for why the Bible tells a different story of Israelite origins. McDermott notes:

> One can claim that the story of a gradual infiltration is preserved in an altered form in the stories of Genesis, but that still does not explain why the Exodus

[135] Alt was Europe's Albright—a scholar with enormous breadth and learning—and his views, continually developed up until his death in 1956, were widely influential in Biblical circles (Dever 1990:53).

> and conquest stories were used by people whose origins were entirely different (1998:44).

An earlier reasoning by Yadin seems to fit well here, in that he queried why a nation would invent such an outrageous story of living as slaves in Egypt for some four hundred-plus years if there were not at least a kernel of truth to the story (Shanks 1983:17).

Another issue that the Peaceful Infiltration Model fails to properly address is the evidence indicating continuity between the Canaanites and the Israelites. Like the Conquest Model, this model claims that a group other than Canaanites came in from the outside. The question then is whether or not they immediately decided to adopt the Canaanite customs and traditions, or did the close proximity between these nomads and the Canaanites change them before they had a chance to settle into their own ways and customs?[136]

7.3.1 Settlement Patterns as shown by Regional Surveys

The development of the archaeological surveys (regional surveys), where archaeologists walk across a wide area looking on the surface for every bit of evidence they can find of ancient occupation, has often been quite remarkable (Shanks 1992:7). On the one hand, the location of the new settlements is consistent with the explanation offered by Alt and Noth that Israel entered the land of Canaan peacefully (McDermott 1998:43). But, on the other hand, the extensive surveys in the regions of Judah, Ephraim, Manasseh, and Issachar, in the Sharon, the northern Negev and parts of Transjordan revealed the establishment of dozens of small settlements that may be considered Israelite (Ben-Tor 1992:285). Hundreds of sites were found during intensive surveys carried out in the central hill zones of Canaan. The settlements indicate that obviously there was a new population in the area.

This thesis has demonstrated a high degree of likelihood that the Conquest Model did have a role to play in the initial emergence of Israel in Canaan. It seems logical to infer that the bulk of the Israelite nation, minus the military forces, went about settling

[136] More will be said about the continuity issue later in this chapter. Finkelstein and Fritz use the latter explanation in a modified version (1988:100; Fritz 1987:84)..

the cities being taken by force and at the same time settling in areas where they did not remove the Canaanites, and continued to live and eventually fight to take control of Canaan. Unlike the Conquest Model, this process involved a certain level of peaceful infiltration, although probably with a high level of constant tension, carried on for an extended period of time—perhaps until the time of David some two hundred years after the initial foray into the land.[137]

Gottwald notes that there is nothing in the socio-economic details of the traditions of ancient Israel that argues for Israel entering Canaan in a state of transition (1978:5). Furthermore, Dever says that the Peaceful Infiltration Model seems right until you try to chase pastoral nomads around—one can talk about movements of people from Transjordan, going across the Jordan River into western Palestine, but there is, in fact, almost no archaeological evidence to support such movements (1992:29). The final analysis indicates that there were no sources of nomads in the steppes that could have supplied the peaceful infiltrators (Finkelstein and Mazar A 2007:75).

The Peaceful Infiltration Model, according to Dever, 'rests on a kind of 19th-century nostalgia about the Bedouin, and also on ignorance about pastoral nomads and how they really operate' (1992:30). Furthermore, Albright suggested that Alt and Noth paid too little attention in their work to the results of the archaeological investigations which flourished in Palestine after World War I, and reached one-sided and very limited conclusions by their preference for literary-critical and tradition-historical methods—'there must always be external evidence' (1939:12). In Alt's view, early stages of the Israelite penetration into the hill country of Canaan did not threaten the old Late Bronze Age city-states along the coast and in the river valleys, much less displace the predominantly Canaanite population of Palestine; however, there was a later stage of territorial expansion with successful Israelite raids being carried out. In this way, the ambiguous archaeological evidence (always minimized by the German reconstructionists) could be accommodated, and the apparently contradictory traditions in Joshua and Judges harmonized (Dever 1990:53).

7.3.2 Summary of the Peaceful Infiltration Model

[137] According to Hess, Joshua is clear that the whole land of Canaan (the Promised Land) was not realized until the time of David as noted in 1 Kings 4:21 (1996:62).

The Peaceful Infiltration Model is in agreement with Albright's Conquest Model in that it portrays the nomads who eventually will become Israel coming from the east outside of Canaan—this is where any similar agreement ends. Conversely, Alt saw the coming of the Philistines into Canaan as a sudden part of one event; however, he viewed the arrival of the Israelites as a gradual event, unorganized and a long-term process.

This thesis agrees with Alt's assessment that the people who entered Canaan in the hill-country settlements did live in relative peace among the Canaanites for an extended period of time before eventually taking complete control of the land—Israel. However, this thesis is in total opposition to any idea that suggests that the Israelite nation was totally unorganized and did not make an initial military invasion into Canaan, although not as successfully as God had commanded because of their disobedience. Without offering any specific evidence for the infiltration or the settlement, Alt hypothesized that the Israelites were not a unified people but a mixture of unrelated and disparate nomadic or semi-nomadic peoples from the surrounding regions, all of whom worshipped different gods (1989:3–10).

This thesis proposes that the archaeological data and the biblical text do not negate one another when it comes to Israel's initial military attacks on major Canaanite cities in the central hill country, northern Canaan and southern Canaan.[138] Rather, the thesis considers a second phase of Israel's continuing emergence in Canaan highlighted by a certain peaceful infiltration, and continued as a somewhat peaceful existence alongside the Canaanite populace it had failed to exterminate as God had commanded. Clearly other nationalities as well lived among them right up to the days of the monarchy—some associated with the court of King David (1 Sam 7:14).

7.4 The Peasant Revolt Model (Social Revolution Model)

Mendenhall first proposed the Peasant Revolt Model, later changed to Social Revolution, and it was expanded greatly by his student, N Gottwald. Unlike the Conquest or Peaceful Infiltration models, the Peasant Revolt Model posits an internal

[138] There is a considerable absence of any military action taken by Israel in the central part of Canaan—a phenomenon to be explored under the Symbiosis Model section.

movement (revolt) from within the indigenous Canaanite population—a movement against the ruling class viewed as overbearing and domineering. The Social Revolution Model says the Israelites did not come in from the outside but were Canaanites themselves (McDermott 1998:44).[139]

As noted earlier in this thesis, Mendenhall's take on the revolt included a prominent religious component within the definition of the model—whereas Gottwald rejected the Mosaic covenant and its religious ideology as a significant factor in Israel's emergence from Canaanite society, expressing strong doubts about the historical value of the Exodus-Sinai traditions (1985:35). In regard to a religious component in the Peasant Revolt Model, McDermott poses an interesting question—asking if there was a successful revolt, why would such a story disappear from the Bible (1998:44–45). It is one thing to make the claim that such a revolt at Israel's beginning shaped the Bible—in the laws on treating the poor, refugees, widows and orphans and in the negative attitude towards kings in much of the Old Testament, but it quite another to fail to offer any explanation as to why the Bible presents such a different story in regard to Israel's emergence in Canaan (McDermott 1998:44–45).

Advocates of the Peasant Revolt Model have failed to demonstrate, either from the archaeological data or from any epigraphical source an event that would qualify as a revolt which would have resulted in indigenous Canaanites becoming Israelites. Halpern disagrees with those who would use archaeological evidence to say that the early Israelites were Canaanites. McDermott, speaking of Halpern says:

> The archaeological evidence [he says] is too ambiguous to prove that there was continuity between the material culture of the Canaanites and that of the Israelites. Although they have some characteristics in common, the house types and the pottery have enough differences that it is possible they were made by a group ethnically distinct from the Canaanites but who adopted some Canaanite customs (McDermott 1998:61)).

One scholar wrote that 'as an archaeologist, there is very little I can say about the peasant revolt model, because it rests on ideological assumptions that are very difficult

[139] McDermott notes that the evidence of continuity adds support to this model, plus the evidence on the fate of the Canaanite cities is also consistent with this model (1998:44).

to test archaeologically' (Dever 1992:30). Having written this statement, Dever in the very next sentence says, 'What I like about it is that it stresses the indigenous origins of most early Israelites. And that does fit the archaeological evidence' (1992:30). As is often the case, this kind of double-talk makes it difficult to give credence to some of these scholarly conclusions. For instance, on the one hand, it is difficult to test an ideological assumption by archaeological data, but on the other hand, the data fits the conclusion that most early Israelites were indigenous in origin.

Despite many new and provocative insights, one of the crucial weaknesses of Mendenhall's Peasant Revolt Model is that he could not define Israelite ethnicity in terms of material culture either archaeologically or, for that matter, in political or sociological terms. In addition, he could not correlate events of the supposed peasants' revolt with the actual stratigraphic sequence of the Late Bronze Age sites in Palestine (Dever 1990:55). Furthermore, the Peasant Revolt Model, like the Conquest Model of Albright, fails to explain why the new settlements were located in the poorer land (McDermott 1998:44). A Mazar offers one of the best balanced approaches to what archaeology can and cannot do:

> Archaeology can provide positive evidence for the phase of establishing new sites in regions previously unsettled, but it cannot supply evidence for a possible nomadic phase which may have preceded the settlement; it gives a clue to the destruction of some major Canaanite cities which probably happened as a result of military conflicts between the Israelites and the Canaanite population, yet it cannot be taken as proof of a total, 'monolithic' conquest. Thus the variety of the archaeological finds illustrates the complex process of the Israelite conquest and settlement (1981:34).

Halpern, in spite of the assertion that data is often ambiguous, rightly notes that the archaeological evidence alone may be ambiguous, but when taken together with the textual evidence, it can only mean that the Israelites came from outside Canaan (1992a:1132–1133).

7.4.1 Peasant Revolt Model Summary

There are components of the Peasant Revolt Model which address certain elements of what would be Israel's emergence in Canaan. However, it fails to accommodate the

spread of the emerging new settlement patterns evident not only in the central hill country of Canaan but also in the Transjordan region (Stager 1998:90–111). In essence, the Peasant Revolt Model, like the Conquest Model of Albright, fails to explain why the new settlements were located in the poorer land (McDermott 1998:44).

This thesis takes the position that there is some validity in including the Peasant Revolt Model in the overall picture of the process of Israel's emergence in the land of Canaan. As already noted, the Conquest Model of Albright, and the Peaceful Infiltration Model of Alt, although having some place in the emergence of Israel in Canaan, did not meet the criteria for being the one definitive model by which Israel emerged in and took possession of the land from the Canaanite population. In fact, this thesis has demonstrated, as others have also noted, the taking of the land of Canaan by Israel was a rather lengthy process—perhaps some two hundred years lasting to the time of King David.

There are biblical accounts of Canaanite 'converts' in the final formation of Israel such as the case of the subjects of the Amorite Sihon (Num 21:27b–30), Rahab and her group at Jericho (Josh 2; 6:22–25) and the Adullamites and other urban groups in the Judean foothills (Gen 38). Further, there are examples of Canaanite allies under the protection of Israel who gave support to Israel while maintaining a separate status within the Israelite movement—Gibeon and the other Hurrian cities in Benjamin (Josh 9–10; 2 Sam 4:1–3; 21:1–14), Meroz (Judg 5:23), Succoth and Penuel (Judg 8:14–17) and Kenites/Rechabites (Judg 1:16; 4:11; 1 Sam 15:6–7; 30:29) (Gottwald 1985:156).

Even up to the time of David, around two hundred years after Israel's initial foray into Canaan, one finds David, on the run from Saul, running to the Philistine city of Gath (1 Sam 27). The biblical text says that David, along with six hundred men following his lead, lived with Achish at Gath (1 Sam 27:3). David lived among the Philistines in their territory for one year and four months at the city of Ziglag, a city given to him by Achish (1 Sam 27:6–7). The language in 1 Samuel 22 in regard to the nature of the men who followed David is descriptive:

> And everyone who was in distress, and everyone who was in debt, and everyone who was bitter in soul, gathered to him. And he became commander over them. And there were with him about four hundred men (1 Sam 22:2)

Later in the book of 1 Samuel, at 23:13, the number of men following David had grown to six hundred—six hundred men along with David now residing in the territory of the Philistines where Saul would not pursue them (1 Sam 27:4).

It is not a stretch to imagine that when the Israelites entered the land of Canaan there were Amorites/Canaanites who disliked their current status in life and sought to improve, strike out against, take action, by casting their lot with the invading Israelites. One can readily see how the common man living on the fringe of Canaanite society, pursued by life's problems or treated unfairly in the Canaanite system, might seek to follow the strong leadership of a man like Joshua. As shown, this continued right up to the time of David.[140] These rebels, outcasts, likely played a role in the emergence of Israel in the land of Canaan.

7.5 The Symbiosis Hypothesis

Most scholars today do see some early relationship between the first Israelites and the Canaanites, which accounts for the similarities in material culture and religion (McDermott 1998:64).[141] However, there is no consensus on how that relationship began or how it continued to develop. Symbiosis refers to interaction between two different organisms living in close physical association, typically to the advantage of both parties.[142]

Volkmar Fritz proposed that the arrival of Israel in Canaan probably occurred in a way similar to the so-called Infiltration hypothesis—thus, the relationship or symbiosis evolved from Israel's living near the Canaanites:

---

[140] Other nationalities remained a part of the population into the early monarchy and some were even close associates in the Davidic court. Among these were Amorites (1 Sam 7:14; cf. also reference to Gibeonites as part of this group, 2 Sam 21:2; 1 Kgs 9:20), Hittites (Ahimelech and Uriah were closely associated with David; 1 Sam 26:6; 2 Sam 23:39; see also 1 Kgs 9:20), Jebusites (Araunah from whom David purchased the property for the offering; 2 Sam 24:18–25; cf. also 1 Kgs 9:20), Perizzites (1 Kgs 9:20), and Hivites (1 Kgs 9:20).

[141] I am not sure that this would be true today, 2019, nor have I read any research to affirm or deny this statement.

[142] An example would be 'a perfect mother and daughter symbiosis' (relationship).

> The various groups that settled in the country from the twelfth century onwards cannot merely be regarded as nomads. Periods of a partially sedentary life must have interspersed their nomadic existence; otherwise the wide-ranging adoption of Canaanite culture during the last phase of the Late Bronze Age cannot be explained. Therefore, I would like to call the new theory *the symbiosis hypothesis* (1987:98).

Israel Finkelstein brought more credibility to the Symbiotic Model with his extensively documented work, which drew heavily on settlement pattern studies (1988). The Symbiosis Hypothesis represents a middle ground between the earlier proposed models.

Fritz hypothesized that the first Israelites did not live on the extreme fringes of the Canaanite lands like the desert Bedouins, but were nomads who lived for a long time in close contact with the Canaanites and thus had adopted some of the Canaanite material culture prior to their settling down in the new villages of the highlands. Because there are similarities in other aspects of both material cultures, especially pottery, Fritz surmised that these new settlers must have been people who had close contact with the Canaanites over a long period of time–these people were the Israelite tribes living in a symbiotic relationship with the Canaanites (1987:97–98).

This thesis understands the relationship of the Israelites to the Canaanites as primarily one of combatants on the field of war. That is, the biblical story clearly notes that Israel invaded the land of Canaan serving their God, Yahweh, as instruments of the fulfilment of prophecy—that when the Canaanites (Amorites) had exhausted every opportunity God gave them to repent of their sins, God would finally take action to destroy the wicked inhabitants of Canaan and at the same time fulfil the prophecy of a land to be given to Abraham's seed—a land that they would take after being slaves for four hundred years in Egypt (Gen 15:13–15). If this is the case, and the biblical text and the archaeological data seem to converge nicely, then the relationship proposed by Fritz and others is not a relationship at all, but rather the nation of Israel carrying out, to some degree, God's plan to punish the Amorites and give Abraham's seed the land they had been promised. Thus the continuity.

7.5.1 Continuity of the Material Culture between the Canaanites and Israelites

Rather than a close proximity of the Israelites to the Canaanites for an extended period of time in which they came to know and use their material culture, it seems appropriate to note that the biblical text sheds significant light on another overlooked scenario. As noted above, the biblical text says that Israelites were used as an instrument of punishment by God—meting out God's vengeance on a sinful people who had failed time and time again to do the will of God. Thus, rather than focusing on the destruction of cities, the Israelites were eliminating the evil population whose iniquity was finally full or complete. In the book of Genesis, the biblical text relates that God told Abram that he, Abram, would not physically receive the land promised to him, but rather his descendants would eventually take it when the sins of the Amorites, and others, were complete:

> On that day the Lord made a covenant with Abram, saying, to your offspring I give this land, from the river of Egypt to the great river, the river Euphrates, the land of the Kenites, the Kenizzites, the Kadmonites, the Hittites, the Perizzites, the Rephraim, the Amorites, the Canaanites, the Girgashites and the Jebusites (Gen 15:18–21).

Abram was not allowed to take the land of Promise because the Lord still held out hope for the people to repent—Genesis 15:16b '… for the iniquity of the Amorites is not yet complete.'[143] Furthermore, the biblical text indicates that Israel's reward was the spoils of war that came from their victories over the Canaanite cities.[144]

> When the Lord your God brings you into the land that he swore to your fathers, to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob, to give you–with great and good cities that you did not build, and houses full of all good things that you did not fill, and cisterns that you did not dig, and vineyards and olive trees that you did not plant–and when you eat and are full, then take care lest you forget the Lord,

---

[143] A question worthy of study, but not within the purview of this thesis, concerns the fact that God allowed, in fact commanded, Joshua and the Israelites to kill men, women and children. How can a holy and just God require such action?

[144] According to the biblical text, Joshua and the Israelites only inflicted, by fire, physical damage on five cities—to some degree or another. Manor affirms that the biblical narrative does not describe wholesale destruction of sites; while it clearly refers to 'destroying' cities, given the circumstances of the description in general, it is reasonable that the 'destruction' was of the populations and not the physical buildings (2013:97).

> who brought you out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of slavery (Deut 6:10–12).

This fits well with the fact that they had cities to live in, wells to drink from and trees to gather fruit from that they did not build, dig nor plant. There is no reason to postulate that the material continuity was a result of the Israelites coming from the Canaanite population, or that they were nomads or semi-nomads who lived in close proximity to the Canaanites and learned to use their material culture items. The Bible story converges well with the archaeological data indicating that Israel entered Canaan at the end of the Late Bronze Age, and that there was continuity between the villages and cities from the Late Bronze Age on into the Iron Age I.

The Israelites, besides having divine assistance at times, were masters of tactical military strategies involving what Malamat calls ‘indirect military approaches’ by which the Canaanites were enticed and ambushed, victims of surprise attacks and night operations which apparently caught them off-guard (1982:31). After Israel had essentially broken the strength of the open-field military alliances, siege efforts were unnecessary as Israel moved from town to town in their clean-up operations (Josh 10:29–43).

The biblical text repeatedly indicates that the focus was the populations, with no particular reference to structures with respective cities being taken within a day or two of Israel’s arrival at the towns (Josh 10:32, 35). The decimation of the Canaanite coalition against Israel probably accelerated this capture, but it may have been facilitated further by a demoralized population that remained in the cities along with the likelihood that some survivors fled to the respective towns in the hill country to escape the Israelites (Manor 2013:97). The flight would explain the need for the Israelites to re-conquer many of the towns after the fleeing Canaanites had returned when the Israelites moved on to their next engagements as hinted at in the book of Judges (Manor 2013:97).

7.5.2 Ethnic Markers?

As noted earlier, Dever suggests that the most intriguing and controversial question concerning the pottery of this period (transition from Late Bronze Age to Iron Age I) is

whether or not ceramic analysis can enable one to identify the settlers in the hill country ethnically and determine their origins (2003:121). The scenario presented above suggests that the question of continuity of material culture from the Late Bronze Age Canaanite society continuing on down into the Iron Age I Israelite period can be accounted for by referencing the biblical text that clearly notes that Israel would enjoy the spoils of victory—that is, living in houses they did not build, and so on (Deut 6:10–12)—does not eliminate the fact that certain new and distinct elements surfaced early in the Iron Age I period, such elements as the pithoi storage jars, four-room courtyard houses, rock-hewn cisterns, silos, and refraining from eating pork.

7.5.2.1 Pottery and other Cultural Markers

In chapter two of this thesis, Dever noted that the best clue to the origins of the hill-country colonists is the pottery of Iron Age I (2003:125). Further, he pointed out the continuity of the ceramic tradition from the Late Bronze Age into the period in which he dubbed the inhabitants as 'proto-Israelites' (1992b:552). It is in these hill-country villages that, for the first time, the early Israelites appear in an actual archaeological context (Dever 1992:40). What is interesting, in terms of pottery, is that the common early Israelite pottery turns out to be nearly identical to that of the late thirteenth century BC pottery—coming right out of the Late Bronze Age urban Canaanite repertoire (Dever 1992:40). Again, if one considers the biblical text found at Deuteronomy 6:10–12 the nearly identical pottery continuation is not a difficult problem to solve.

Furthermore, If one accepts the premise that the residents of Canaan shared some kinship with the emerging Israelite nation, the ceramic tradition could easily have been shared not only by Canaanite residents but also by 'family' who may have already returned and who were sympathetic with the shared cultural background of the newly-arrived extended family (Manor 2013:108). This may have been true of the central zone of Canaan as shown earlier where there were no conflicts or battles between Israel and the Canaanite cities located in this zone—however, does this hold true for the other sections of Canaan where the continuity is also found?

Finkelstein says that the material culture does not show that the first Israelites were identical to the Canaanites living in the lowlands. Finkelstein correctly assesses that the collared-rim jars, found mainly in Israelite settlements, were found in a few Canaanite sites as well as other places, but these findings are not enough to indicate that the Israelite settlers were Canaanites (Finkelstein 1988:283–285). More significant is the fact that the pottery of the new settlements has some similarity to that of the earlier hill-country settlements from Middle Bronze Age II B–C (*c.*1800–1550 BC) which fits Finkelstein's view that the Israelite settlements should be related to earlier settlements in the hill country (Finkelstein 1988:283–285). Again, if Deuteronomy 6 is taken seriously, the continuity similarity is explained and becomes a non-issue.

The biblical reference Deuteronomy 6:10–12, cited several times thus far, answers many of the pottery questions. It surely addresses Dever's assessment that '… based on the pottery evidence, we would not even suspect that the people living in these hill-country sites were newcomers at all' (1992:40). Thus, the biblical reference (Deut 6:10–12) addresses Dever's unimaginable query:

> One can't imagine nomads sweeping in from the desert, with no architectural or ceramic tradition behind them, suddenly becoming past masters of the potter's art in Palestine (1992:40).

First, it has already been established that the Israelites were not nomads and second, the fact that God gave them the cities (architecture), the goods within the conquered households (pottery), the fields and vineyards, and so forth, demonstrates the reason for the continuity. Once again the archaeological data and the biblical text seem to consistently converge.

God's blessing to the Israelites, the spoils of war, did not preclude them from using their own ingenuity to adapt to the condition of life in Canaan. Clearly the production of pottery in the Iron Age I period involved using different techniques than those in the Late Bronze Age—in particular, the Iron I pottery generally reveals fewer wheel-forming techniques, except in its finishing (Dever 2003:118). There appears to be a shift from a large-scale industrial production to that of a cottage industry with each family or perhaps a village potter or two making the pottery required for life in the

village. The early pottery identified as being early Israelite is very drab and unsophisticated in comparison to that of the Philistines who entered Canaan around the same time as Israel—in Dever's opinion it was barbaric compared to the Philistine pottery (1992:41).

- ***Collared-Rim Jars (Pithoi Jars)***

A characteristic of the material culture in the hill-country settlements is the poor pottery repertoire limited to types essential for basic subsistence. The large storage jars (pithoi), likely used primarily for water storage, are a hallmark of this culture, and their number overwhelms that of other ceramic forms (Mazar A 1990:346).

The introduction of the pithos jar (large collared-rim storage jar) is considered by some scholars directly attributable to the Israelites (Albright and Biran).[145] The two hundred settlements found in the central hill-country were in need of such a container in order to transport and store much-needed water to sustain life. Some of the jars were quite large (some stood three feet high or more) holding from ten to fifteen gallons of water. The collared-rim is apparently a small decorative element with no function intended. Dever suggests the collared-rim storage jar is perhaps the only form of new pottery that can be found in the Israelite settlements (1992:43). In opposition to Dever, Finkelstein argues that the ceramic assemblage of the Israelite settlement types, taken as a whole, stand in sharp contrast to the repertoire of the Canaanite centres (1988:274). During the excavations at Dan, Biran found in the pits many large collared-rim jars, which he believes were introduced into the country by the Israelites. Discussing the question of why Bronze Age material (a few sherds) was also found in the Iron Age pits he noted:

> In these pits we found large collared-rim jars. I believe, with Albright, that these collared-rim jars were introduced into the country by the Israelites. Dan is an example of how this happens. There were no collared-rim jars at Dan during the Canaanite period. Suddenly they appear when the Israelites conquer the city (Shanks 1987:15).

[145] Mazar cautions against an ethnic attribution to the Israelites since the jars were also found at Canaanite sites and at Sahab in Transjordan, probably an Ammonite site (1990:347).

The discovery of collared-rim pithoi at Dan, when they were not found elsewhere in Galilee, is possible evidence of the northward migration of the Danites from central Palestine (Mazar A 1990:347–348). Mazar's assessment of the Israelites' initial use of Canaanite pottery fits well with what this thesis has already suggested in regard to Deuteronomy 6:10–12:

> It appears that the Israelite settlers in the hill country lacked their own pottery-making tradition, and that initially they obtained the most necessary pottery vessels from their Canaanite neighbours. When they did begin producing pottery, they manufactured a limited repertoire of forms based on Canaanite prototypes, without adopting the Canaanite decoration (1990:348).

Mazar's assessment clearly allows for the possibility of Israel using the spoils of war as they developed their own pottery repertoire.

- ***The Four-Room House***

The new settlers in the hill country of Canaan brought with them a new style of architecture along with the peculiarly-decorated storage jar. This new architecture acquired the name four-room house (Shanks 1992:8).[146] Some scholars have suggested that this form of architecture developed among the Israelites who settled the central hill country and in the northern Negev (Mazar A 1990:343). Certainly the pillared house or four-room house was the building fashion of the period adopted by all the peoples living in Palestine during the Iron Age I. Among the Israelites inhabiting the central hill country and the northern Negev, this type of house became the most popular, whether it originated with them or not.

Later in the period of the Monarchy, the four-room house became a hallmark of Israelite domestic architecture. Such houses were usually rectangular or square in shape and had a central rectangular courtyard surrounded by rooms or pillared porticoes on all three sides (Mazar A 1990:341).

[146] Shanks points out that to call this new architecture a four-room house is a misnomer. It is not really a four-room house but rather it consists of a long, narrow room; sticking out from three long rooms. Thus the four rooms are the long narrow room at the bottom and the three long ones sticking out from it. It is a misnomer in the sense that often the rooms are subdivided and other rooms may be added to the periphery (1992:9).

One of the most difficult, if not impossible, tasks in analysing archaeological data is determining whether or not the particular item(s) defines or belongs to only one particular group of people. The case for the four-room house as an ethnic marker for the Israelites is supported by strong circumstantial evidence, but cannot be conclusively proved.

- ***Cisterns and Silos***

Cisterns, silos and agricultural terraces demonstrate the means by which the settlers in the hill country of Canaan adapted to their new environment (Mazar A 1990:345). Both Albright and Aharoni stressed the importance of plastered cisterns, invented by the Israelites, to allow settlement at places in the hill country lacking a perennial water source. However, Albright and Aharoni's conclusion should be viewed with caution, and has been abandoned by most archaeologists due to later research showing that these cisterns already existed in the Middle Bronze Age at Hazor, and they are found only in a few sites related to the Israelite settlements (Mazar A 1992:289).

In the early Israelite houses cisterns were dug under the floors and in the courtyards to provide a ready source of water. Survival in the hill country in the summertime would be impossible without some means of water catchment (Dever 1992:38). These cisterns were cut into the bedrock and were typically bell-shaped. The development of iron tools to dig such pits for storage (liquid or grain) made it possible for early Israel (Dever's proto-Israelites) to settle in the central hill country of Canaan (Dever 1992:39).

7.5.2.2 Summation of Ethnic Markers Discussion

In a word, it is impossible to definitively prove that any of the above so-called ethnic markers can be directly attributed to the arrival of Israel in Canaan. However, there seem to be instances where the likely candidate for the introduction of certain items, for instance the collared-rim jars, strongly suggests it was an Israelite phenomenon.[147] The same may be said in regard to the abundance of four-room structures found in the villages of the central hill country occupied by a group of new arrivals at the end of the Late Bronze Age/beginning of the Iron Age I.

[147] Biran's assessment of the pithoi jars at Dan is especially enlightening and points to the Israelite tribe of Dan as introducing this new form of pottery to Laish (Shanks 1987:15).

A discussion of the refraining from eating pork will be reserved for the Auto-Ethnogenesis Model evaluation.

7.5.3 Final Verdict on the Symbiosis Hypothesis: Conflict and the Central Zone of Canaan

It may be somewhat of a stretch to include the Symbiosis Hypothesis as part of the overall model towards which this thesis continues to develop. However, if one examines the biblical text in regard to the military campaigns waged by Joshua and the Israelite army against the Canaanites, a pattern of non-conflict is apparent—non-military conflict or encounters in the central portion of Canaan. Since part of Joshua's point is to demonstrate God's presence with Israel as they accommodate the land, this omission is striking (Manor 2013:106).

The initial entry into Canaan witnesses Israel crossing the Jordan to conquer Jericho, and Ai (Josh 3–8); the pact with Gibeon brings on the southward campaign (Josh 9–10); then, after returning to Gilgal, news of a northern confederacy prompts Israel to mobilize northward concentrating the campaign in Upper Galilee and part of Lower Galilee (Josh 11). A list of the defeated kings summarizes the work (Josh 12), but notable is the lack of towns in central Canaan. Manor correctly notes:

> If one were to draw an east-west line across Canaan from the Jordan to the Mediterranean at Gibeon, south of the line is where Israel entered Canaan and the first campaign occurred. A second line could be drawn diagonally along the southern edge of the Jezreel Valley from the Jordan to the Mediterranean; north of that line is where the remaining cities of Joshua 12 existed. The exceptions were Dor and Tirzah (2013:106).

What then is the explanation as to why the central area is void of all military activity? Not only does this area not appear as a military object for Joshua—Joshua convenes the nation of Israel, after the conquest of Ai, at Mt Ebal and Mt Gerizim for a covenant renewal ceremony with no opposition of any kind (Josh 8:23–35) from the nearby important inhabited Canaanite city of Shechem.[148] Standing on the ancient Tel of

[148] On a beautiful sunny Saturday July 6th, 2019, the writer of this thesis stood on the ancient Tel of Shechem, along with Dale Manor, Frank Wheeler and Kathy Culbertson and looked back south towards the area where Joshua would have stood to address Israel; six tribes would have been on

Shechem in July 2019, the writer of this thesis enquired of Dr Dale Manor, my archaeology mentor and Field Director of the excavations at Tel Beth-Shemesh, Israel since 2000, his opinion on why Shechem did not attack Joshua or vice versa. Dr Manor is of the opinion, while not defining exactly how, that there was less of a symbiosis and more of a kinfolk/relative relationship of some kind between the Canaanite inhabitants of Shechem and the invading Israelites (Manor interviewed by researcher on site at Shechem July 2019).

Manor, reflecting on the story of the rape of Dinah, Jacob's daughter, in Genesis 34, by Shechem the son of Hamor the Hivite—thinks that perhaps this event and what follows could have been the impetus for a relationship between the Canaanites of Shechem and the Israelites (Manor interviewed by researcher on site at Shechem July 2019).

Jacob's sons deceitfully agreed to give Dinah as a wife to Shechem with one stipulation—that all the men of Shechem submit to circumcision. The biblical text notes that the men of Shechem agreed to the procedure, but on the third day after their circumcision (Gen 34:25) Dinah's brothers and sons of Jacob, Simeon and Levi, took their swords and killed all the males of the city including Hamor and his son, Shechem. They then proceeded (Gen 34:28–29) to take all their wealth and their little ones and their wives, blending them in with their culture.

From the biblical text (Gen 46:5–27) one learns that a terrible famine in the land prompted Israel (Jacob and his clan) to descend into Egypt. It is reasonable to assume that all the family remained in Egypt until Moses—but perhaps soon after the famine ended some of the family returned to Canaan around Shechem (Manor 2013:107). Such a scenario also fits well with Abimelech's later argument for his matrilineal connections to Shechem in Judges 9:1–3:

> Now Abimelech the son of Jerubbaal went to Shechem to his mother's relatives and said to them and to the whole clan of his mother's family, 'Say in the ears of all the leaders of Shechem, "Which is better for you, that all seventy of the

one slope of Mt Ebal and the other six tribes across from them on the slope of Mt Gerizim. When this event took place (see Josh 8:30ff; Josh 24) the Canaanite city of Shechem was inhabited by the Canaanites—the proximity of where Israel met to hear from Joshua and the city of Shechem is astonishing—why no conflict?

> sons of Jerubbaal rule over you?" Remember also that I am your bone and your flesh.'

Perhaps, after the famine was over some of these people came back to Shechem rather than going down to Egypt with Jacob/Israel and his clan. [149]

Based on the above analysis of the Symbiosis Hypothesis, it appears that there is enough reason to include, at least in some small way, this model in the overall conclusion this thesis will shortly reach.

7.6 The Auto-Ethnogenesis Model

Dever's positive assessment of the Peasant Revolt Model, and his real insight and its continuing value is that it focuses for the first time attention on the indigenous origins of the early Israelite people–a position which virtually all scholars now accept (2003:74).[150] Manor noted that the Auto-Ethnogenesis Model[151] presented by Dever contends that the Canaanites became dissatisfied with the Late Bronze Age society under the mantle of the Egyptian Amarna rule, and retreated to the interior of the country from the significantly more densely occupied coastal area (2003:175–182). Bunimovitz and Lederman follow a completely different track, working from the premise that the people of Beth-Shemesh carved out their identity as Israelites under conflicting threats of identity—in other words, they chose to become Israel, begin worship of Yahweh and stop eating pork. They referred to this as the 'border effect'. Dever, Bunimovitz and Lederman, like other advocates of this model, basically operate from the premise that what became Israel was a *self*-generated people definition that emerged from the resident Canaanite society (Manor 2013:100).

Bunimovitz and Lederman have excavated at Tel Beth-Shemesh since 1990, some twenty-nine years. As a border town of eighth-century Israel, its proximity with the Philistines was a draw for the excavators—as they set out to understand the exchange

[149] Manor interviewed by researcher on site at Shechem July 2019..

[150] Dever did not accept the Peasant Revolt Model of Mendenhall and Gottwald noting that 'However revolting the ancient peasants may have been, they are not likely to have constituted a major component in the mix of early Israelite peoples' (2003:73).

[151] Manor coined this phrase in a presentation at Faulkner University in 2012, published in 2013, noting that it is a permutation of the Peasant Revolt Model (2013:100).

and interplay between Beth-Shemesh and its neighbours. In a 2011 article Bunimovitz and Lederman wrote:

> A review of the geopolitical changes in the Shephelah during the Late Bronze–Iron Age transition indicates that the Canaanite inhabitants of Beth-Shemesh took advantage of their location at the Philistine periphery and resisted Philistine hegemony. By denying food ways (eating and drinking) that symbolized their new aggressive neighbors, the people of Beth-Shemesh culturally identified themselves as 'non-Philistines'. (2011:37).

Bunimovitz and Lederman also note an inverse process, by which elements of Philistine culture were adopted by Canaanites living with the Philistine territory—but whether resisting or adopting the indigenous population of the Shephelah changed its previous way of life during the Iron Age I (2011:37).

Both tracks of the Auto-Ethnogenesis Model, Dever and Bunimovitz/Lederman are subject to the same problems—how does one explain what prompted the people to subscribe to a radically different religious identity, and, with food sources strained why would people suddenly decide to do away with a significant food source with which they were familiar and which helped them to survive? Another issue to consider is the Merneptah stele, which notes the presence of a people by the name of Israel in Canaan in the thirteenth century BC, around 1207 BC.

7.6.1 Yahwism

One must ask for an explanation as to why a group of people, such as the Canaanites, would cease worshipping their gods and begin to worship Yahweh? As far as this thesis could ascertain, Bunimovitz and Lederman have not offered any explanation as to why this occurred among the Canaanites. One would assume that they would have included this as one of the resistance markers the Canaanites employed to further maintain a separate identity from the Philistine aggression.

Dever's assessment of aesthetics, ideology and religion is that the intangible nature of the three may make them seem invisible to the archaeologists—no matter how intently he or she looks for them (2003:125). Religious beliefs can only be inferred from material culture remains, but cultic practices are often clear; thus, Dever suggests

that the worship of Yahweh is nothing more than an outgrowth from Canaanite religion as the new self-identified Israelites initiated new practices out of their former religious paraphernalia (Dever 2003:199–200). Archaeologically, Yahweh is as invisible in Iron I villages as he was said to be later in biblical Israel (Dever 2003:128). The temples and their elaborate paraphernalia that is so typical of Late Bronze Age Canaanite society simply disappeared by the end of the thirteenth century BC. However, the more one learns about official religion and especially about folk religion in the entire biblical period, the more it is evident that it was an outgrowth of Canaanite religion, no matter how much Yahwism eventually transformed it later in the Monarchy (Dever 2003:200). It is the opinion of this thesis that neither Dever nor Bunimovitz and Lederman deal adequately with the question of why the Canaanites adopted the worship of Yahweh.

McCarter is in agreement with Dever, Bunimovitz and Lederman in regard to Auto-Ethnogenesis:

> I would describe the process that Israel went through when it established itself in Canaan as a process of ethnic self-identification. It involved Israel's drawing boundary lines between itself and other peoples. This is why the question of where the increased Iron I population in the central hills came from is really a secondary issue in explaining Israelite origin. Wherever they came from–and I think their origin was diverse–they became a single people by drawing an ethnic boundary around themselves through the development of an elaborate genealogy. An important part of this boundary drawing involved religion (1992:129).

According to McCarter, Yahwism and Israel arose at the same time as a part of the same process (1992:129). Dever notes that 'we have very little archaeological evidence in the 12th or 11th century BCE. of early Israelite religious beliefs or practice; however, that is not to say that they did not exist, but they are not very accessible to the archaeologist' (1992:35).

If one gives proper credence to the biblical text, clearly the God of the Israelites (Yahweh) was with them from the beginning of their existence as Israel—the twelve tribes or twelve sons of Jacob. The Israelites were descendants of Abraham—people who would inherit the land God could not give to Abraham because of his long-

suffering with the sinful Amorites. When the time arrived for punishment of the Amorites (Canaanites, Hivites, and so on), Yahweh sent the Israelites into the land of Canaan to administer his justice and fulfil the promise made to the Patriarch Abraham. The worship of Yahweh was not a new development any more than the Israelites were a new development forged out of fear for their identity. They knew who they were—the chosen people of Yahweh, although their actions often did not reflect it.

7.6.2 Why No Pork?

The argument that the Canaanites at Beth-Shemesh, or at any other site, suddenly stopped eating pork in order to avoid identifying with the Philistine aggressors simply does not compute logically. On the one hand, pork consumption in nearby Philistine centres climbed to unprecedented levels of about twenty percent; on the other hand, analysis of over twelve thousand animal bones from Iron Age I Beth-Shemesh proves that pork was entirely avoided at this site (Hesse, Brown and Griffith 2016:255–265). Bunimovitz and Lederman account for zero-pork consumption as an attempt at 'otherness', noting:

> One conspicuous way to emphasize 'their otherness' vis-à-vis Philistine identity–apparent at Beth-Shemesh–would have been to avoid pork consumption in contrast with Philistine dietary habits (2011:46).

The distinct break in pork consumption between the Late Bronze Age and the Iron Age correlates with the arrival of the Sea Peoples who were consummate pork consumers (Bunimovitz and Lederman 2009:123).

Once again this thesis finds a reasonable convergence with the archaeological data, that is, the Iron Age I distribution of pig bones at Philistine sites in comparison with Beth-Shemesh, in that the biblical text clearly notes that one of the commandments given to the Israelites was to abstain from eating pork. It is more likely that the inhabitants of Iron I Beth-Shemesh were Israelites honouring their dietary laws rather than Canaanites who were resisting the Philistines by avoiding a meat product that was a staple ingredient for their subsistence. Assuming that Beth-Shemesh was Canaanite but became Israel, it would be more reasonable to infer that they would

gravitate toward an alternative rather than abruptly change simply because of the Philistine presence. Manor correctly notes that, 'Given a choice, the Canaanites would reasonably have aligned more readily with those with whom they shared a Mesopotamian heritage than with the drastically different Philistines' (2013:108–109).

7.6.3 The Merneptah Stele

The Merneptah Stele, a black granite slab measuring over seven and a half feet tall, is covered with hieroglyphic writing mainly recounting the exploits of Pharaoh Merneptah during his Libyan campaign. Near the end of the writing on the stele, Merneptah recalls his earlier victories in a military campaign in Canaan. The stele was discovered at Thebes at the end of the twentieth century.

There are two universally agreed facts about the Merneptah Stele–one is that it dates to *c.*1207 BC, and the other is that it mentions Israel in connection with this earlier campaign in Canaan (Shanks 1992:17). In hieroglyphic writing it is the earliest extra-biblical mention of Israel.[152] Not only was the most powerful man in the world at that time aware of Israel—he boasted that their defeat was one of the most important achievements of his reign. Of course, as did all kings and pharaohs, he exaggerated somewhat by saying Israel's seed was no more. The fact is that Israel was already a military force to be reckoned with right at the time of the transition period between the Late Bronze Age and Iron Age I.[153] A likely time frame for the encounter between Merneptah's forces and those of Israel would be shortly after Joshua's death and during the period of the Judges (Manor, in phone interview by researcher 2019). Thus, the Egyptian campaign of Merneptah had nothing to do with the conquest scenario of Israel in Canaan.

[152] The determinative attached to Canaan, which introduces the set of four, is the determinative for a foreign land. The determinative attached to Israel is for a people, not a foreign land (Shanks 1992:19).

[153] The campaign was some five years prior to the inscription (1212 BC)

The Merneptah Stele is a troubling bit of evidence for those who advocate Israel's existence only begins with the Monarchy. In addition, it seems logical that the Merneptah Stele is also a problem for those who advocate Israel's existence is the result of indigenous Canaanites who self-identified as Israel in order to resist losing their identity to the Philistines. It is not enough for some to say that this mention of Israel refers to something else—the nature of that something else is not made clear (Shanks 1992:20). Israel was a force in Canaan as early as 1207 BC; they were not Canaanites.

7.6.4 Auto-Ethnogenesis: Final Verdict

This thesis concludes that the Auto-Ethnogenesis Model contributes little, if anything, to the question of the origin of Israel in Canaan. If one accepts the premise, as does this thesis, that Israel did not fully conquer Canaan as the Lord commanded, but instead ceased military action and settled in the land with many of the Canaanites as neighbours—then it is possible that some slight form of auto-ethnogenesis was involved in the ultimate formation of Israel as the ruling nation in Canaan. It is possible that utopian-seeking Canaanites simply self-identified themselves as Israelites rather than Canaanites. Perhaps not a good analogy, but a similar phenomenon exists in modern-day Israel—that is, there are many Arab towns and villages living under Israeli law, that are considered Israeli citizens. In some manner, it seems logical that these Arabs became citizens of Israel, without becoming Jews, but in some sense self-identified as Israeli citizens.

7.7 Conquest by Imagination Theory: The Minimalist School of Thought

In tongue-in-cheek fashion, briefly, the minimalist school of thought was introduced by way of what this thesis referred to as the Conquest by Imagination Theory.[154] In essence, the introduction of this theory/non-theory was intended to demonstrate what this thesis considers an absurd position–namely that there is no history whatsoever to be found in the Bible. Furthermore, the minimalist position in regard to archaeological

[154] The phrase 'tongue in cheek' denotes something said or written without really meaning it. Certainly this is the case with the Conquest by Imagination Theory.

evidence is to pick and choose evidence which advances its agenda and reject what does not confirm its positions. Therefore, this thesis does nothing more with the minimalist school of thought—considering it irrelevant to the discussion of the origin of Israel in Canaan.

7.8 Summary of Chapter Seven: The Settlement of Israel in Canaan: A New Perspective

In this chapter, the thesis exhibits some necessary repetitive material—necessary in the sense that when mentioned again, a deeper analysis of the subject is conducted. For instance, the models or theories of how Israel emerged in Canaan have been noted in earlier chapters, but now the strengths and weaknesses are dealt with in a manner that takes into account the relationship of the material culture and the biblical texts. The analysis continues to suggest a new perspective that will eventually be fully disclosed in the final chapter.

As the models are discussed, relevant subjects, such as the significance of the Merneptah Stele, possible ethnic markers (pottery, four-room houses, cisterns and silos) are evaluated and interjected into the question of Israelite settlement in Canaan. An important relevant issue concerning the continuation of the material culture from the Late Bronze Age into the Iron Age I period is raised, and a new perspective is proposed—one that converges nicely with the biblical text and offers a plausible explanation for the clear overlap of Canaanite material culture into the period of Israelite occupation of the land.

An example of the expansion of the discussion, in terms of a repetitive look at models, is clearly shown in the new perspective concerning the failure of Israel to engage militarily in the central highlands of Canaan. Once again the biblical texts connect or converge smoothly with the archaeological evidence in presenting a consistent argument for some kind of symbiotic relationship at work between the Israelites and the occupants of central Canaan. This scenario fits well with the biblical accounts, especially in regard to Hamor the Hivite’s son Shechem who raped Jacob’s daughter Dinah, and the treacherous way the sons of Jacob dealt with them.

In each one of the sections of this chapter a bit of the ‘new perspective’ has been hinted at through noting the role or possible role each model played in the overall picture of the origin of Israel in Canaan. A significant ‘tightness’ or ‘fit’ in so many places points the thesis on toward the presentation of a new model—an Eclectic Model. The final task in chapter eight will be the presentation and evaluation of this new model.

CHAPTER EIGHT

THE EMERGENCE OF ISRAEL IN CANAAN: AN ECLECTIC MODEL

8.1 Introduction

In a 1993 article in *Biblical Archaeology Review* Thomas Davis noted that field archaeologists no longer ask 'can archaeology prove the Bible true?'—instead they ask sociological questions, economic questions and anthropological questions about ancient societies (1993:54). This certainly was not the case from the 1920s to about 1970, as the Bible, rather than the nature of the archaeological data, directed the kinds of questions archaeologists asked (Davis 1993:54). Fast-forward to 2010 and one finds that archaeologists, in the main, are in agreement with Bunimovitz and Faust:

> We envision a different integration between archaeology and the Bible. On the one hand, an archaeological agenda, independent of the biblical text, will open a much wider range of social and cultural questions. On the other, using the Bible as a cultural document to answer these questions will restore its central place in the archaeological discourse of the biblical period. Conceiving of both biblical text and ancient material artifacts as cultural documents, we believe that their inspection will be fruitful and enlightening. Words and artifacts can give us access to the mindset of the people of the biblical period. Encapsulated in both are the worldviews, cosmology, perceptions of landscape, ideology, symbolism, etc. of the people who produced them. The insights gained by this approach will eventually result in a better understanding of biblical political history (2010:43).

As noted earlier, this thesis does not recoil from the new direction taken by most field archaeologists—that is, allowing the material data (artefacts) to determine the course of an excavation—that is fine. However, while supposedly not discarding the biblical text, the field archaeologists should allow for the biblical text, especially when there is an obvious convergence, to have its day as well.[155]

[155] see William Dever's work regarding convergence (2001:82–84).

The demise of biblical archaeology in the 1970s was due in part to the competition from foreign national schools and a crisis in funding (Dever 2001:83). Dever, quite successfully,[156] initiated a systematic onslaught to change Biblical Archaeology into a more secular field known as Syro-Palestinian archaeology (1980:41–48). However, in the 1990s Dever was also one of the leading proponents of bringing the Bible back into the mix with archaeological interpretation, realizing that the total split between the two fields was more than he had bargained for (Bunimovitz and Faust 2010:47). Bunimovitz and Faust note that Dever's plea to rebuild Biblical Archaeology along new lines of construction was, generally speaking, unheeded (2010:47). Even with Dever's renewed interest in reuniting the biblical text and archaeological data he continued to assign very little credence to the biblical texts:

> In particular, let us look at the biblical texts. We do not have and never will have the *editio princeps.* What we do have is a textual tradition that has been deliberately edited and reedited over more than a thousand years, as well as in a secondary process of transmission that usually cannot be reconstructed. What we confront in the Hebrew Bible is thus a version of a version of a version in an endless hermeneutical chain. That is why it is pointless to insist on 'what the Bible says', *Which* Bible? *Whose* Bible? (2017a:16–17).

According to Dever, archaeology is a superior source in that it allows us to leap over the intervening centuries, as it were, to come face to face with the primary data, the realia of the past (2017a:17).

Ben-Tor writing in 1992 referenced the call going forth to sever archaeology from the Bible and to abandon the term 'biblical archaeology'. However, he responded by dismissing this suggestion on the grounds that the two fields are naturally related and mutually enriching:

> It is as unreasonable as to demand that classical archaeology be separated from Homer and other writings of antiquity. Eliminate the Bible from the

[156] Dever's efforts to disembowel Biblical Archaeology from professional North American archaeology in the 'Holy Land' was more successful than he may have anticipated (Levy 2010:6)

> archaeology of the Land of Israel in the second and first millennia B.C.E., and you have deprived it of its soul. The way to overcome the difficulties associated with biblical archaeology should be sought in the education of a public unaware of what constitutes a legitimate demand from archaeology, and in the mutual cooperation of biblicists, historians, and archaeologists, who are not always sufficiently informed about the disciplines of their colleagues (Ben-Tor 1992:9).

The public, according to Ben-Tor, should be taught what archaeology can (and should) or cannot do, while biblical archaeologists should be guided by two seemingly opposed approaches: on the one hand, modern research demands that they specialize in restricted fields, and on the other, they must acquire at least a basic grounding in bordering fields of study, chiefly in biblical studies and in the history and languages of the ancient Near East (1992:9)

Ben-Tor's analysis of what results if the Bible is severed from the archaeological process is right on target. Excavating a site in the land known as the Holy Land, during a period referred to in the biblical text without at least some involvement of the Bible is a site without foundation—without soul.

Of course, interpretation of biblical texts can, and often does, result in two, in some cases more than two, different conclusions. This thesis demonstrated that confusion regarding the Conquest Model occurs when one views the story in Joshua 1–12 literally and not theologically. There certainly are historical facts within these chapters, but they are dominated, in terms of whether or not Israel took the land by military conquest, by the theological position that God gave them the land because of his promise to the Israelites' forefather Abraham. This was in spite of the fact that Israel failed to follow God's command to eliminate all the Canaanites in the land.

In the case of archaeological data, the same phenomenon occurs in regard to interpretation of the material data. What was considered as the proper interpretation of the data one season may change totally after several seasons or several years. In some cases, the interpretation of material data may change from one season to the next. As an example, the author of this thesis excavating at Tel Beth-Shemesh in June 2004 was part of an effort to remove a series of bones surfacing from an obvious pit outside a doorway of a large building. A team of students from Canada, familiar with

bones, removed the skeletal remains of what was initially said to be a young horse buried upside-down in the pit—a pregnant horse. Upon return to the dig in 2005, it was discovered, after their analysis and putting together of the skeletal remains, the young horse was actually a young donkey, and what had led to the original idea of pregnancy was actually part of the animal's brain.

A few more examples may be illustrative of the problems involved in interpretation. A destruction layer of a Canaanite town mentioned in the conquest cycle in the book of Joshua may be considered as an illustration of the story told in those chapters; but it may equally be interpreted by others in a different manner (Mazar A 1992:281). Further, Iron I settlements seen by some as evidence of Israelite settlement may be explained by others as settlements of other, non-Israelite ethnic groups (Mazar A 1992:281). Continuing with A Mazar's thoughts:

> Archaeological material is sometimes utilized indiscriminately in historical studies. We must take into account that excavation data can lead to different interpretations; such interpretations are often subjective and slanted toward a particular historical view. An overall examination of the conquest tradition in the archaeological context illustrates the complexity of the subject and the various possibilities for interpretation of the finds (1990:329).

The point is that the silent archaeological evidence may always be interpreted in more ways than one. This is particularly true when dealing with what is referred to as 'gaps', as in a lack of certain ceramic groups—this is evidence from silence and is not always conclusive (Mazar A 1992:241).

Although it is most likely that the modern twenty-first century archaeologist would take exception to Zertal's 1991 assessment, there still is some echo of truth even today with all the advanced technological equipment:

> In truth, even today archaeology lies somewhere in that vague no-man's-land between the natural sciences and the humanities. Although archaeology uses some modern technologies, many of its conclusions are drawn on the basis of intuition, rather than on objective measure. The quality of excavation, surveying and publication of results is very uneven (1991:30).

Zertal goes on to say that ‘after years of archaeological research, however, I believe it is impossible to explore Israel’s origins without the Bible’ (1991:43).

After sixteen seasons of work at Tel Beth-Shemesh, it is apparent to the author of this thesis that advancements in excavation techniques and equipment are being constantly and rapidly made. The future is bright for even greater clarity in interpreting the material finds. However, it is also apparent to this seasoned excavator that much of the interpretive work is at best hypothesis and awaits the smoking gun to confirm the final conclusion. In the case of Tel Beth-Shemesh, there are many convergences in terms of geographic location and the biblical texts. For example, the Tel is surrounded on three sides by the beautiful Sorek Valley, the biblical location of the return of the Ark of the Covenant from the hands of the Philistines (1 Sam 6); furthermore, it is only a mile or so across the Sorek Valley to the north to arrive at Zorah, the biblical home of a judge of Israel—Samson; and finally, looking down the Valley to the west toward the Mediterranean Sea some eight miles is the biblical site of Timnah, where Samson took a Philistine woman as his wife.

Reflecting back on two institutions formed early on during the height of the biblical archaeology movement, it is understandable why archaeologists turned against the so-called biblical archaeology. The Palestine Exploration Fund was founded in 1865 with the stated purpose or aim of making accurate and systematic investigation of the archaeology, topography, the geology and physical geography, the manners and customs of the Holy Land, for *biblical illustration*. In contrast, the Committee of the Palestine Exploration Society, founded in New York some five years later, defined its mission as the illustration and *defence of the Bible.*

There is a real difference, one that tended to control excavation strategies, in excavating and investigating sites in the Holy Land for illustration of the biblical text as opposed to excavating and investigating with the purpose of not only illustration of the Bible, but also defence of the biblical texts. Thus the rub, the tension finally boiled over around 1970 with the movement to jettison the term Biblical Archaeology and replace it with Syro-Phoenician Archaeology.

It has been the position of this thesis from the beginning that neither archaeological data nor biblical texts supplant the other in terms of importance or in terms of

determining the direction of excavation or interpretation of material. It has been pointed out in several places that both disciplines should be accepted as partners in respect to what each is called upon to do, or in respect to what each one is capable of doing. It is in this light that the final pages of this thesis are forthcoming.

8.2 Israel in Transjordan: Moving towards Canaan

After the death of Moses, the Lord said to Joshua the son of Nun, Moses' assistant, 'Moses my servant is dead. Now therefore arise, go over this Jordan, you and all this people, into the land that I am giving to them, to the people of Israel.' (Josh 1:1). As noted earlier, this thesis assumes there was an exodus of Israelites from the bondage of Egypt, led by Moses, that resulted in a wilderness wandering that ended at the death of Moses and the orders given to Joshua to take the land God had promised to the descendants of Abraham. What nation would invent such a crazy story, that they were slaves in Egypt and they left that country and came to this country [Israel], and then make that the kernel of all their history (Shanks 1983:17). Even if one wants to minimize it, there is a core of truth there—a historical core even if it did not happen exactly as it is recorded (Shanks 1983:17).

Even though there are sections of Joshua which are definitely theological, the information given is within the context of a real movement of the nation of Israel initiated by God's command to their new leader, Joshua. This movement towards the entrance into Canaan was preceded by a period of settlement and conflicts in the region of the Transjordan.

In Deuteronomy 3:12–22, prior to the Israelites' entry into Canaan, Moses gives the land conquered during their Transjordan campaign to the Reubenites and the half-tribe of Manasseh with a reminder (warning) that they must have all their fighting men cross over armed to fight with their brothers who have not yet been awarded land in Canaan (Deut 3:18). Their wives and children and the abundance of livestock may remain in the cities given them; however, they will not return to them until their brothers have received their land allotment (Deut 3:18–20). Thus there is an Israelite presence in Transjordan prior to the full complement of Israelites entering Canaan near Jericho.

Israel waited on the plains of Moab to enter Canaan. The biblical narrative is very clear as to where the earliest Israelites came from—east of the Jordan (Rainey 2008a:46). Rainey's certainty is based upon his expertise in Northwest Semitic languages, demonstrating that Hebrew has more affinities with Transjordanian languages (such as Aramaic and Moabite) than with Phoenician that is coastal Canaanite (Rainey 2008a:49). These linguistic affinities between Hebrew and the Transjordanian languages evidence the common heritage of the early Israelites with other pastoral nomadic Transjordanian tribes such as the Ammonites, Moabites, Edomites and further east, the Arameans (Rainey 2008a:49, 50).

The book of Numbers (chapters 13–36) tells the story of Israel's time and preparation in Transjordan. It was not a time of peace and settlement. The kings of Transjordan, Sihon and Og were defeated. The book of Deuteronomy reviews how the Israelites defeated King Sihon when he refused them passage through his land, and attacked them at Jahaz. Soon afterwards, the Israelites spied out Jazer and captured it. As they headed north from Jazer, the Israelites were attacked by King Og's forces at Edrei, but they defeated him and took control of his land as well. Both Sihon and Og were Amorites (Deut 3:8). A significant part of the land, from the Arnon River in the south, to the Yarmuk River in the north and on up into Bashan was taken by the forces of Israel. In fact the text notes:

> So the Lord our God gave into our hand Og also, the king of Bashan, and all his people and we struck him down until he had no survivor left. And we took all his cities at that time—there was not a city that we did not take from them—sixty cities, the whole region of Argob, the kingdom of Og in Bashan. All these cities were fortified with high walls, gates, and bars, besides very many unwalled villages. And we devoted them to destruction, as we did to Sihon the king of Heshbon, devoting to destruction every city, men, women, and children. But all the livestock and the spoil of the cities we took as our plunder. So we took the land at that time out of the hand of the two kings of the Amorites who were beyond the Jordan, from the Valley of the Arnon to Mount Hermon (the Sidonians call Hermon Sirion, while the Amorites call it Senir), all the cities of the tableland and all Gilead and Bashan, as far as Salecah and Edrei, cities of the kingdom of Og in Bashan (Deut 3:3–10).

These narratives provide a good historical background for the eventual invasion of Canaan from the Transjordan region.

Until recent times the area in Transjordan from the Mishor plain north to Bashan seemed to show very little clear evidence of any history of settlement in Late Bronze/Iron I of the thirteenth and twelfth centuries BC. This was the area and time frame of the initial settlement there by the tribes of Reuben, Gad and East Manasseh (Num 32; Deut 3:12–20; and Josh 12:1–6, 13:8–32)—however, intensive survey and study has provided a clearer picture of the situation (Kitchen 2003:198).

Nelson Glueck led the pioneering archaeological survey work in the 1930s on the Transjordanian plateau, concluding that the region was devoid of settlements during much of the Middle and Late Bronze ages (Glueck 1934). However, a series of new settlements, indicating the arrival of new peoples, were established—likely by the Ammonites, Moabites, Edomites, and Israelites (Aharoni 1970:101). More recent surveys revised the picture set forth by Glueck in the 1930s—specifically demonstrating that there was no gap in occupation in Transjordan, and that in the northern and central zones there were quite a few settled mounds. It is now recognized that Glueck's survey was superficial—quite simply, he overlooked hundreds of archaeological sites in his survey of Transjordan (Mattingly 1983:252). Glueck's knowledge of ceramics was also wholly inadequate for the task to which he applied himself (Franken and Power 1971:119). Furthermore, some scholars accused Glueck of being unduly influenced by his religious convictions (Franken and Power 1971:119).

Small Iron Age I sites in Transjordan resembling Israelite Settlements west of the Jordan are chiefly in the Gilead, north of the Yabbok (Mazar A 1992:297). These Iron Age I settlements have been identified, mainly between the Yabbok and Yarmuk rivers. South of this region the number of sites declines until in Edom none are found (1992:297). In the Gilead survey ten small Iron Age I settlements were found, resembling the parallel phenomenon in the hill of Ephraim and Manasseh. These settlements may be taken as an expression of the settlement of the half-tribe of Manasseh in the Gilead, after a pattern similar to that found west of the Jordan (1992:298). The overall picture in the Mishor plain, Gilead, and up into Bashan is one of a series of Late Bronze II settlements, some modest, some walled, which passed

over into the Iron Age IA phase of occupation that showed new cultural features such as collared-rim jars, four-roomed houses, or both together (Kitchen 2003:198).

These features, collared-rim jars and four-room houses are not a guarantee of an Israelite presence, but it remains true that these are characteristics of the Israelite settlement in Canaan:

> All this is fully consistent with the biblical tradition that the Hebrews came north from the fringes of Moab proper (south of the Arnon) to the Mishor plains, and defeated the two minor Amorite kingdoms of Sihon and Og that occupied Mishor/south Gilead and north Gilead into Bashan respectively. The Mishor and environs were a prime sheep-rearing region, as our geographers can still tell us, hence the very natural request of Reuben and Gad to stay on in that area (Num 32) (Kitchen 2003:199).

In time, old rivalries between Moab, the Israelites, and Ammon broke out over who should control the Mishor area. Sihon had taken it from Moab, then Israel took it from Sihon and later Moab took it back, and the seesaw went on. Is it any wonder that some of the Iron Age IA sites ended up being destroyed and burned, some never to rise again. Thus, whatever minor gaps currently appear in our total documentation (so for Heshbon, as at Jericho), the overall picture in Numbers/Deuteronomy and Joshua makes very good sense, and fits well the known archaeological and related context (Kitchen 2003:199). It should be noted that Israel did not originate on the desert fringe of Moab, but further back where Egypt and the Sinai have claims (2003:199).

The remains from survey work done over three seasons (1979, 1981, 1982), investigating only a small portion of biblical Edom, produced only a handful of sherds from the Middle and Late Bronze Ages (MacDonald 1979:58, 59). An examination of 585 sites in Moab between Wadi Mujib and Wadi Hesa (the biblical rivers of Arnon and Zered) again yielded only a small amount of archaeological data from the Middle and Late Bronze Ages (Miller 1977:89). In Moab, some sherds and flimsy architectural remains have been found at Heshbon and Dibon (Mazar A 1992:297). Attributing ethnicity to these sites is extremely difficult due to the complex history of the region.

The large site in the land of Ammon (Sahab) is located some 12 km (7½ miles) east of Amman. It is a large site (250 dunams/60+ acres) likely occupied during the Late

Bronze and the Iron Age I periods (Mazar A 1992:297). The material culture of the Iron Age I probably represents the Ammonites (1992:358). Our knowledge of the material culture of Transjordan in the Iron Age I comes from a small number of surveys and excavations. Two major sites of Jordan Valley have been excavated: Tell es-Sa'idiyeh (tentatively identified with biblical Zaphon and Tell Deir 'Alla, east of the Damiyah bridge, identified by some as Succoth (1992:97).

The Madaba Plateau Region (MPR) is the traditional territorial boundaries of Reuben (Josh 13:15–23). This territorial boundary must have somehow also reflected a cultural boundary as well (Cross 1988:65). Herr carefully qualifies his conclusions concerning the identity of the inhabitants of the MPR, but noting that the most likely candidate remains the Reuben tribal group (1999:64).

Clearly the biblical account of the Israelites' travels (Num 32; Deut 3:12–20; Josh 12:1–6; 13:8–32) and conquest in Transjordan and eventual settling down of the tribes of Reuben, Gad and East Manasseh fits nicely (converges in many instances) with the archaeological patterns set forth in the survey work in Transjordan. Finkelstein notes that the Bible is the only epigraphical source available as a starting point to discuss characteristics of Israelite settlements since the characteristics of the geographical location are known only from one source, the Bible (1988:28).

It was a lengthy encampment at the northern end of the Dead Sea. Joshua, as any good military commander would, sent out a two-man reconnaissance team to feel out the enemy's strength and preparedness for battle. Jericho was the first target for assault upon their entry into the land.

8.3 Israel in Canaan: the Merneptah Stele

There is no doubt that a people (Israel) resided in some capacity in the land of Canaan as early as the thirteenth century BC. This indisputable evidence is found in the form of an inscription on Pharaoh Merneptah's Stele (often referred to as the Israel stele) that names Israel as one of the people he defeated on his campaign in Canaan.

This famous hieroglyphic text, discovered in 1896 by Petrie,[157] dates to about 1205 BC, and refers to 'Israel' at this time as a people—not a country or a nation (Rainey 2008a:45, 46). The Merneptah Stele has been described as '…the point of reference for any discussion regarding the Israelites (Merling 1996:14). Clearly, Israel was in Canaan by the thirteenth century BC.

Questions, in regard to the name Israel on the stele, are to what extent these people are in control of Canaan, and where did these people recognized as Israel come from? Thus, the thrust of this thesis has been to explore the various models/theories that have arisen over the past ninety-plus years as to the origin of Israel in Canaan. The Conquest Model proposed by Albright theorizes that Israel took the land of Canaan by military force, crossing the Jordan and initially attacking and destroying the biblical site of Jericho. Alt and Noth countered Albright with a theory referred to as the Peaceful Infiltration Model, noting that the people who came to be known as Israel entered peacefully and settled on the fringes of Canaanite culture. Mendenhall and Gottwald made the case for a Peasant Revolt or Revolution, suggesting that the people who became known as Israelites were actually indigenous Canaanites dissatisfied with the oversight of the oppressive Canaanite city-state rulers and thus they revolted with the help of others who had entered Canaan. Fritz's model came to be known as the Symbiosis Hypothesis in which he believed the Israelites were related in some way to the Canaanites, and thus they entered into a symbiotic relationship that resulted in the birth of the nation of Israel; the Auto-Ehnogenesis Model originated with Bunimovitz, Lederman and Dever.

8.4 Israel Enters Canaan: Albright's Conquest Model

Following the lengthy encampment, near the northern end of the Dead Sea, Israel crossed into Canaan. The Israelites entered the land of Canaan from the east, crossing the Jordan River near the northern end of the Dead Sea. The first major

[157] Merneptah's stele is in the Cairo Museum in Egypt.

Canaanite city approached and taken by the Israelites was Jericho (Deut 6). According to the biblical text (Deut 9:1), Israel is told they are about to cross the Jordan to go in and dispossess nations greater and stronger than themselves, which live in large cities that have walls up to the sky. Further, Scripture makes it clear (Deut 9:4–6) that it is not because of Israel's righteousness that God will give them this land, but because of the wickedness of the people they are dispossessing, and because of the promise God made to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.

The biblical record (Deut 6) tells that the city of Jericho was a walled-city with securely barred entry gates. However, the Joshua text does not describe Jericho as a major city, unlike a site such as Gibeon in Joshua 10:2 or Hazor in Joshua 11:10 (Hess 1996:138). Furthermore, God gave specific instructions as to what, when and how the Israelites were to gain access to the city, which included Joshua and his fighting men marching around the city once a day for six days and on the seventh day marching around the city seven times. Priests, trumpets of rams' horns and the Ark of the Covenant were also part of the parade. On the seventh day, after completion of all the commands of God, trumpets were sounded, the army shouted and the walls collapsed allowing Israel to rush into the city. The articles of bronze and iron, all the silver and gold were devoted to the Lord and not to be taken by the people. The inhabitants of the city were killed (all except Rahab and her family), and the city and everything in it was burned.

In Joshua chapter 2:5, 7, 15, and chapter 6:5, 20, the biblical text notes that Jericho was a strongly fortified city. Further, the text demonstrates that Israel's attack came at harvest time, and the inhabitants of the city did not have time to flee with their foodstuffs (Josh 6:1). However, the siege was short (Josh 6:15) and decisive (the walls of the city were levelled (Josh 6:20)—some would add because of an earthquake rather than attribute the victory to God. When one compares the biblical narrative with the archaeological evidence, the correlation is substantial—examining the archaeological evidence at Jericho with the biblical narrative describing the Israelite destruction demonstrates a remarkable agreement (Wood 1990:53).

Evidence of significant erosion on the tell makes it difficult to determine how much Late Bronze occupation there was at the site (Hess 1996:151). Absence of Late

Bronze fortification at the site is not unusual, since where Late Bronze fortification is found, the walls do not circle the city (1996:151). It leaves open the question as to whether or not the city continued to use the massive Middle Bronze walls already in place (1996:151).[158] Boling suggests that it is not beyond the realm of possibility that it was the destruction of the Middle Bronze fortification at Jericho that lies at the basis of the number of details in Joshua chapter 6 (Boling 1982:212).

The conquest of Jericho, according to the biblical text, occurred in an extraordinary manner described in great detail. The Lord chose to use the city as an object lesson for impressing two distinct things on his people: (1) they were receiving the land solely as a gift from God's hand; (2) the land properly belonged to the Lord alone, and they had to consecrate it to him (Goslinga 1986:73).

The biblical tradition of an entry into Canaan opposite Jericho is clearly noted in the book of Joshua chapters 5–6. However, the archaeological evidence for this event is meagre (Zertal 1991:47). In fact, Kenyon set the stage for dismissing the Conquest Model as feasible by noting that there was no strongly-fortified city at Jericho in the Late Bronze Age for Joshua to conquer (1957:262).[159] However, Manor notes that Kenyon concedes that apparently there was some kind of occupation at the site 'in the second half of the Late Bronze Age, but nothing more than that' (2013:95; 1981:371). Manor correctly points out that it would have been fairer to say that no evidence of occupation has been located at Jericho rather than argue definitively that it was not occupied at the time (2013:95). While the archaeological evidence may be minimal in regard to Israel crossing the Jordan and engaging Jericho—it cannot be totally dismissed.

It has been necessary to repeat some sections already discussed earlier in this thesis for the sake of clarity, and to give foundation to this final chapter. In the case of the story of Israel's victory over Jericho, the biblical text, archaeological convergences, and in some cases the silence that lends itself to no judgment, is sufficient to make the point without needless repetition in regard to the other military events in Canaan

[158] Aharoni has suggested this to be the case, as have Yadin and others.
[159] Dever concluded that Kenyon's findings were a crushing blow to the Conquest Model (2003:45). It should be noted that it was not uncommon for Iron Age I sites to continue to use Middle Bronze fortifications.

carried out by Israel. Similarities with the comparison of the biblical text and archaeological data at Jericho are found in the case of Ai, Hazor, Lachish and Jerusalem.

The material dealing with Jericho and the Transjordan biblical texts and archaeological data present a compelling case for the Israelite movements and settlements on the east of Jordan and their initial foray into Canaan. It is the contention of this thesis that Israel did enter Canaan and did encounter and destroy Jericho and four other Canaanite cities as well as destroying the entire population of other Canaanite cities. However, the failure of the Israelites to comply with God's command to destroy the entire Canaanite population led to a limited occupation and many years of conflict and tension between Israel and the Canaanites. God had indeed given them the land of Canaan, as Joshua theologically infers; however, disobedience derailed the initial intention of God, causing the rebellious Israelites years of suffering and tension.

Thus, the Conquest Model championed by Albright and others is a component of the Eclectic Model this thesis sets forth; however, it is not the definitive model for how Israel emerged in Canaan and took the land—it is the beginning point of Israel's eventual conquering of the land.

8.5 Alt and Noth: The Peaceful Infiltration Model

Between the World Wars, European scholars searched for alternatives to the Conquest Model as set forth by Albright. In stark contrast to the Conquest Model is the theoretical opposite proposed by Albrecht Alt, and his student Martin Noth. Alt and Noth proposed a new thesis concerning the origin of Israel in Canaan based on the form critical presuppositions of Hermann Gunkel. Assuming the narratives of Joshua were late compositions written as literary constructs, rather than historical accounts, Alt and Noth postulated a peaceful entrance into Canaan (the Peaceful Infiltration Model) by a group that would come to be known as Israel. This group, entering from the desert, settled among the resident Canaanite populace and eventually gained ascendancy. Central to the argument is the need to resolve the problem of the nature of the biblical narratives, especially the discrepancy between the Israelite blitzkrieg in

Joshua 1-12 and a more complex and gradual process of settlement described in Judges 1 and elsewhere in Joshua (Coote and Whitelam 2004:108).

Alt, a leading German Protestant theologian, argued that the origin of Israel in Canaan was due to a peaceful infiltration/migration over a period of time. The basis of the theory is that the Canaanite hill country was both geographically and politically separate from the lower-lying areas of Canaan (Alt 1989:175). Alt sought to use extra-biblical sources contemporary with the time of Israel's settlement in order to build a history of the territorial divisions of the land of Canaan (Alt 1989; Hawkins 2013:36). Using mainly Egyptian sources, he concluded that Shechem was the only significant city-state left in the hill country between Jerusalem and the valley of Jezreel in the fourteenth century BC. This is the sparsely populated region in which the biblical tradition places the initial settlements of the Israelites (Hawkins 2013:27).

Before the historic periods of the Iron Age, the plains and foothills of Canaan were ruled by a city-state system. Under this system, the larger city dominated the small region around itself with a similar city-state located not far away. The area had a large number of districts each centred on a city with a hereditary prince as ruler (Alt 1989:145). The hill country, according to Alt's thinking, did not lend itself to such an organization pattern as found in the city-state system in the lower-lying plains. The underdeveloped status and its isolation were more conducive to larger territorial formations (Alt 1989:149). It was the more wide-open territorial nature of the hill country system that allowed the Israelites to settle among them without causing any great disturbance to local everyday life. Such an arrangement allowed Israel to maintain her uniqueness from the Canaanites in the hill country and the plains below (Alt 1989:167-169).

Occupation of the land of Canaan by the Israelite tribes, according to the archaeological data, demonstrates that it occurred in a very similar way to the so-called Peaceful Infiltration Model (Fritz 1987:98). However, it has been demonstrated that the Peaceful Infiltration Model alone is not adequate to account for the arrival of Israel in the land of Canaan nor Israel's becoming the dominant power over the land. However, there is an element of what may be referred to as a 'peaceful infiltration'

within the complex scenario, culminating in the emergence of Israel in Canaan. Several examples may be noted.

A study of Albright's Conquest Model clearly revealed that Israel was commanded by God to eradicate the people living in Canaan; however, they did not comply completely with this command. A Mazar makes an interesting observation concerning the Conquest Model;

> …we may conclude that…even if the Israelites were the invaders of certain Canaanite cities, the devastation was not carried out in one sweep during the same military campaign; rather, such destruction was a result of a drawn-out process of regional wars, in which a tribe or a group of tribes succeeded in destroying certain Canaanite cities (1990:334).

A Mazar postulated that successive local clashes between the Israelites and Canaanites were digested in the book of Joshua to yield a tradition of a single conquest—a telescoped reflection of a complex historical process in which some of the Canaanite city-states, weak and poor after three hundred years of Egyptian domination, were replaced during the Iron Age I by a new national entity, Israel (1990:334).

What has mistakenly been proposed as a Peaceful Infiltration into Canaan by the Israelites could just as reasonably have been the result of Israel's failure to follow through with God's command. Thus, the hill country of Canaan became the home to the Israelites who were unable to take the cities and destroy the inhabitants of Canaan. It follows that there was a sense in which there was a considerable amount of peaceful coexistence between the invading Israelites and the indigenous Canaanites. However, it was not a continual peace, and in many cases the people of Israel suffered at the hands of the Canaanites. Far from a blitzkrieg, the Israelites were stuck in a quagmire unable or unwilling to remove the Canaanites and take their land.

In the case of the Gibeonites (Josh 9), by deception the Israelites find themselves unable to destroy them—they likely entered into this flawed treaty without consulting with the Lord (Josh 9:14). There was a semblance of peace, yet the Gibeonites were forced to serve Israel in the capacity of slave labourers (Josh 9:21, 27). Be that as it

may, Israel denied themselves the opportunity to fulfil God's directive to annihilate this segment of the Canaanite population. Thus, the Gibeonites continued to live peacefully among the Israelites and were likely assimilated to some degree into the Jewish culture as the years passed on.[160]

In another instance, the Israelites were unsuccessful in completely conquering the city of Jerusalem (Judg 1:8). In spite of Israel's effort, the Jebusites quickly reoccupied the city and lived among the Benjaminites (Judg 1:21). There was apparently some element of peaceful coexistence between the Jebusites and the Israelites since the Levite's servant suggested spending the night in Jebusite-controlled Jerusalem (Judg 19:11).

Other evidence of peaceful coexistence is implied in the book of Judges' assessment of Israel's varying success in driving out the Canaanite inhabitants. Note the phraseology transitions from 'the Canaanites lived…among them' (Israel) in Judges 1:29, 30 to a reversed phraseology: 'the (Israelites) lived among the Canaanites' (Judg 1:32, 33). This reversal implies a dominant Canaanite population, at least for a while.

The failure of Israel to take the land by military might, as God commanded, will be reiterated in Joshua's reminder to steer clear of the nations remaining among Israel (Josh 23:4, 7, 12). Israel's failure meant that God would no longer drive out the Canaanites (Judg 2:3) and bring the problems that peaceful coexistence would entail.

Alt and Noth, viewed the Bible and archaeology as not providing enough data to explain the Israelite presence in Canaan—paradigms developed in other times and cultures were needed (Merling 1996:33). Once again, the biblical record and the archaeological data are not at odds, at least not to the degree often proclaimed. Entering the land in the twelfth century BC, Israel was certainly a military force to be reckoned with, as recognized on the Merneptah Stele. However, even though the Lord was with them, and in some cases took a direct hand in fighting for them, the Israelites

---

[160] In Joshua 11:19-20, the text records that no one 'made peace' with Israel except the Gibeonites. The objection is made that there was no such thing as peaceful infiltration or coexistence based on this passage. However, this statement more likely refers to a formalized peace rather than Israel's default failure of their mission.

seem to have preferred to settle in and make a home for themselves among the heathen population, in disregard of the commandments of the Lord through his servant Joshua. A similar occurrence is noted in the case of the Israelites returning from Babylonian captivity, when they turned to their own selfish pursuits and disregarded the important task of rebuilding the temple and restoring the walls of Jerusalem *c*.539–517 BC.

The concept of a peaceful infiltration is not totally appropriate, since there surely were instances of conflicts between the Israelites and their Canaanite neighbours. Further, any theory that proposes a picture so different from the biblical account must provide a plausible explanation of how the biblical picture arose (Bimson 1989:7). Most scholars agree that this has not been adequately accomplished by proponents of the Peaceful Infiltration Model.

To a certain degree, one can easily see how and why the Israelites and the Canaanites were thrown together side by side for some period of time until the full takeover of the land, with all its complexities, was brought about. However, this does not fully explain the origin of Israel in Canaan.

In the final analysis, the Peaceful Infiltration Model has, in some sense, a role to to be considered in this thesis' Eclectic Model.

8.6 Mendenhall and Gottwald: The Peasant Revolt (Social Revolution) Model

In his 1962 article, 'The Hebrew Conquest of Palestine', Mendenhall took the discussion of Israelite origin in an entirely new direction. From the outset he made it clear that his intention was to offer an alternative model to Albright's Conquest Model and Alt's Peaceful Infiltration Model (1962:66–67). Rejecting the basic assumption of both Albright and Noth that Israel came from outside the land, he, instead, interpreted Israel's formation within the turbulent context of the Late Bronze Age-Iron I transition. Mendenhall proposed that the indigenous Canaanite peasantry, in a non-violent rebellion against their Canaanite overlords, retreated to the central hill country where they met and joined forces with a small band of slaves who had escaped from Egypt. This small contingent of slaves had experienced a theophany of Yahweh while travelling in the Sinai Wilderness. Religion played an important role in Mendenhall's

assessment of the Peasant Revolt Model—according to Mendenhall, it was this Yahwistic faith revealed at Sinai, rather than ethnicity that bound the new social organization together (1962:74). This new social organization that entered Canaan, in Mendenhall's opinion, could not be explained as nomads settling down in the land—they were not nomads (2001:15).

Religion played a large role in the formation of the nation of Israel coming forth from the Peasant Revolt and their synthesis with the smaller band of slaves coming to Canaan from Egypt. Rather than ethnicity binding the people together as the nation of Israel, it was this new faith in YHWH that brought them together in this new social organization, Israel. The people who became Israel were related by experience at Sinai, not ethnicity (Coote and Whitelam 2010:12; Mendenhall 1962). According to Mendenhall, the Sinai experience demonstrated that there was an alternative to blind allegiance to a human state that required absolute obedience–the alternative was the religion of YHWH (1962:74, 87).

Mendenhall's student, Norman Gottwald, surpassed his teacher in the scholarly discussion of the Peasant Revolt Model in the 1970s as evidenced by his massive work *The Tribes of Yahweh*. In regard to the Peasant Revolt or Revolution theory, Mendenhall's one short article pales in comparison to the 916 page work *The Tribes of Yahweh* (1979). While maintaining support for the basic tenets of Mendenhall's theory, he organized the theses around a more recent political paradigm (Merling 1996:39; Gottwald 1979:12–17).

Gottwald developed his own unique approach from his own sociological experiences in the Civil Rights movement, the anti-war movement against the Vietnam War, criticisms of North American Capitalism, as well as church and school politics (1979:XXV). Further, he took as his model the medieval period of European writing, using terms such as 'serf', 'lower class', 'aristocrats', 'free citizenry', and 'Canaanite feudalism' (1979:213–214).

Gottwald agreed with his mentor that the ancestors of the Israelites were not nomads, semi-nomads or even pastoral nomads (1979:436–437). As did Mendenhall, he also had serious doubts about the homogeneity of the Israelites who left Egypt (1979:455). Like Mendenhall, he proposed that the repressed classes threw off the

bondage of the city-state structure through a series of free agrarian institutions devoid of any state form of government or class system (Gottwald 1984:37).

Gottwald departed from Mendenhall in rejecting the Mosaic covenant and its religious ideology as a significant factor in Israel's emergence from Canaanite society, expressing strong doubts about the historical value of the Exodus-Sinai traditions (1979:14–15). He noted that ancient Israel was not spawned by religious experience, but rather by political unrest steeped in class struggle (1979:34–41). It is hard to imagine class struggle playing much of a role in Israelite society, since the Torah—their religious and civil law, emphasized the equality of men. The Israelites were not known for delineating one another by class or social standing.

Gottwald's assessment diverged significantly from Mendenhall's portrayal of Israel as an apolitical theocracy bound in covenant relationship with Yahweh (Coote and Whitelam 2010:12). Instead, Gottwald focused more on the internal process, the role of the lower-class Canaanites and less on the Exodus group that may have inspired them to revolt (Hawkins 2013:41). Gottwald dropped the use of the term Peasant Revolt, as did Mendenhall, because it invited an association with European peasant uprisings (2002:190–201).

In regard to the role any kind of 'Peasant Revolt' or 'marginalized society people' played in the emergence of Israel as the dominate power in Canaan—Gottwald's position that politics had more to do with the origin of Israel than did religion seems to fit better in any position allowing for the misfits on the fringes of Canaanite society joining with and eventually becoming part of the Israelite nation ruling in Canaan.

In terms of the process, whereas Mendenhall portrays the process as a rather overnight happening, Gottwald extends the process by supplementing the 'peasant rebellion' model with one of social revolution—the latter ebbing and flowing over two centuries—the Iron I settlements in the central hill country were the work of rebel groups withdrawing to the regions of lowest resistance (Gottwald 1984:37–38). Gottwald doubted that the early Iron I destructions, which Albright saw as the basic conquest and settlement period, can be proved to be the work of the Israelites. Instead, he suggested that such wide-ranging destructions more accurately support other conclusions than a one-nation conquest (Gottwald 1979:199–200). Mendenhall

suggested that the settlers in the central hill country were rebels who withdrew, not physically and geographically, but politically and subjectively from the existing regimes (1962:73).

Based on material in earlier chapters and the short summation of the Peasant Revolt Model as espoused by Mendenhall and Gottwald, it is the conclusion of this thesis that the Peasant Revolt Model does have a limited connection with the overall question of the origin of Israel. This thesis has clearly demonstrated that the 'conquest' of Canaan by the Israelites was a lengthy[161] and complex endeavour that certainly brought into play peoples other than the Israelites.

8.7 Fritz and Finkelstein: The Symbiosis Hypothesis

Volkmar Fritz suggested that the archaeological data points to the occupation of the land of Canaan by the Israelite tribes as having occurred in a very similar way to the one posited by the Peaceful Infiltration Model (Fritz 1987:98). The various groups that settled in the country from the twelfth century onwards cannot be be regarded as merely nomads—there must have been periods of sedentary life interspersed with the nomadic lifestyle (Fritz 1987:98). If this did not occur, then the wide-ranging adoption of Canaanite culture during the last phase of the Late Bronze Age cannot be explained. Based on these conclusions, Fritz called his new theory the *Symbiosis Hypothesis* (1987:98).

Fritz's proposal represents a middle ground between earlier models, noting that there are both similarities and differences between early Israelite and Canaanite material culture (Fritz 1987:98). In his mind, these Iron I settlers were semi-nomadic tribes who came from a culture interdependent with Canaanite city-dwellers (Bloch-Smith and Nakhai 1999:68). These early close relations with the LBA Canaanites were typical of the symbiotic relationships between semi-nomads and urbanites known as an enclosed nomadism (Rowton 1974:2–3). There was definitely a form of co-existence between the Canaanites and the Israelites, with any attempt to change the balance resulting in military action.

[161] a time frame of some 200 years, from the time of entry into Canaan in the thirteenth century to the time of King David, is likely accurate.

Fritz pushes the arrival of the ancestors of Israel back to the 14th or even the 15th century BC, thus allowing for a longer period of contact between Israel's ancestors and the Canaanite society of the LBA (Fritz 1981:71). This occurred before the semi-nomadic groups eventually became sedentary at the beginning of Iron I. Only then did they become visible archaeologically, since semi-nomads leave few traces of their existence (Bimson 1989:10). Thus, when the Israelites entered the land in the late thirteenth century BC[162] there were sections, pockets, districts where a symbiotic relationship existed and was captialized on by the incoming Israelites.

Obviously the origin of Israel must be sought before the beginning of the Iron Age—something Fritz certainly suggests. The traditions of Israel's early history cannot and should not be cavalierly relegated to an exilic or other late date in the way that Lemche, Coote, Whitelam and others have stated (Bimson 1989:13).

Israel Finkelstein's LBII/Iron I transition theory put more substantial teeth into the Symbiosis Hypothesis with his extensively documented work, which drew heavily on settlement pattern studies (Finkelstein 1988; Finkelstein and Na'aman 1994:9–17). Unlike Fritz, Finkelstein's symbiotic relationship occurs between indigenous nomads and the sedentary people, whereas Fritz's nomads came from outside the country in a fashion similar to the infiltration hypothesis. Symbiotic is used in the adjectival sense of two interdependent groups living together to their mutual benefit.

Fundamental to Finkelstein's interpretation is the belief that the causes which produced the Israelites were not extraordinary. In other words, the supernatural directives did not lead to the arrival of a new external people group in Canaan. Instead, the Israelites were an evolutionary development of the land and political climate:

> An additional failing of quite a few of the scholars who have dealt with the Iron I period in recent years is their strictly superficial acquaintance with the region. This has affected their research adversely, because the process of Settlement

[162] Fritz maintains that the Merneptah Stele, which dates from the last decade of the thirteenth century BC, provides indisputable evidence of Israel defined as a people. He does note that no mention is made of the whereabouts of these people or their way of life. This early reference, the earliest known outside the Bible, comes from the late thirteenth century BC, occurring in the final stanza of a hymn celebrating the victories of Pharaoh Merneptah, inscribed on what has come to be known as the Israel stele (1987:99).

> was intimately connected with the nature of the land itself—the landscape, climate, and economic potential (Finkelstein 1988:20–21).

Environmental conditions made the origins of Israel predictable, given the pressures of Late Bronze Age Canaan (Merling 1996:49; Coote 1990:1).

In a similar fashion to the Mendenhall/Gottwald Peasant Revolt Model, the Symbiosis Hypothesis does not see the Israelites as ethnically related, but rather circumstantially related (Merling 1996:49). Finkelstein characterizes the Israelites as simply those hill country residents who were living there during Iron I and were in the process of changing their lifestyle. He wrote, '…Israelites in Iron I are those people who were in a process of sedendarization in those parts of the country that were part of Saul's monarchy, and in Galilee' (Finkelstein 1988:28). He sees them as not only unrelated, but believes that a generation or two earlier they would not have even seen themselves as Israelites (Finkelstein 1988:28).

The creator of the Israelites, according to Finkelstein, was not YHWH who called them from Egypt as the Bible declares, but rather the pressures exerted on the pastoral peoples of the Canaanite hill country during Iron I. However, he does admit that early Israel may have had diverse origins, and concedes that there is probably a historical kernel to the tradition of an exodus from Egypt, but he believes that the vast majority of Iron I settlers were indigenous (Bimson 1989:10).

As before, in regard to earlier models discussed, the Symbiotic Hypothesis does not meet the criteria to allow for it to be the one decisive model for an explanation of the origin of Israel in Canaan. However, it is clear from previous work in this thesis that archaeological evidence[163] as well as biblical texts[164] provide a neat convergence in regard to the possible symbiotic relationship the Israelites enjoyed as they entered the land and began their conquest and continued occupation of the land for some 200 years until David.

[163] There is no archaeological evidence for Israel engaging in battle many of the cities, especially Shechem, in the central section of the hill country

[164] One may refer to the texts in Genesis 34, which perhaps describe an event that could be the impetus for a relationsip between the Canaanites of Shechem and the Israelites. Also see Judges 9:1–3 and Abimelech's argument for his matrilineal connections to Shechem.

8.8 Dever, Bunimovitz and Lederman: The Auto-Ethnogenesis Model

The study of ethnogenesis is a study of the formation of ethnic groups (Faust 2006:7). 'When did the people known as Israel know they were Israel?' is an oft- asked question. In a paper presented at Faulkner University in Montgomery, Alabama in the spring of 2012, and published in 2013, DW Manor coined the term 'Auto-Ethnogenesis' referring to a permutation of the Peasant Revolt Model (Manor 2013:100). Manor's contention is that advocates of this model essentially operate from the premise that what became Israel was a *self*-generated people definition that emerged from the resident Canaanite society. Manor sees two tracks characterizing this model.

Track one is represented by William Dever, one of the most prolific writers on early Israel, who has for many years built his case along the lines of the Peasant Revolt Model. Dever argues for Canaanite unrest leading to societal dissatisfaction with Late Bronze Age life under the rule of the Egyptian Amarna period (Dever 2003:175–182). In his opinion, Israel emerged from the indigenous population of Canaan, occurring when disaffected Canaanites withdrew to the hill country during and after the transition from the Late Bronze Age to Iron Age I, ultimately coming to see themselves as Israelites (Hawkins 2013:46; Dever 2003:191–210). Dever breaks rank with the Peasant Revolt Model in that he does not see the flight of the Canaanites as a group leaving intolerable conditions, or driven by a Yahwistic fervour, but rather a quest for a new society, a new lifestyle—they simply wanted to start over, founding a kind of utopia— that in the end was revolutionary (Dever 2003:178).

According to Dever, the Canaanites fled from the more densely-occupied coastal area to the interior hill country seeking a new way of life. This would offer an explanation for the pottery continuity in ceramic designs from the Late Bronze Age into the Iron Age—suggesting the people took their pottery skills with them (Dever 2003:178). In regard to pottery continuity, from Late Bronze Age to Iron Age I, Dever points out that virtually all of the individual forms exhibit a strong and direct continuity—thus the early Israelites look ceramically just like Canaanites (2003:121). The direct long-term continuities between earlier Canaanite pottery and later Iron I Israelite pottery, readily documented, cannot be the result of coincidence (Dever 2003:121). The explanation offered that this is the result of the early Israelites coming into Canaan

as foreigners or as newcomers is astounding; to make such an assertion would mean that the Israelites brought with them no pottery traditions and upon arrival immediately adopted the local pottery repertoire and replicated it exactly (Dever 2003:121).

Dever surmises that Canaan was on the edge of collapse with many villagers, peasant farmers, as well as the landless ‘Apiru, sensing they had nothing to lose. He postulates it may very well have been the case that a century of rebellion had brought about a certain social solidarity between these disparate groups, all needing some relief (Dever 2003:175–179. The continuity between Late Bronze Age and Iron Age I material decisively supports the conclusion that ancient Israel emerged from the indigenous Canaanite population (2003:121).

A second track is suggested by the work at Tel Beth-Shemesh overseen by Shlomo Bunimovitz and Zvi Lederman. The foundation of their premise is that people are forced or compelled to carve out their identity during times when their very existence or identity is threatened by another group (2009:123; Manor 2013:101). Their argument hinges on the indigenous Canaanites reacting to the arrival of the Philistines by making a conscious decision to identify with (become) Israelites based on the threat posed by the incoming Philistines. In so doing, they were subscribing to something totally different from the Philistine invaders, thus maintaining their own sense of identity as Canaanites. The end of the Egyptian hegemonic control in the twelfth century BC allowed an ample period of time for the arriving entities to establish themselves in Canaan and negotiate their identities through a variety of social and cultural processes (Weinstein 1992:142–150). Their basic premise is basically a comprehensive explanation for the beginnings of Israel in Canaan (Manor interviewed by researcher June 2019).

The Philistines succeeded in carving out a territory for themselves in southern Canaan at the expense of the Egyptians and their Canaanite vassals. However, the interaction between the Philistines and the Canaanites was more complex and carried significant consequences for both sides (Bunimovitz and Lederman 2011:255–256). The interaction between the Philistines and the Canaanites was in the form of either sharing settlements or living next to one another in neighbouring sites (Bunimovitz and Lederman 2011:256).

Accordingly, Bunimovitz and Lederman assert that the Canaanites occupying Beth-Shemesh, located in the Sorek Valley at the northern outskirts of Philistia, made a conscious decision to resist being identified with or overcome by the aggressive Philistines. This resistance manifested itself in their subscribing to something totally different from the Philistine invaders in order to maintain a sense of distinctive ethnicity. Thus, they dropped pork consumption from their diet, as well as avoiding the use of bichrome Philistine pottery (Bunimovitz and Lederman 2011:258).

The process of hybridization, brought about by the close proximity of the Canaanites with the encroaching Philistine culture, contributed to their zealous pursuit of 'otherness'—or in other words, their attempt to maintain a distinctive ethnicity untarnished by the Philistines. The time frame, number of years, for this otherness culminating in the indigenous Canaanites identifying as Israelites is not known or estimated (Manor interviewed by researcher June 2019).

Auto-Ethnogenesis definitely is not the final answer to the question of Israelite origin in Canaan. In fact, there is very little to commend this model in regard to playing any or a small role in the final argument presented in this thesis.

8.9 An Eclectic Model

The idea of a combination of various models to explain the emergence or origin of Israel in Canaan is not an original proposal. However, this thesis has taken the concept a step further by incorporating or integrating biblical elements into the narrative. Manor correctly notes:

> Recently Avraham Faust argued that Israel's emergence was the result of a combination of the various models. Using anthropological and archaeological data, he demonstrated the validity of the converging models. He affirmed that 'the consensus today is that all previous suggestions have some truth regarding the origins of the ancient Israelites…the percentage and weight given to each process varies.' He did not, however, integrate biblical elements into the narrative (Manor 2013:102; Faust 2006:173).

At various points this thesis has demonstrated the convergence of the biblical text and the archaeological data as a reasonable alternative to dismissing the biblical text (the Bible) completely—arguing that both disciplines have their place in the discussion of the origin of Israel, with neither having the final word.

It is the contention of the thesis that an Eclectic Model, that is, a model that allows for the input from several other hypotheses to work together toward a common goal, has been shown to be a starting place for future investigations into the question of the origin of Israel in Canaan. Furthermore, the thesis purports that the Eclectic Model demonstrates clearly a reasonable coherence between archaeology and the Bible. At no point in this thesis has the claim been made that the final answer has been given. Rather, it has been emphasized that there is no one theory/model/hypothesis that fully explains the emergence of Israel in Canaan by itself. Therefore, an Eclectic Model is proposed.

8.9.1 The Conquest Model's Role in the Eclectic Model

It was never the intention of this thesis to pit one discipline against the other, that is, to prove the superiority of the Bible over archaeology or vice versa, but rather to illuminate the lines of convergence between the two, and in so doing allow each discipline to work independent of the other yet supportive at points where possible. Clearly the archaeological data cannot prove the validity of the biblical text, any more than the biblical text can absolutely prove the exactness of the material data uncovered in excavations or surveys. Again, this was never the point of this endeavour.

The Eclectic Model set forth in the thesis evolved from a thorough investigation of the major proposals given over the past ninety-plus years. The strong points of each model were discussed along with the favourable components of the models. For instance, the Conquest Model of Albright is clearly the initial point in regard to the emergence of Israel in Canaan. The biblical text speaks to the fact that God had a plan for the taking of the land promised to Abraham's descendants using the Israelites as his vehicle to accomplish this goal, and further, to fulfil a promise of punishment for the sinful unrepentant people occupying Canaan (Gen 15). Clearly the commands of God were ignored, and the Israelites were unable and unwilling to complete their

mission. Thus, it was noted that the book of Joshua is, therefore, not only a historical book, but a theological treatise noting time and time again that God is giving the land to a sinful people (the Israelites) who did not comply with his command; but, God keeps his promise to Abraham in spite of the Israelites' disobedience. They will take the land, but not immediately, and they will pay a high price for their disobedience.

The importance of large Canaanite mound excavations was explored and at many points the convergence of biblical text and archaeological data illustrated the significant possibility of the initial military forays of Israel against major cities in Canaan. It was clearly noted that what was deemed to be an absolute impossibility (such as the Israelite destruction at Jericho and Ai) was often decided based upon the silence of archaeological data rather than concrete proof. Again and again, this thesis points out that archaeology and the Bible are two distinct disciplines—neither one capable of fully answering questions surfaced in regard to the origin and emergence of Israel in Canaan. For example, archaeological evidence, the Merneptah Stele, clearly demonstrates the presence of a people referred to as Israel around the end of the thirteenth century BC, approximately 1207 BC. In light of this specific archaeological evidence certain theories need to be examined more closely, since their conclusions do not coincide with this data. Further, the contribution of the regional-surface surveys was probed and their importance in determining the settlement patterns and other data was noted. Again, the strong points and some negative aspects of the survey work and conclusions were pointed out.

This thesis contends that the Conquest Model or the biblical model of the Israelites' conquest of Canaan, although not the final word on the Israelites' conquering of Canaan, is an important component of the Eclectic Model, serving as the starting point for the initial surge of God's people into the land of Canaan.

8.9.2 The Peaceful Infiltration Model's Role in the Eclectic Model

According to the Peaceful Infiltration Model, those who settled the highlands of Canaan, or western Palestine, in the thirteenth and twelfth centuries BC, had originally been nomadic tribes—people of the semi-arid regions of Transjordan (Dever 2003:50). Alt and Noth, along with Aharoni, argued for a peaceful migration or infiltration of semi-nomadic people who slipped into the central hill country of Canaan and remained

there, almost unknown, until they made it their permanent home (Noth 1960:69). This group would eventually become known as Israel.

It is the contention of this thesis that the early settlers in the highlands of Canaan were not, as Alt, Noth and Aharoni proposed, nomads or semi-nomadic people, but rather Israelites, who, after failing to accomplish the will of God by destroying the Canaanite population, were forced to settle in areas near the large Canaanite strongholds. Far from an intended peaceful infiltration, the multiple Israelite settlements in the central hill country of Canaan existed because of their failure to follow through with God's command. Thus, there was a sense in which a certain level of peaceful existence prevailed in the land of Canaan, Israelites living amongst the pagan Canaanites—but it was not intended, nor would it last forever. The people inhabiting settlements were far from becoming Israelites—they were Israelites seeking to eventually take the land of Canaan completely—a process that took some 200 years.

In essence, the Peaceful Migration Model plays no role in the question of the origin of Israel in Canaan; however, in practical terms there was a long period of existence, somewhat peaceful, between the Israelites and the Canaanites. Thus, some semblance of the Peaceful Infiltration Model may be connected to the Eclectic Model.

8.9.3 The Peasant Revolt Model's Role in the Eclectic Model

This thesis has shown that evidence of a revolt of the size suggested by the proponents of the Peasant Revolt Model is non-existent. Final analysis shows that the Peasant Revolt Theory (Social Revolution Theory) suffers from a lack of evidence for a retreat from the cities to the hill country by indigenous Canaanites joining with recent implants from outside Canaan—the archaeological evidence is too ambiguous to draw such a conclusion (Hawkins 2013:43; Halpern 1992a:1132–1135). Even Dever's support of the theory as the one most in line with the archaeological data did not override the evidence against such a theory as being the origin of the Israelites from within Canaan (2003:52–54). Simply stated, there is no archaeological evidence for a peasant revolt occurring in Canaan. Instead, this thesis contends that whatever role a peasant revolt may have had in the origin of Israel in Canaan may be seen in the events that followed Israel's initial entry into the land.

We know from secular records and biblical accounts that there were, and always will be, people who are on the fringe of acceptable society—never seeming to find their place among civilized people—the downtrodden, those who have fallen through the proverbial cracks, the homeless, and so on. In this sense, there were those who, without mounting an organized peasant revolt, were ready and willing to follow someone or some ideology that would give them a sense of belonging and security.

Events in the life of David seem to speak to the scenario mentioned above. Some two hundred years after the Israelite entrance into Canaan, one finds David, on the run from Saul, running for his life even to the Philistine city of Gath (1 Sam 27). The text says that David, along with the six hundred men following his lead, lived with Achish at Gath (1 Sam 27:3). David lived in Philistine territory for one year and four months at the city of Ziglag, a city given to him by Achish (1 Sam 27:6–7). The language of 1 Samuel 22:2 describes the nature of the men who followed David: 'And everyone who was in distress, and everyone who was in debt, and everyone who was bitter in soul, gathered to him. And he became commander over them. And there were with him about four hundred men'. In 1 Samuel 23:13 the number of men following David had grown to 600—the 600 who left Saul's territory and ended up in Gath, where Saul would not pursue them (1 Sam 27:4).

So, yes, there was a revolt component within the long process of the Israelites' finally acquiring control of the entire land of Canaan (the Promised Land), but it was not a Canaanite citizenry revolt, but rather a revolt that involved the disenfranchised and other people who likely saw in the Israelites a better way of life. Such were the ragtag fighting men who attached their fate to that of David.

One can readily understand how the common man, being pursued by the problems of life, might readily follow such a bold leader as David. As mentioned earlier, when Israel under King David took possession of all the promised land, there were many rebels, outcasts, and similar, who went along for the ride—a ride that led to the total emergence of Israel as the dominant power in the land of Canaan.

8.9.4 The Symbiosis Hypothesis' Role in the Eclectic Model

Fritz saw the symbiotic relationships occurring between nomads coming from outside Canaan in a fashion similar to the Infiltration hypothesis (1987:98).[165] This thesis contends that any role the Symbiosis Hypothesis plays in the overall Eclectic Model is clearly seen during the military operations carried out by Joshua's Israelite army, not nomadic tribes. An examination of the record of the Israelites' initial entry into Canaan, paying special attention to the military campaigns, reveals that there was a large geographical area of Canaan where the Israelites did not engage the residents in battle. There was a total lack of activity in central Canaan, which is a striking omission given the fact that Joshua's theological point is, to show God's presence with Israel they receive the land (Manor 2013:106). The question one must ask is why? Why were there no skirmishes or major battles recorded in these areas?

This thesis contends that the answer to these questions may be found in the symbiotic relationship between the incoming Israelites and residents of the central hill country. For instance, could the answer be that the residents of these areas were related to the incoming Israelites? Even though they were now two separate groups, there was a history that allowed for the symbiotic relationship. Perhaps not all of Jacob's clan left Canaan for Egypt during the days of Joseph, or perhaps some returned rather than remain in Egypt for over 400 years.

For instance, Shechem and vicinity were important in Israelite history, going back to the Patriarchs. Jacob's two oldest sons, Reuben and Simeon, after killing the males of the town because of the rape of their sister, took material plunder from the town including 'all their little ones and their wives…' (Gen 34:28–29). It is likely that the wives of the men who were killed became concubines or wives within Jacob's family. Is it not probable that a symbiotic relationship between the inhabitants of the central part of Canaan was alive and well? Such a reconstruction of events is based on circumstantial evidence, but it would alleviate the question of why there was no military campaign in the central part of the country. If Israelites (descendants of Jacob/Israel) had already returned to the land of Canaan, they would likely have been exempt from the purge carried out by Joshua (Manor 2013:107).

[165] Finkelstein saw them as indigenous nomads.

The Symbiosis Hypothesis plays a role in the Eclectic model in that it offers a plausible explanation, borne out by archaeological data and the biblical text as to why the Israelites did not engage the towns of the central hill country in battles. This seems to be the only reasonable explanation as to why Joshua, when addressing the twelve tribes of Israel at Mount Gerizim and Mount Ebal, just down the valley from Canaanite Shechem, did not go to war against the towns.

8.9.5 The Auto-Ethnogenesis Model's Role in the Eclectic Model

Described by Manor as a permutation of the Peasant Revolt Model, the Auto-Ethnogenesis Model is based on the premise that what became Israel was a self-generated (Auto-Ethnogenesis) people that emerged from the resident Canaanite society (Manor 2013:100). Dever, a long-time proponent of the Peasant Revolt Model, broke ranks with this theory by denying that the flight of the Canaanites was a people leaving intolerable conditions, or driven by a Yahwistic fervour; rather, the disaffected Canaanites withdrew to the hill country during and after the transition of the Late Bronze Age to Iron Age I to form a new society, a new lifestyle and ultimately self-identifying themselves as Israelites seeking a utopian world (Dever 2003:191–210).

If one correctly accepts the premise that Israel did not fulfil the conquest command set forth by the Lord, but instead ceased their military activity and settled in the land with the Canaanites as their neighbours—then it is possible that a form of auto-ethnogensis was present in the ultimate formation of Israel as the ruling nation in Canaan. The utopian-seeking Canaanites simply self-identified themselves as Israelites rather than Canaanites.

In light of the evidence gathered in regard to the Auto-Ethnogenesis Model, it would be a stretch, in all candour, to find any argument from the Auto-Ethnogenesis Model with which I feel comfortable in suggesting that it has anything to do with Eclectic Model offered in this chapter. Perhaps there were Canaanites in search of a better lifestyle who decided to identify with the Israelites. If this was the case, then maybe some auto-ethnogenesis could be applied.

8.10 Summary of the Eclectic Model

This thesis is perfectly at ease with allowing the archaeological data to set the agenda for excavators as noted by Bunimovitz and Faust:

> We envision a different integration between archaeology and the Bible. On the one hand, an archaeological agenda, independent of the biblical text, will open a much wider range of social and cultural questions. On the other hand, using the Bible as a cultural document to answer these questions will restore its central place in the archaeological discourse of the biblical period. Conceiving both biblical texts and ancient material artifacts as cultural documents, we believe that their inspection will be fruitful and enlightening. Words and artefacts can give us access to the mindset of the people of the biblical period. Encapsulated in both are the worldviews, cosmology, perceptions of landscape, ideology, symbolism, etc. of the people who produced them. The insights gained by this approach will eventually result in a better understanding of biblical political history (2010:43).

However, this thesis is absolutely against the tendency of modern archaeologists to dismiss the Bible completely, except when it seems to confirm or bolster their particular viewpoint or conclusion.

Bunimovitz and Faust speak of the Bible, as well as artefacts, as cultural documents (2010:43). A cursory reading of this statement leads one to believe that the two entities are equals. However, this is not the case, as seen in the latter part of the chapter penned by Bunimovitz and Faust in the 2010 book edited by Levy. Particularly relevant are snippets from the last page (p.50) of chapter two—snippets that clearly reflect the position of both authors:

> While 'liberating' the research agenda from the 'shackles' of the Bible, it is rather the new approach to Biblical Archaeology suggested here that reinstates the Bible at the heart of the archaeological discourse of the Iron Age (2010:50).
>
> We propose to reverse the usual scientific procedure in Biblical Archaeology (2010:50).
>
> From a cultural perspective, the Bible as an 'unconscious revelation' is invaluable (2010:50).

Bunimovitz and Faust are in agreement with Murray, whom they quote on page 48 of their chapter in Levy's book:

> As Murray (1998:xxxi) wrote: 'It does not matter whether the stories…are true…And even a forgery is an important piece of evidence for the period that perpetrated it…This principle of unconscious revelation through representation…is one of the most powerful tools in the modern historian's study of mentalities (2010:48).

As one who bases the totality of life on the inspired Word of God, the statements referring to the Bible as 'unconscious revelation' do not compute. Further, it is hard to fathom how one can propose that the Bible be returned to its central place in the study of archaeology and then refer to the Bible as an unconscious revelation that has shackled the field of archaeology for years. According to Bunimovitz and Faust, the biblical text is problematic as a source for comprehensive historical reconstruction (2010:48).

This thesis is heartened by the willingness of prominent Israeli archaeologists, of the calibre of Bunimovitz and Faust, to at least consider the biblical text despite the low level of authority and reality they afford it. The thesis is not written to convince archaeologists such as Faust and Bunimovitz, and others, to embrace the Word of God, the Bible, as fully inspired and without error;[166] rather, it argues for the Bible to be given its just due in terms of what it can and cannot do in regard to the study of the origin of ancient Israel in Canaan. This thesis appeals to the reader to give serious consideration to the numerous lines of convergence clearly demonstrated and some that are highly likely. In so doing, it is the hope and prayer of the author of this thesis that a plausible case has been successfully made for an Eclectic Model demonstrating the coherence of the archaeological data and the biblical text—a model showing the

[166] While the author of this thesis believes by faith that the Bible is the inerrant, inspired Word of God—recognition is also made concerning places where obvious exaggeration has occurred and texts reflect theological reality and not necessarily the current reality—it has been noted several times that the book of Joshua has a theological component that emphasizes God's role in giving the land of Canaan to the Israelites—not that they followed his command to take it and destroy the Canaanite population.

emergence of Israel as a complex journey carried out over a lengthy period of time—some two hundred years.[167]

Again it is important to observe that the proposed Eclectic Model is not the end to all the questions about the origin of Israel in Canaan; but, it may serve as a starting point for those interested in continuing the conversation about this slippery topic. The sage advice of William Dever, noted earlier in chapter three, will serve well as an ending point for this labour of love and occasional sweat and tears. Dever notes that when the biblical and archaeological lines converge, what he refers to as 'convergences', one arrives at what historians often call 'the balance of probability', or what jurisprudence might refer to as 'the preponderance of evidence' (2017:44). Dever further notes that even though these convergences may not provide iron-clad proof for either the archaeological data or the biblical texts, they do offer what we can know and need to know in order to get on with our lives (2017:44).

It is the intention of the author of this thesis to move on with life while continuing to contemplate and study the complex questions of how Israel emerged in the thirteenth century BC in the land of Canaan. If this work has contributed in some small way to the discussion of the question of the origin of Israel in Canaan—then it has been worthwhile. It is with hope and prayers that this work has at least drawn attention to the fact that one should be even-handed with both the archaeological data and the biblical text when evaluating both cultural documents.

[167] from their entry into the land around 1207 BC or a bit earlier, to the time of David's kingship over Israel in the tenth century BC.

WORKS CITED

Aharoni Y 1957. *The Settlement of the Israelite Tribes in Upper Galilee.* Jerusalem (Hebrew).

_____ 1970. New Aspects of the Israelite Occupation in the North. *Near Eastern Archaeology in the Twentieth Centuries: Essays in Honour of Nelson Glueck.* JA Sanders (ed.), New York: Doubleday.

_____ 1971. The Settlement of Canaan, in *Judges*. In B Mazar (ed.) (vol. 3), *The World History of the Jewish People*: 94–128*.* New Jersey: Rutgers University Press.

_____ 1979. *The Land of the Bible: A Historical Geography.* Translated by AF Rainey (ed.), Philadelphia: Westminster.

_____ 1982. The Israelite Occupation of Canaan. *BA* 8:14–23. New Haven: Archaeological Society of Oriental Research.

_____ 1982a. *The Archaeology of the Land of Israel: From the Prehistoric Beginnings to the End of the First Temple Period.* Translated by AF Rainey. Philadelphia: Westminster.

Aharoni Y, Fritz V and Kempenski A 1975. Excavations at Tel Masos (Khirbet-el Meshash). Preliminary Report on the Second Season. Tel Aviv 2:97–124.

Ahlstrom GW 1993. *The History of Ancient Palestine.* Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Albright WF 1924. Excavations at Gibeah of Benjamin (Tell El-Ful). *AASOR IV:*1–8. New Haven: Yale University Press

_____ 1929. New Israelite and Pre-Israelite Sites: The Spring Trip of 1929. *BASOR* 35:1–14.

_____ 1935. Archaeology and the Date of the Hebrew Conquest of Palestine. *BASOR* 58:10–18.

_____ 1939. The Israelite Conquest of Canaan in Light of Archaeology. *BASOR 74:11–23.*

_____ 1950. *The Biblical Period.* New York: Harper and Brothers Reprint.

_____ 1963. *The Biblical Period from Abraham to Ezra: An Historical Survey.* New York: Harper Torchbooks.

_____ 1965. *Archaeology and the Religion of Israel: The Ayer Lectures of the Colgate-Rochester Divinity School 1941.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins.

_____1971. *The Archaeology of Palestine.* Gloucester, MA: Peter Smith Publisher Inc.

Alt 1989*. Essays on Old Testament History and Religion.* Translated by RA Wilson from German. Sheffield: JSOT Press.

Auld AG 1984. *Joshua, Judges, and Ruth.* Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press.

Bar Adon P 1972. The Judaean Desert and the Plain of Jericho. In M Kochavi (ed.) *Judaea, Samaria and the Golan 92–149*. Jerusalem: (Hebrew)

Ben-Tor A (ed.) 1992. *The Archaeology of Ancient Israel.* Translated by R Greenberg. New Haven: Yale University Press.

_____ 1993. Hazor: Fifth Season of Excavations (1968–1969). In E Stern (ed.), *The New Encyclopaedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land,* (vol. 2), 604–606. New York: Simon & Schuster.

_____ 1998.The Fall of Canaanite Hazor–the 'who' and 'when'. *Questions in Mediterranean Peoples in Transition.* S Gitin, A Mazar, and E Stern (eds) Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society.

_____ 2013. Who Destroyed Canaanite Hazor? *BAR* 39:26–36.

Ben-Tor A and Rubiato MT 1999. Did the Israelites Destroy the Canaanite City? *BAR* 25:22–39.

Biran A 1989. Collared-rim Jars and the Settlement of the Tribe of Dan, In S Gitin and WG Dever (eds), *Recent Excavations in Israel: Studies in Iron Age Archaeology*. ASSOR 49, Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.

_____1993. *Biblical Dan.* In E Stern (ed.), *The New Encyclopaedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land,* (vol. 1) 323-332. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society.

Bimson JJ 1989. The Origins of Israel in Canaan: An Examination of Recent Theories. *Journal of Theological Studies Articles On-line. Themelios* 15:4–15.

Bimson JJ and Livingston D 1987. Redating the Exodus. *BAR* 13:40–53, 66.

Bloch-Smith E and Nakhai BA 1999. A Landscape Comes to Life: The Iron Age I. *NEA* 62:62–92, 101–127.

Boling RG 1975. *Judges: Introduction, Translation and Commentary.* In WF Albright and DN Freedman (eds), *The Anchor Bible* (vol. 6A), Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Company.

_____1982. *Joshua: A New Translation with Notes and Commentary.* In WF Albright and DN Freedman (eds), *The Anchor Bible* (vol. 6). Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Company.

_____ 1982a. *Joshua: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary by Robert G. Boling, Introduction by G. Ernest Wright.* Garden City: Doubleday & Company.

Bright J 2000. *A History of Israel (*4th ed*.),* Philadelphia: Westminster John Knox Press.

Bunimovitz S 1990. Problems in the "Ethnic" Identification of the Philistine Culture. *Tel Aviv.* 17:210–222.

_____ 1994. Socio-Political Transformations in the Central Hill Country in the Late Bronze-Iron I Transition. In I Finkelstein and A Na'aman (eds), *From Nomadism to Monarchy* 129–202. Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi.

Bunimovitz S and Faust A 2010. Reconstructing Biblical Archaeology: Toward an Integration of Archaeology and the Bible. In TE Levy (ed.) *Historical Biblical Archaeology and the Future: The New Pragmatism*, 43–54. London: Equinox Press Ltd.

Bunimovitz S and Lederman Z 1997. Beth-Shemesh: Culture Conflict in Judah's Frontier. *BAR* 23:42–49.

_____ 2009. The Archaeology of Border Communities: Renewed Excavations at Tel Beth-Shemesh, Part 1: The Iron Age. *NEA* 72:114–142.

_____ 2011. Canaanite Resistance: The Philistines and Beth-Shemesh—A Case Study from the Iron Age I. *BASOR* 364:37–51.

_____ 2011a. Migration, Hybridization, and Resistance: Identity Dynamics in the Early Iron Age Southern Levant. 255–265. *Cambridge Histories Online.* Cambridge University Press.

Butler TC 2009. Judges. In B Metzger, DA Hubbard and GW Barker (eds), *Word Biblical Commentary 8.* Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

_____ 2014. Joshua 1-12. In Nancy L deClaisse-Wafford (ed.), *Word Biblical Commentary 7A,* (2nd ed.). Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

_____ 2014a. Joshua 13–24. In Nancy L deClaisse-Wafford (ed.), *Word Biblical Commentary 7B:* (2nd ed.). Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

Callaway JA 1968. New Evidence on the Conquest of Ai. *JBL* 87:312–320.

_____ 1985. Was My Excavation of Ai Worthwhile? *BAR* 11:68–69.

_____ 1985a. A New Perspective on the Hill Country Settlement of Canaan in Iron Age I. In J Tubb (ed.), *In Palestine in the Bronze and Iron Ages: Papers in Honour of Olga Tufnell, 3*1–49. London: Institute of Archaeology.

_____ 1993. Ai. In E Stern (ed.), *The New Encyclopaedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land,* 39–45. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Cahill J 1998. It is There. The Archaeological Evidence PROVES IT. *BAR* 24 :34–41. Washington: Biblical Archaeology Society.

Casey 2014. *Jesus: Evidence an Argument for Mythicist Myths?* London: T & T Clark.

Chaney ML 1983. Ancient Palestinian Peasant Movements and the Formation of Premonarchic Israel, 39–90. In DN Freeman and DF Graf (eds.), *Palestine in Transition.* Sheffield: The Almond Press.

Clamer C and Ussishkin D 1977. A Canaanite Temple at Tell Lachish. *BA* 40 (2):71–76. New Haven: American Schools of Oriental Research.

Clarke D 1973. Archaeology: The Loss of Innocence. *Antiquity* 47:6–18.

Cohen-Weinberger A and Guren Y 2006.Philistine Bichrome Pottery: The View from the Northern Canaanite Coast. In AM Maeir and P de Miroschedji (eds.), "I Will Speak Riddles of Ancient Times" *Archaeological and Historical Studies in Honour of Amihai Mazar on the Occasion of his Sixtieth Birthday* (vol. 1), 303–334. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.

Coote RB 1990. *Early Israel: A New Horizon.* Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

_____ 1998. *The Book of Joshua.* In The New Interpreter's Bible (vol. 2), 553–719. Nashville: Abingdon Press.

Coote RB and Whitelam KW 2004. The Emergence of Israel: Social Transformation and State Formation Following the Decline in Late Bronze Age Trade. *Semeia* 37**:**107–147.

_____ 2010. *The Emergence of Early Israel in Historical Perspective* (2nd ed.). Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press.

Cross FM 1988. Reuben, First-Born of Jacob: Sacral Traditions and Early Israelite History. *ZAW* 100:46–65.

Davis TW 1993. Faith and Archaeology A Brief History to the Present. *BAR* 19:54–59.

de Vaux R 1971. Palestine in the Early Bronze Age. *The Cambridge Ancient History Vol. 1, Part 2.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

_____ 1977. Was There an Israelite Amphictyony? *BAR* 3:40–47.

_____ 1978. *The Early History of Israel.* Translated by D Smith from French. Philadelphia: Westminster.

Dever WG 1980. Archaeological Method in Israel: A Continuing Revolution. *BA* 43:41–48.

_____ 1981. What Archaeology Can Contribute to an Understanding of the Bible. *BAR* 7:40–41.

_____ 1989. Yigael Yadin: Prototypical Biblical Archaeologist. In *Eretz-Israel: Archaeological, Historical and Geographical Studies* 44–51*.* Israel Exploration Society.

_____ 1990. *Recent Archaeological Discoveries and Biblical Research.* Seattle: University of Washington Press.

_____ 1991. Archaeological Data on the Israelite Settlement: A Review of Two Recent Works. *BASOR* 184:77–88. Bulletin of American Schools of Oriental Research.

_____1992. How To Tell A Canaanite From An Israelite. In *The Rise of Ancient Israel,* 27–60. H Shanks (ed.).

_____ 1992a. "Archaeology". In DN Freedman (ed.), *The Anchor Bible Dictionary* (vol. 1), 354–357. New York: Doubleday.

_____ 1992b. Archaeology and the Israelite 'Conquest'. In DN Freedman (ed.) *The Anchor Bible Dictionary* (vol. 3), 545–558. New York: Doubleday.

_____ 1993. Biblical Archaeology: Death and Rebirth. In A Biran and J Aviram (eds), *Biblical Archaeology Today: Proceedings of the Second International Congress on Biblical Archaeology* 706–722. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society.

_____ 1998. Archaeology, Ideology, and the Quest for an 'Ancient' or 'Biblical Israel'. *NEA* 6:39–52.

_____ 2001. *What Did the Biblical Writers Know and When Did They Know it? What Archaeology Can Tell Us about the Reality of Ancient Israel.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

_____ 2003. *Who Were the Early Israelites and Where Did They Come From?* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

_____ 2006. The Western Cultural Tradition at Risk. *BAR* 32:26, 76. Washington DC: Biblical Archaeology Society.

_____ 2008. *Did God Have a Wife? Archaeology and Folk Religion in Ancient Israel*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

_____ 2010. Does Biblical Archaeology Have a Future, 349–360. In TE Levy (ed.), *Historical Biblical Archaeology and The Future: The New Pragmatism* 349–360. London: Equinox Publishing Ltd.

_____ 2017. Whom Do You Believe—The Bible or Archaeology? *BAR* 43:43–47, 58.

_____ 2017a *Beyond the Texts: An Archaeological Portrait of Ancient Israel and Judah.* Atlanta: SBL Press.

El-Haj NA 2001. *Facts on the Ground: Archaeological Practice and Territorial Self-Fashioning in Israeli Society (*excerpted from pages 99–105). Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Faust A 2006. *Israel's Ethnogenesis: Settlement, Interaction, Expansion and Resistance.* London: Equinox.

Finkelstein I 1988. *The Archaeology of the Israelite Settlement.* Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society.

_____ 1991. The Emergence of Israel in Canaan: Consensus, Mainstream and Dispute. *SJOT 5*:47–59.

_____ 1993. The Socio-political Organization of the Central Hill Country in the Second Millennium BCE. Proceedings of the Second International Congress.

_____ 1996. The Philistine Countryside. *Israel Exploration Journal.* 46:225–242.

Finkelstein I and Mazar A 2007. *The Quest for the Historical Israel: Debating Archaeology and the History of Early Israel.* BB Schmidt (ed.) 17. Atlanta: SBL.

Finkelstein I and Na'aman N 1994. *From Nomadism to Monarchy: Archaeological and Historical Aspects of Early Israel.* Washington, DC: Biblical Archaeological Society.

Finkelstein I and Silberman N 2001. *The Bible Unearthed.* NY: The Free Press.

Franken HJ and Power WJA 1971. Glueck's Exploration in Eastern Palestine in the Light of Recent Discoveries. *VT* 21:119–123.

Freedman DN 1967. The Biblical Idea of History. *A Journal of Bible and Theology* 21:32–49.

_____ 1975*. The Published Works of William Foxwell Albright: A Comprehesive Bibliography.* Cambridge, MA: American Schools of Oriental Research.

Frick FS 1979. Religion and Socio-Political Structure in Early Israel: An Ethno-Archaeological Approach. In SBL Seminar Papers. Missoula, MT:Scholar Press.

Fritz V 1981. The Israelite 'Conquest' in the Light of Recent Excavations at Khirbet el Meshash. *BASOR* 241:61–73.

_____1987. Conquest or Settlement? The Early Iron Age in Palestine. ASOR

50:84–100. New Haven: American Schools of Oriental Research.

Gal Z 1982. The Lower Galilee in the Iron Age. *PhD Thesis.* Tel Aviv University (Hebrew with English Abstract).

_____1988. The Late Bronze Age in Galilee: A Reassessment. *BASOR* 272:79–84. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Garfinkel Y, Hasel M and Klingbeil MG 2013. An Ending and a Beginning. *BAR* 39:44–51.

Garstang J and Garstang JBE 1948. *The Story of Jericho.* London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott.

Gilboa A 2005. Sea Peoples and Phoenicians along the Southern Phoenician Coast—A Reconciliation of Sikila (SKL) Material Culture. *BASOR* 337:47–78.

Gilboa A, Cohen-Weinberger A and Guren Y 2006. Philistine Bichrome Pottery: The View from the Northern Canaanite Coast. In AM Maeir and P de Miroschedji (eds), "I Will Speak the Riddles of Ancient Time" *Archaeological and Historical Studies in Honor of Amihai Mazar on the Occasion of his Sixtieth Birthday* (vol. 1), 303–334. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.

Giveon R 1974. A Monogram Scarab from Tel Masos.*Tel Aviv* 1:75–76. Great Britain: Maney Publishing.

Glueck N 1934. *Explorations in Eastern Palestine*, I, 1–114. In *AASOR.* Philadelphia: American Schools of Oriental Research and University of Pennsylvania Press.

Goldingay J 2011. *Joshua, Judges, & Ruth for Everyone.* Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press.

_____ 2015. *An Introduction to the Old Testament: Exploring Text, Approaches and Issues.* Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.

Goslinga CJ 1986. *Bible Student's Commentary: Joshua, Judges, Ruth.* Translated by Ray Togtman. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House.

Gottwald NK 1975. Domain Assumptions and Societal Models in the Study of Pre-Monarchic Israel. In *Supplements to Vetus Testamentum* 18:89–100.

_____ 1978. Were the Early Israelites Pastoral Nomads? *BAR* 4:2–7.

_____ 1979. *The Tribes of Yahweh: A Sociology of the Religion of Liberated Israel, 1250-1050 BCE.* Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books.

_____ 1983. Two Models for the Origins of Ancient Israel: Social Revolution and Frontier Development. In HB Huffman (ed.), *The Quest for the Kingdom of*

God: Studies in Honour of George E. Mendenhall, 5–24. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.

_____ 1985. *The Hebrew Bible—A Socio-Literary Introduction.* Philadelphia: Fortress Press.

_____ 1985a. The Israelite Settlement as a Social Revolutionary Movement. In *Biblical Archaeology Today: Proceedings from the International Congress on Biblical Archaeology,* 34–46.

_____ 1989. Israel's Emergence in Canaan. *The Bible Review.* October 10:26–34.

_____ 2002. Rethinking the Origins of Israel. In DM Gunn and PM McNutt (eds.), "*Imagining" Biblical Worlds: Studies in Spatial, Social and Historical Constructs in Honor of James W. Flanagan,* 190–201. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

_____ 2008. Israel, Origins of. In KD Sakenfeld (ed.), (vol. 3), *The New Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible* 132–138. Nashville: Abingdon Press.

Grant E 1931. *Ain Shems Excavations (Palestine) 1928-1931, pt. 1.* Haverford, PA: Haverford College.

Halpern B 1988. *The First Historians: The Hebrew Bible and History.* University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania University Press.

_____ 1992. The Exodus from Egypt: Myth or Reality? In *The Rise of Ancient Israel,* 87–117. Washington, DC: Biblical Archaeology Society.

_____ 1992a. Settlement of Canaan. In DN Freedman (ed.), *The Anchor Bible Dictionary* (vol. 5), 1131–1135. New York: Doubleday.

_____ 1999. Power, Kingdom and State: Socio-cultural Sketches on the Origins and Development of Israelite Monarchy. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 119:149–151.

_____ 2010. Archaeology, the Bible and History. The fall of the House of Omri–and the Origins of the Israelite State. In TE Levy (ed.), *Historical Biblical Archaeology and The Future: The New Pragmatism.* London: Equinox Publishing Ltd.

Hawk LD 2010. *Joshua in 3–D: A Commentary on Biblical Conquest and Manifold Destiny.* Eugene, OR.: Cascade.

Hawkins RK 2013. *How Israel Became a People.* Nashville: Abingdon Press.

Herion GA 1986. "The Impact of Modern and Social Science Assumptions on the Reconstruction of Israelite History." *JSOT 34:3–33.*

Herr LG 1999. Tall al-Umayri and the Reubenite Hypothesis. *Eretz, Israel* 26:64–77. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society.

Hess RS 1993. Early Israel in Canaan: A Survey of Recent Evidence and Interpretations. *PEQ* 125:125–142.

_____ 1996. *Joshua: Introduction and Commentary.* In DJ Wiseman (ed.), The Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries. Downers Grove: Inter-Varsity Press.

Hesse B, Brown E and Griffith T 2016. Animal Husbandry in the Early Iron Age at Tel Beth-Shemesh. In Tel Beth-Shemesh A Border Community in Judah Renewed Excavations: The Iron Age 1990–2000 (vol. 1), 255–265. Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns.

Ibach R 1976. Archaeological Survey of the Hesban Region. In Heshbon 1974, *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 16 (1):119–126.

_____ 1978. Expanded Archaeological Survey of the Hesban Region. In Heshbon 1976. *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 16 (1) 201–213.

Isserlin BSJ 1983. The Israelite Conquest of Canaan: A Comparative Review of the Arguments Applicable. *PEQ* 115:85–94.

_____ 2001. The Israelites. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Keil CF and Delitzsch F 2001. *Commentary on the Old Testament in Ten Volumes. Vol II Joshua, Judges, Ruth, I & II Samuel.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Company.

Kempenski A and Fritz V 1977. Excavations at Tel Masos (Khirbet El-Meshash) Preliminary Report of the Third Season. *Tel Aviv 4:*136–158*.*

Kenyon K 1951. Some Notes on the History of Jericho in the Second Millennium B.C. *PEQ 83:101–138.*

_____ 1952. Excavations at Jericho. *PEQ* 84:62–93.

_____ 1954. Excavations at Jericho. *PEQ* 86:45–63.

_____ 1957. *Digging Up Jericho*. New York: Frederick A Praeger.

_____ 1960. Excavations at Jericho. *PEQ* 92:88–109.

_____ 1972. *Beginning in Archaeology. 3rd revised edition,* New York: Praeger.

_____ 1974. *Digging Up Jerusalem.* London: Ernest Benn Limited.

_____ 1978. Jericho. In *Archaeology and Old Testament Study* 264–275. D Winton Thomas (ed.). Oxford: Clarendon Press.

_____ 1981. *Excavations at Jericho Vol 3: The Architecture and Stratigraphy of the Tell, Text.* Thomas A Holland (ed.). London: British School of Archaeology in Jerusalem.

_____ 1993. Jericho. In E Stern (ed.), *The New Encyclopaedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land,* (vol. 2), 674–697. New York: Simon & Schuster.

King PJ 2005. Why Lachish Matters. *BAR* 31:36–47.

Kitchen K 1990. New Directions in Biblical Archaeology: Historical and Biblical Aspects. In *Biblical Archaeology Today,* 34–52.

_____ 2003. *On the Reliability of the Old Testament.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Kochavi M (ed.) 1972. *Judaea, Samaria, and the Golan: Archaeological Survey.* 1967–1968. Jerusalem: Archaeological Survey of Israel (Hebrew).

_____ 1974. Khirbet Rabud-Debir. *Tel Aviv* 1:2–33.

_____ 1984. The Period of Israelite Settlement. in Eph'al I. (ed.) *The History of Eretz Israel* (vol. 2), 19–84 *Israel and Judah in the Biblical Period.* Jerusalem: (Hebrew).

Krader L 1968. Pastoralism. *The International Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences* (vol. 11), 453–461. DL Sills (ed.) New York: Macmillan.

Lapp PW 1967. The Conquest of Palestine in the Light of Archaeology. *Concordia Theological Monthly* 38:283–300.

Levy TE 2010. The New Pragmatism Integrating Anthropology, Digital, and Historical Biblical Archaeologies. In *Historical Biblical Archaeology and the Future: The New Pragmatism* 3–42*.* London: Equinox.

Levy TE and Freedman DN 2008. William Foxwell Albright: A Biographical Essay. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Science*: 1–29.

MacDonald B 1979. The Wadi El Hasa Survey. *BA* 45:58–59.

Malamat A 1982. How Inferior Israelite Forces Conquered Fortified Canaanite Cities. *BAR* 8:24–35.

Manor DW 2005. *People's Old Testament Notes: Joshua, Judges and Ruth.* C Woods (ed.), Henderson, TN: Woods Publications.

_____ 2013. The Emergence of Israel: The Bible and Archaeology. Gleaves SG, RC Bailey and B Lambert (eds). In *ΠΝΕΥΜΑΤΙΚΑ Spiritually Appraising Matters of the Spirit.* 1:1:90–110. Montgomery, AL: Faulkner University Kearley Graduate School of Theology.

Marquet-Krause J 1949. *Les Fouilles de 'Ai (et-Tell): Atlas.* Paris, France: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner

Mattingly GL 1983. The Exodus-Conquest and the Archaeology of Transjordan: New Light on an Old Problem. *Grace Theological Journal* 4:245–262. Winona Lake IN: Grace Theological Seminary.

Mazar A 1981. Giloh: An Early Israelite Settlement near Jerusalem. *IEJ* 31:1–36. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society.

_____ 1990. *Archaeology of the Land of the Bible: 10,000-586 BCE.* Anchor Bible Reference Library. NY: Doubleday.

_____ 1992. The Iron Age I. In A Ben-Tor (ed.), *The Archaeology of Ancient Israel*, 258–301. New Haven: Yale University Press.

_____ 1993. Jerusalem. *The New Encyclopedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land,* (vol. 3), 698–701. E Stern (ed.). New York: Simon & Schuster.

Mazar B 1975. *The Mountain of the Lord.* Garden City: Doubleday & Company Inc.

McCarter PK Jr 1980. *I Samuel. The* Anchor Bible (vol. 8) *A New Translation with Notes and Commentary.* WF Albright and DN Freedman (eds), Garden City: Doubleday & Company.

_____ 1992. The Origins of Israelite Religion. In H Shanks (ed.), *The Rise of Ancient Israel,* 118–141. Washington, DC: Biblical Archaeology Society.

McDermott JJ 1998. *What Are They Saying About The Formation of Israel?* Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press.

Meir Ben-Dov 1985. *In the Shadow of the Temple.* Translated by Ina Friedman. Jerusalem: Keter Publishing House.

Mendenhall GE 1962. The Hebrew Conquest of Palestine. *BA* 25:66–87.

_____ 1973. *The Tenth Generation: The Origins of the Biblical Tradition.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University.

_____ 1976. Change and Decay in All Around I See: Conquest, Covenant, and the Tenth Generation. *BA* 39:152–157.

_____ 1983. Ancient Israel's Hyphenated History. In DN Freedman and DF Graf (eds), *Palestine in Transition,* 91–103. Sheffield: The Almond Press

_____ 2001. *Ancient Israel's Faith and History An Introduction to the Bible in Context.* GA Herion (ed.). Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press.

Merling D Sr 1997*. The Book of Joshua: Its Theme and Role in Archaeological Discussions* AUSDDS 23. Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press.

_____ 2004. The Relationship Between Archaeology and the Bible: Expectations and Reality. In JK Hoffmeier and A Millard (eds.) *The Future of Biblical Archaeology, Reassessing Methodologies and Assumptions* 29–42. Grand Rapids:Eerdmans.

Miller JM 1977. Archaeology and the Israelite Conquest of Canaan: Some Methodological Observations. *PEQ* 109:87–93.

_____ 1977a. The Israelite Occupation of Canaan. In JH Hayes and JM Miller (eds.), *Israelite and Judean History,* 213–284. London: SCM Press.

Mittmann S 1970. Beiträge zur Siedlungs und Territorialgeschichte des nordlichen Ostjordanlandes. Weisbaden.

Moore MB and Kelle BE 2011. *Biblical History and Israel's Past.* Grand Rapids: William B Eerdmans Publishing Company.

Moorey PRS 1991. *A Century of Biblical Archaeology.* Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press.

Moran WL 1992. *The Amarna Letters.* Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Murray O 1998. Introduction. In J Burckhardt *The Greeks and Greek Civilization*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Mussell M 1993. An Archaeological Evaluation of the Social Revolution Model of the Israelite Settlement in Canaan. Ph.D. Dissertation. Drew University Graduate School.

Negev A and Gibson S (eds) 2001. Hazor. In *Archaeological Encyclopaedia of the Holy Land.* New York: The Continuum Publishing Group Inc.

Noth DM 1938. *Grundsatzliches zur geschichtlichen Deutung archaologischer Befunde auf dem Boden Palastinas. PJB* 34:7–29. Palastinajahrbuch. Charleston South Carolina: Nabu Press.

_____ 1960. *The History of Israel* (2nd ed.). Translation revised by PK Ackroyd. Translated by S Godman, from *Geschichte Israels* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Harper & Row.

Ofer A 1994. All the Hill Country of Judah: From a Settlement Fringe to a Prosperous Monarchy. In I Finkelstein and N Na'aman (eds), *From Nomadism to Monarchy: Archaeological and Historical Aspects of Early Israel* 92–121. Washington, DC: Biblical Archaeological Society.

Orlinsky HM 1941. *An Indexed Bibliography of the Writings of William Foxwell Albright, Published in Honour of his Fiftieth Birthday.* New Haven: The American Schools of Oriental Research.

Petrovich D 2008. The Dating of Hazor's Destruction in Joshua 11 via Biblical, Archaeological, & Epigraphical Evidence. *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 1–16.

Rainey AF 2007. Whence Came the Israelites and Their Language. *IEJ* 57:41–64.

_____ 2008. Shasu or Habiru: Who Were the Early Israelites. *BAR* 34:51–55.

_____ 2008a. Inside, Outside: Where Early Israelites Come From? *BAR* 34:45–50, 84.

Reich R 2011. *Excavating the City of David.* Jerusalem: Old City Press Ltd.

Rowton M 1974. Enclosed Nomadism. *JESHO* 17:1–30.

Sauer JA 1986. Transjordan in the Bronze and Iron Ages: A Critique of Glueck's Synthesis. *BASOR* 263:1–26. Bulletin of American Schools of Oriental Research.

Schnucker RV 1991. Neo-Orthodoxy. In WA Elwell (ed.), *The Concise Evangelical Dictionary of Theology* 331–333.. Grand Rapids: Baker.

Shanks H 1982. Israel Comes to Canaan. *BAR* 8:14–15.

_____ 1983. BAR Interviews Yigael Yadin. *BAR* 9:16–23.

_____ 1987. BAR Interview: Avraham Biran–Twenty Years Digging at Tel Dan. *BAR* 13:12, 14–16, 18, 21–25.

_____ 1992. *The Rise of Ancient Israel.* 1–25. H Shanks (ed.).

_____ 1998. David's Jerusalem Fiction or Fact? *BAR* 24 (4):25.

Shiloh Y 1984. *Excavations at the City of David I 1978–1982.* Jerusalem: The Institute of Archaeology Hebrew University Ahva Press.

_____ 1993. Jerusalem. In E Stern (ed.), *The New Encyclopaedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land,* (vol. 2), 701–712. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Shiloh Y and Kaplan M 1979. Digging in the City of David. *BAR* 5:36–49.

Shmueli O 2010. Har Betah and Har Gavnunim, Survey. *Hadashot Arkeologiyot: Excavations and Surveys in Israel.* Israeli Antiquities Authority.

Silberman NA 1993. *A Prophet from Amongst You: The Life of Yigael Yadin: Soldier, Scholar, and Mythmaker of Modern Israel,* E Stern (ed.). Boston, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Stager LE 1998. Forging an Identity: The Emergence of Israel. In MD Coogan (ed.), *The Oxford History of the Biblical World,* 90–131. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Steiner M 1998. It's Not There. *BAR* 24:26–33, 62.

Stern PD 1991.*The Biblical Herem: A Window on Israel's Religious Experience.* Brown Judaic Studies. Atlanta: Scholars Press.

Stone LG 2014. Early Israel and Its Appearance in Canaan. In BT Arnold and RS Hess (eds), *Ancient Israel's History: An Introduction to Issues and Sources,* 127–164. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.

Thompson TL 1992. *Early History of the Israelite People: From the Written and Archaeological Sources.* Leiden: Brill.

_____ 1995. A Neo-Albrightean School of History and Biblical Scholarship? *JBL* 114:683–698.

_____ 1997. "Defining History and Ethnicity in the South Levant." In LL Grabbe (ed.). *Can a "History of Israel" Be Written?* Sheffield: Sheffield Academy Press.

Ussishkin D 1987. Lachish–Key to the Israelite Conquest of Canaan? *BAR* 18:20–23, 28–29, 31, 34–39.

_____ 1993. Lachish. In E Stern (ed.), *The New Encyclopaedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land* (vol. 3), 897–911. New York: Simon & Schuster.

_____ 2004. A Synopsis of the Stratigraphical, Chronological and Historical Issues. In *The Renewed Archaeological Excavations at Lachish* (vol. 1), Tel Aviv: 50–119.

Weinstein 1992. The Collapse of the Egyptian Empire in the Southern Levant. In WA Ward and MS Joukowsky (eds), *The Crisis Years: The 12th Century BC from Beyond the Danube to the Tigris,* 142–150. Dubuque: Kendall/Hunt.

Weippert M 1971. *The Settlement of the Israelite Tribes in Palestine.* London: SCM Press Ltd.

Wood BG 1990. Did the Israelites Conquer Jericho? A New Look at the Archaeological Evidence. *BAR* 16.2:44–59.

_____ 1990a. Dating Jericho's Destruction: Bienkowski Is Wrong on All Counts. *BAR* 16:45, 47–49, 68–69.

Wright GE 1962. *Biblical Archaeology.* Philadelphia: Westminster.

Yadin Y 1975. *Hazor: The Rediscovery of a Great Citadel of the Bible.* NY: Random House.

_____ 1979. The Transition from a Semi-Nomadic to Sedentary Society in the Twelfth Century B.C.E. In FM Cross (ed.), *Symposia: Celebrating the Seventy-Fifth Anniversary of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 57–68. Cambridge: Cambridge University.

_____1982. Is the Biblical Account of the Israelite Conquest of Canaan Historically Reliable? *BAR* 7:16–23.

_____ 1993. In E Stern (ed.), *The New Encyclopaedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land,* (vol. 2), 594–603. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Yeivin S 1971. The Benjaminite Settlement in the Western Part of their Territory. *IEJ* 21:141–154.

Younger KL Jr 1999. Early Israel in Recent Biblical Scholarship. In DW Baker and BT Arnold (eds). *The Face of Old Testament Studies: A Survey of Contemporary Approaches,* 176–206. Grand Rapids: Baker.

Zertal A 1991. Israel Enters Canaan. *BAR* 17:28–47.

_____ 1993. The Mount Manasseh (Northern Samarian Hills) Survey. In E Stern (ed.), *The New Encyclopaedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land,* (vol. 4), 1311–1312. New York: Simon & Schuster.

_____ 2004. *The Manasseh Hill Country Survey: Volume I, The Shechem Syncline.* Culture and History of the Ancient Near East 21:1. Boston: Brill.

Zevit Z 1985. The Problem of Ai. *BAR* 11:58–69.

Zuckerman S 2007. Anatomy of a Destruction: Crisis Architecture, Termination Rituals and the Fall of Canaanite Hazor. *Journal of Mediterranean Archaeology* 20:3–32.