

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

Handbooks for Bible Classes and Private Students.

EDITED BY
REV. MARCUS DODS, D.D.,
AND
REV. ALEXANDER WHYTE, D.D.



IN PREPARATION.

-
- THE SABBATH.** By Rev. Professor SALMOND, D.D., Aberdeen.
-
- THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. JOHN.** By Rev. GEORGE REITH, M.A., Glasgow. [*Shortly.*]
-
- THE BOOK OF ACTS.** By Rev. Professor LINDSAY, D.D., Glasgow. Part II., Chaps. xiii. to xxviii. [*Shortly.*]
-
- THE FIRST EPISTLE TO THE CORINTHIANS.** By Rev. MARCUS DODS, D.D., Glasgow.
-
- THE EPISTLE TO THE PHILIPPIANS.** By Rev. JAMES MELLIS, M.A., Southport.
-
- THE EPISTLE TO THE COLOSSIANS.** By Rev. SIMEON R. MACPHAIL, M.A., Liverpool.
-
- CHURCH AND STATE.** By A. TAYLOR INNES, Esq., Advocate, Edinburgh.
-
- CHRISTIAN ETHICS.** By Rev. Professor LINDSAY, D.D., Glasgow.
-
- THE WORK OF THE SPIRIT.** By Rev. Professor CANDLISH, D.D.
-
- APOLOGETICS.** By Rev. JAMES IVERACH, M.A., Aberdeen.
-
- THE BOOK OF EXODUS.** By JAMES MACGREGOR, D.D., late of New College, Edinburgh.
-
- THE DOCTRINE OF SIN.** By Rev. Professor CANDLISH, D.D.
-
- ISAIAH.** By Rev. Professor EMSLIE, M.A., London.

[For Volumes already issued see next page.]

NOW READY.

- THE EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS.** By JAMES MACGREGOR, D.D., late of New College, Edinburgh. *Price 1s. 6d.*
- THE POST-EXILIAN PROPHETS.** With Introductions and Notes. By Rev. MARCUS DODS, D.D., Glasgow. *Price 2s.*
- A LIFE OF CHRIST.** By Rev. JAMES STALKER, M.A. *Price 1s. 6d.*
- THE SACRAMENTS.** By Rev. Professor CANDLISH, D.D. *Price 1s. 6d.*
- THE BOOKS OF CHRONICLES.** By Rev. Professor MURPHY, LL.D., Belfast. *Price 1s. 6d.*
- THE CONFESSION OF FAITH.** By Rev. JOHN MACPHERSON, M.A., Findhorn. *Price 2s.*
- THE BOOK OF JUDGES.** By Rev. Principal DOUGLAS, D.D. *Price 1s. 3d.*
- THE BOOK OF JOSHUA.** By Rev. Principal DOUGLAS, D.D. *Price 1s. 6d.*
- THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.** By Rev. Professor DAVIDSON, D.D., Edinburgh. *Price 2s. 6d.*
- SCOTTISH CHURCH HISTORY.** By Rev. N. L. WALKER. *Price 1s. 6d.*
- THE CHURCH.** By Rev. Prof. BINNIE, D.D., Aberdeen. *Price 1s. 6d.*
- THE REFORMATION.** By Rev. Professor LINDSAY, D.D. *Price 2s.*
- THE BOOK OF GENESIS.** By Rev. MARCUS DODS, D.D. *Price 2s.*
- THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS.** By Rev. Principal BROWN, D.D., Aberdeen. *Price 2s.*
- PRESBYTERIANISM.** By Rev. JOHN MACPHERSON, M.A. *Price 1s. 6d.*
- LESSONS ON THE LIFE OF CHRIST.** By Rev. WM. SCRYMGEOUR, Glasgow. *Price 2s. 6d.*
- THE SHORTER CATECHISM.** By Rev. ALEXANDER WHYTE, D.D., Edinburgh. *Price 2s. 6d.*
- THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. MARK.** By Rev. Professor LINDSAY, D.D., Glasgow. *Price 2s. 6d.*
- A SHORT HISTORY OF CHRISTIAN MISSIONS.** By GEORGE SMITH, LL.D., F.R.G.S. *Price 2s. 6d.*
- A LIFE OF ST. PAUL.** By Rev. JAMES STALKER, M.A. *Price 1s. 6d.*
- THE BOOK OF ACTS.** By Rev. Professor LINDSAY, D.D. Part I, Chaps. i. to xii. *Price 1s. 6d.*
- PALESTINE.** With Maps. By Rev. ARCH. HENDERSON, M.A., Crieff. *Price 2s. 6d.*

HANDBOOKS
FOR
BIBLE CLASSES.

EDITED BY
REV. MARCUS DODS, D.D.,
AND
REV. ALEXANDER WHYTE, D.D.

EDINBURGH:
T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET.

PRINTED BY MORRISON AND GIBB,

FOR

T. & T. CLARK, EDINBURGH.

LONDON, HAMILTON, ADAMS, AND CO.

DUBLIN, GEORGE HERBERT.

NEW YORK, SCRIBNER AND WELFORD.

THE
BOOK OF JOSHUA.

BY

GEORGE C. M. DOUGLAS, D.D.,

PRINCIPAL OF THE FREE CHURCH COLLEGE, GLASGOW.

EDINBURGH:

T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET.

THE BOOK OF JOSHUA.

INTRODUCTION.

THE subject-matter of this book is the fulfilment of the work which was given to Moses to do, but which had been left unfinished by him, owing to that sin which brought after it the judgment on him and his brother Aaron : 'Because ye believed me not, to sanctify me in the eyes of the children of Israel, therefore ye shall not bring this congregation into the land which I have given them' (Num. xx. 12). This was followed by the prayer of Moses : 'Let the LORD, the God of the spirits of all flesh, set a man over the congregation, which may go out before them, and which may go in before them, and which may lead them out, and which may bring them in ; that the congregation of the LORD be not as sheep which have no shepherd. And the LORD said unto Moses, Take thee Joshua the son of Nun, a man in whom is the Spirit,' etc. (Num. xxvii. 16-18). The book of Joshua records what Joshua did in this capacity.

It may be divided into three parts : I. The conquest of the land, ch. i.-xii. ; though, as a matter of arrangement, if one preferred it, the earlier chapters might be placed separately as an introduction, with the history of the crossing of the Jordan, and the restoration of the people to the full enjoyment of their privileges as the professing Church of God. II. The allotment made of the land to the tribes, including along with this the appointment of the cities of refuge, and the provision of cities for the Levites, ch. xiii.-xxi. Perhaps ch. xxii. may be regarded as an appendix to this, the dismissal of the eastern tribes to their homes, and the jealousy for purity of worship ; otherwise it might be classed with the two chapters which follow. III. The jealousy of Joshua for the godliness and obedience of the people, which involved their future welfare ; and a few closing verses which tell of the death of him and his companions and fellow-workers, ch. xxiii. xxiv.

The period embraced by the history, excepting these last two

The Book is a Theocratic History.

chapters (which may refer to a time fifteen or twenty years later), was seven years of war, and whatever time was occupied in the division of the land, we are not told how much. The style of the history, as elsewhere in the Bible, is theocratic; that is to say, everything is looked at from the point of view of the kingdom of God, as I have noted in the Introduction to the *Handbook on Judges*; whilst we are left free to get light from other sources, if we can. Yet the remoteness of the age at which the events took place renders it unlikely that we shall have much of this. There are two sources, however, to which we naturally turn, though as yet there is little to tell of results. (1) There are the Egyptian records. One of these, particularly interesting to the student of the geography of Palestine, is the account given by an Egyptian officer of high rank, called a Mohar, of his travels in Palestine, said to be in the 14th century before Christ; see *Palestine Exploration Fund Quarterly Paper* for April 1876, etc., or the *Records of the Past*, vol. ii. pp. 107-116, published by Bagster in 1875. (2) There are the remains of Hittite monuments, in deciphering which only the commencement has as yet been made, especially by Professor Sayce of Oxford, in papers recently presented by him to the Society of Biblical Archæology; his efforts have been supplemented by Lieut. Conder, R.E., who has this year visited their sacred city, Kadesh, now a ruin, Tell Neby Mendeh, on the left bank of the river Orontes, about 6 miles s. of the lake of Homs; it appears to have been taken and destroyed by the Egyptians in the 14th century. These mighty Hittites had no doubt more to do with the Israelites than we learn from Scripture.

If the question be asked, Who wrote the book of Joshua? we have no means of giving a direct reply. In the Jewish arrangement of the Old Testament, recognised in so old a book as 'Ecclesiasticus' (in the prologue, dated by many about B.C. 230, though by others about B.C. 130), there are three sections: (1) 'The Law,' or the books of Moses; (2) 'The Prophets,' including more than those we might think of under this name: these are called the *later* prophets, while the title 'former prophets' is given to the books of Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings; (3) 'The other writings,' or simply 'the [miscellaneous] writings,' often called the Hagiographa, that is, the holy writings. Joshua then by the Jewish Church was placed first in the second section, the Prophets, standing next to the Law. If any one affirm that Joshua was himself the writer (with the manifest

Its Authorship discussed.

exception of the account of his own death, etc., in the closing verses), I do not see any valid evidence to the contrary : not in the quotation from the book of Jashar (Josh. x. 13 ; 2 Sam. i. 18), which is just as likely to have been an ever-enlarging hymn-book as anything else ; nor in ch. xv. 16-19 compared with Judg. i. 12-15, for this may have taken place before Joshua's death, as the English version shows by taking Judg. i. 8 in pluperfect time ; nor the notice of the taking of Dan, ch. xix. 47, compared with Judg. xviii., for this may have occurred during the many years that Joshua lived on in retirement. And I know nothing more natural than to suppose that if Joshua did not write the book with his own hand, it was composed from his papers by some who were about him. For there is an utter absence of any, even the slightest evidence (with one conjectural exception, to be noticed immediately) of an age later than his own. On the contrary, such a name as 'great Zidon' alongside of 'the strong city Tyre,' ch. xi. 8, xix. 28, 29, suggests a writer at the remote age in which Zidon was the foremost Phœnician city, even above Tyre, its successful rival in a later age. And the age is one in which a stone or a cairn of stones is the usual, almost the exclusive, mark of a great transaction, like the stones commemorating the crossing of the Jordan ; the cairns over Achan's body, and at the graves of the kings of Ai and other towns ; the great stone at Shechem, xxiv. 26, with which compare the stones, viii. 32, and the 'great altar to see to,' called Ed, xxii. 10, 34. And the way in which the territory given to the tribes is recorded suits best the writing of a contemporary. The fullest account by far is given of Judah, the tribe which was earliest settled, and which probably did its work most effectively, strong in numbers, and led by that faithful and devoted man, Caleb ; Judah is described in its first over-large extent, as is also Joseph ; and then we are told how Simeon's share was taken out of Judah's, and Dan's (it is implied) out of the two powerful houses, Judah's and Joseph's. Again, the lists in Chronicles suggest very readily the idea of some slight changes either in the territories assigned, or in the names which came to be in use ; and certain differences in the boundaries mentioned by Josephus may as well be explained by the supposition of certain later changes as by the assertion that he is grossly inaccurate and untrustworthy : while peculiarities, such as the want of cities where we might have expected them, in Joseph's and especially Ephraim's territory, and in Zebulun's, together with

Its Authorship discussed.

the comparative brevity and indistinctness in the geographical account of the four northern tribes, have received no explanation simpler than this, that the laziness and carelessness of these tribes, who indeed sink almost entirely out of sight in the subsequent history, and of those whom they employed to describe the land (see xvii. 14-18, xviii. 3-10, xix. 10-16, and the notes), left Joshua unfurnished with anything more exact and full, while no one at a later time ventured to insert things in this Doomsday Book of Israel, but common consent preserved it as Joshua in person or by the hand of his assistants had left it.

I said there was one conjectural exception to the statement that there is not any, even the slightest, evidence of a later age: it is the manifest dependence of the book of Joshua upon the Pentateuch, and that book pretty much in the shape in which we have it now. This appears not only from the express statement, 'And Joshua wrote these words in the book of the Law of God,' xxiv. 26, whether we give a wider or a narrower meaning to this statement, whether it was the whole book that bears his name, or some part of it, perhaps so little as only the account of this renewal of the covenant. Those, then, who suppose that the present Pentateuch took shape somewhere about the time of Ezra, as the last result of much editing, cannot think the book of Joshua more ancient than that book, to all whose prominent editions or component parts (as they might call them) it refers. The hypothesis, as it is now presented by its ablest and most popular expositors, traces Elohist and Jehovistic history combining: and I am not aware that there is any doubt that the whole history as we now have it in the Pentateuch is known to the author of Joshua; this is very plain as he goes over it in ch. xxiv. And, according to that hypothesis, besides the kernel of the legislation, given at Sinai along with the Ten Commandments (Ex. xx.-xxiii.), there is Deuteronomy, and there is later than the Babylonian exile the so-called priestly legislation, which is found in Ex. xxv. and onwards (speaking generally) through Leviticus and Numbers. Now the references to Deuteronomy, and the influence of it, are universally acknowledged. But besides, the book of Joshua refers to peculiarities which are supposed to have come out in the later hierarchical arrangements: such as the hierarchy itself, carefully graded as common Levites, common priests, and the high priest (a permanent office, xx. 6), and their appointed cities, and the cities of refuge, as in Exodus, Levi-

Difficulties in the way of Late Composition.

ticus, and Numbers (especially ch. xxxv.) ; the one central sanctuary, whatever place the LORD might choose, ch. ix. 27, and first of all at Shiloh, where the tabernacle of the congregation was set up, xviii. 1, xix. 51, against any separation from which the whole twelve tribes united in a very peculiar and strong protest, recorded throughout ch. xxii. ; the singular position of Joshua, in some respects commanding Eleazar the high priest, in other respects receiving commands from him, in accordance with the theocratic arrangements, and as was directed, Num. xxvii. 15-23 ; while, finally, the conquests of Moses, and the settlement of the eastern tribes in these, agree with the narrative in Num. xxi. and xxxii.

But the difficulties are enormous in the way of supposing this book of Joshua to belong to the age of Ezra or to some period still later in Jewish history. To touch on only the obvious difficulty about its position in the canon : if it was produced as a new and independent work of the Jewish students of that age, why was it not ranked alongside of the Chronicles, a work of this description, going back on the antiquities and history of the Church and nation, a book which stands in the *third* section of the Scriptures, the miscellaneous writings, and at the very end of these? Perhaps a feeling of this difficulty has made the supposition popular among these critics that the book did not originate independently and outside of what we call the books of Moses, but inside of them ; that instead of a Pentateuch, or a five-fold work, there was originally a Hexateuch, or a six-fold work ; and that in the final arrangements, this sixth book was separated from the others and made to occupy a position of its own. But this process of amputation is a singular and unprecedented one, and one would like to have some hint in history that it actually was performed. It appears the more singular to those who hear from the critics that the Pentateuch was itself the canon of Ezra : for in this case it would seem that the portion of the work which went to form our book of Joshua had been part of the Law or canonical Scripture of the Jews under Ezra's guidance, and was torn or thrust out of it. If we were told that it was not left out in the cold altogether, among Apocryphal writings, but that (according to the arrangement in our Hebrew Bibles) it was associated with the prophets in a second section of canonical Scripture, this would seem to contradict the critical assumption that our Pentateuch was itself the canon, and instead of this, to show that Ezra and his fellow-workers found it necessary to make a

Difficulties in the way of Late Composition.

canonical collection of Scripture arranged in at least two sections. Without making objection to this statement, which may be true so far as it goes, I simply take note of it as contradicting the opinion generally upheld by these critics, that the three sections in the Jewish canon of Scripture mark three chronological stages (since two of them are thus said to be of the same date), and confirm what I take to be the true view, that the division into three sections depends on the character of the writings and the theocratic position of the writers. The first section is the Law, by Moses, the founder or mediator of the Jewish theocracy. The second section is the Prophets, namely the works by men holding the prophetic office in the Jewish Church, resting on the Law, and first of all expounding and applying it, whether by such writings as we now call the prophecies, or by those historical exhibitions of the Lord's dealings with His people as are named in the Hebrew Bible 'the former prophets.' The third section is the [other] Writings, written by holy men of God, no doubt, by men inspired for their work, and entitled to so much reverence as David and Daniel, who do both receive the title of prophet in the New Testament (Acts ii. 30; Matt. xxiv. 15), even as the Psalm-book is in a like loose or wide sense spoken of as part of the Law (John x. 34), at the time when the Jewish theocracy was fast going to ruin, and its nicer technical distinctions were passing out of sight; but nevertheless men who served God in other capacities, and without being called to execute the prophetic office in the Church. And when we take this view, we see how the Jews were rightly guided to recognise in the book of Joshua the first of the prophetic books, officially expounding and applying the Law as God had given it to Moses; for Joshua was nothing where he was not carrying out what Moses had been interrupted and prevented by his own sin from doing in person.

I see nothing of a late age, later than the establishment of the temple at Jerusalem, in the arrangement of the Levitical cities in such a way that the priests were settled in the tribes of Judah, Simeon, and Benjamin. For in a commentary for believers I refuse to discuss this arrangement with those who consider the alleged history to be a fabrication: and in the position assigned to the priests I see no more than the overruling providence of God in disposing the lot (Prov. xvi. 33) so that his priests occupied the part of the country which in the end would have been most convenient, had the whole people continued faithful to the Lord and united among themselves. To Joshua

Geography of Palestine.

I suppose it might appear a very natural balancing of advantages between the two great houses whose jealous rivalry was ever ready to break out, that the priests had their chief seats within the territory of the powerful house of Judah, though little Benjamin also had some share, representing the children of Rachel; while yet the house of Joseph, represented especially by Ephraim, had the holy tent of God pitched in the midst of them at Shiloh (compare Ps. lxxviii. 59-69), as they had also had the extraordinary renewals of the covenant within their territory at Shechem (ch. viii., xxiv.), under the direction of himself, an Ephraimite.

In reading almost any book of the Old Testament, we have to take notice of geography if we are to appreciate fully what we read: but what is thus true in general attains its most emphatic exemplification in the book of Joshua. The study of the geography of the Holy Land is as old as the study of the Old Testament by Christians outside that country: and to this hour we are told by travellers that there is no better guide to their geographical studies than the book of Joshua. I have occasion often to mention the great contribution to sacred geography in the first Christian centuries, the *Onomasticon*, or list of names, written by the Greek bishop Eusebius, and edited half a century later by the great Hebrew scholar among the Latin fathers, Jerome. The Christian (not to speak of the Jewish) pilgrims before the Crusades, and during them, and after they were over collected a mass of traditions which have been laboriously sifted. From the dawn of modern times there have been intelligent travellers, who have accumulated stores of information for us: and in the latter part of last century, and in the early years of this one, these travellers went to work more scientifically and systematically than any of their predecessors, aided no doubt by the accurate and learned work *Palästina*, by the Dutch scholar Reland. It is still some years under fifty, however, since a vast step in advance was made by the late Dr. Edward Robinson of New York, aided by his countrymen the missionaries at Beyrût, one of whom, Dr. Thomson, still living, has given much information in a popular form in his *Land and the Book*. It would be invidious to single out names of others, both dead and living, who have carried on a noble work. But there is no indelicacy in mentioning the labours of a society, that of the Palestine Exploration Fund, which has accomplished what individuals were not in circumstances to achieve, and whose labours have reached a

Geography of Palestine.

climax in giving to the world in 1880 the map of a trigonometrical survey of Palestine west of the Jordan, on the scale of an inch to the mile, accompanied by memoirs which are in process of publication, and to be followed as quickly as possible by maps on a somewhat reduced scale (one just published, three-eighths of an inch to the mile, is admirable) with the ancient as well as the modern names, to suit them to the wants of the readers of the Old and of the New Testaments. We have had many good maps before, among which those of the Dutch traveller C. W. Van de Velde and of President Porter in Murray's *Handbook* may be singled out: but it is no reproach to earlier labourers in this field to say that the Palestine Exploration maps must displace or essentially modify all earlier efforts, at least so soon as the part of Palestine east of the Jordan has also been surveyed and published. And among the workers on this survey, speyked of geographical research over the whole country, not of topographical research in Jerusalem, for instance, it is no disparagement to the others to single out Lieutenant Conder, R.E., because his duties have led him to take a specially prominent position. It has been no small labour to go over and digest all the information communicated in these publications, and in the quarterly statement of the Society; and after all, I fear that I have to admit that pages of this *Handbook* must be unspeakably dry, particularly in chapters xv.-xix., so that sometimes nothing better can be recommended than to pass them over. Yet I felt it impossible to publish the book without the summary of this information; and I am sure that there are those who will take the map and carefully trace the lists which seem so dry to others, and find them deeply interesting. I may say in a sentence, that the boundaries of the tribes are still in many cases doubtful; but that there is hardly room for doubt that in some cases very considerable modifications must be made of preconceived opinions, in the case of the group of Issachar and Western Manasseh and Ephraim, and in the group of Zebulun and Asher and Naphtali. When the Palestine Exploration Society have done for the country east of Jordan what they have accomplished for Canaan proper, the next great service to scriptural geography will be a careful survey of the Negeb and the desert of Et Tih, that is, of the southern extremity of Canaan from about Beersheba outwards to the great desert in which the children of Israel wandered. It is true that this will have less influence on the geography of the book of Joshua than their

Geography of Palestine.

present labours : yet there are important points for it also. Especially it will settle how far south the limits of Judah and Simeon are to be extended ; and this in connection with the very interesting question of the situation of Kadesh-barnea ; see notes on xv. 3. The Rev. H. A. Trumbull (*Quarterly Paper*, July 1881, pp. 208-212), while not committing himself finally, gives strong evidence from personal examination in favour of Rowlands' view.

In conclusion, I have only to say that in both this *Handbook* and in the other on Judges, I should have been glad to introduce practical and devotional matter, and also to endeavour to enliven my pages with miscellaneous illustrations. But there are other works in which these can be found ; and the teachers of classes will often be well able to supply these in the form which in particular cases seems most expedient. I have contented myself with the humbler task of laying the foundation on which they are to build ; and to the private reader I have endeavoured to give in the narrowest compass what I had found useful for myself.

Note.—In the following pages a few contractions occur in the case of certain words frequently in use : such as A.V. for the Authorised Version, the English Bible of 1611 ; and the points of the compass, N., N.W., W.N.W., etc., for north, north-west, west-north-west, etc. Uniformity in spelling names has been aimed at ; yet cases of difficulty occur, Yâfa and Jaffa, Beyrout and Beyrût, etc.

THE BOOK OF JOSHUA.

CHAPTER I. 1-9.—THE ENTRANCE OF JOSHUA ON HIS OFFICE.

Ver. 1. Moses is here named *the servant of Jehovah* (which peculiar name is represented habitually in the A. V. by 'LORD' in capital letters), a name specially applied to him, as throughout this chapter, in contrast to even the most distinguished prophets, Num. xii. 7, 8: it is the peculiar title of Messiah (probably including His people with Him) in the later prophecies of Isaiah, Isa. xli. 8, xlii. 1, etc.; yet compare Heb. iii. 5, 6, for the difference between the servant and the Son. It is a title comparatively rarely applied to others: to Joshua, but only after his death, ch. xxiv. 29 and Judg. ii. 8; to David in the titles of Ps. xviii. and xxxvi., and in Ps. lxxxix. 20, and in the historical books, etc. Joshua is merely to carry out the work in which Moses failed, Num. xxvii. 12-23; hence his name here, '*Moses' minister,*' as already Ex. xxiv. 13, xxxiii. 11; Num. xi. 28 (twice rendered 'servant' in A. V.), as much as 'which standeth before thee,' Deut. i. 38. Joshua belonged to the tribe of Ephraim; his genealogy is given in 1 Chron. vii. 22-27. '*The Lord spake unto him,*' perhaps directly: yet it would seem principally through the high priest by the Urim, Num. xxvii. 21.—**Ver. 2.** The death of Moses placed Joshua at once in command, without any installation additional to that recorded in Num. xxvii. 15-23; Deut. xxxi. 7, 8. The message now is that he, the commander, should cross Jordan, that river which Moses had not been permitted to cross.—**Vers. 3, 4.** See this promise in Deut. xi. 24. The boundaries, as given here and in that passage, are: north, Lebanon;¹ south, the wilderness; east, the Euphrates; west, the Great Sea, or Mediterranean. They are much the same in Gen. xv. 18; Ex. xxiii. 30, 31. This has been explained by some as rounded rhetorical statement; by others better, perhaps, as the extreme limit beyond which their conquests were never to be pushed, even in the prosperous reigns of David and Solomon. *The land of the Hittites*² may at times have comprehended all this territory, according to traces of their greatness in the Egyptian and Assyrian monuments, and even in Scripture, 1 Kings x. 29; 2

¹ The White Mountain.

² So called from Heth, the second son of Canaan, cp. Gen. xxiii. 3-5.

 CHAP. I. 10-18.—*The First Instructions issued by Joshua.*

Kings vii. 6. In the present rudimentary yet enlarging knowledge of the Hittite race, we can only conjecture that circumstances in their wars with the Egyptians may have been instrumental in making the way plain for Israel from the Exodus and on to the conquest of Canaan. Yet Canaan must be regarded as the proper possession of Israel, to which Joshua confined himself both in his wars and in his division of the land.—Vers. 5, 6. The promise is complete success, and a life lengthened out and preserved to see it: which had been denied to Moses. Such a promise does not lull a true servant of God into lazy security, nor make him careless; on the contrary, it is the very means of nerving him for sustained exertion. Hence these words, *I will not fail thee nor forsake thee, be strong and of a good courage*, which had been already spoken by Moses to the people and to Joshua, Deut. xxxi. 6-8, are applied to all believers at Heb. xiii. 5, 6, as already 1 Chron. xxii. 13, xxviii. 20; 2 Chron. xxxii. 7; Ps. xxvii. 14, xxxi. 24. So in this chapter, v. 7, 9, 18.—Vers. 7, 8. *The law which Moses my servant commanded thee* must be the same as *this book of the Law* which was not to depart out of his mouth. No critical discussions as to the origin of the Pentateuch in its present form can shake the direct evidence for a written Law left by Moses in the hands of Joshua, which he was to study day and night (compare Ps. i.), and to which he was to yield unswerving obedience. The word translated *prosper* in ver. 7, and *have good success* in ver. 8, is better rendered in the margin *do wisely*, or elsewhere *behave oneself wisely*, or *deal prudently*: it is to act with real sagacity; and thus it denotes a principal cause of success rather than the success itself.

CHAPTER I. 10-18.—THE FIRST INSTRUCTIONS ISSUED BY JOSHUA; TO THE WHOLE HOST, AND TO THE EASTERN TRIBES IN PARTICULAR.

Ver. 10. The *officers of the people* are mentioned as existing in Egypt when Moses began his work, throughout Ex. v.: and their office was preserved in the legislation of Moses, Num. xi. 16, etc.; and they are mentioned from time to time in the history. There is considerable probability in the opinion that they were scribes, who wrote down the names of the people and their appointed work, whether under the Egyptian taskmasters, or in their state of freedom, perhaps specially when they were going out to war, Deut. xx. 5-9. Here, and

 CHAP. I. 10-18.—*The First Instructions issued by Joshua.*

at iii. 2, they are spoken of as passing through the host; more literally, through the camp.—**Ver. 11.** This preparation of victuals was necessary, because the manna was on the point of ceasing, though the people may not yet have known it. *Within three days ye shall pass over this Jordan*: this need not be pressed to mean more than their moving to the edge of the river and commencing the arrangements for crossing; observe mention of three days again, ch. ii. 16, 22, iii. 2: unless we suppose that the spies had already been sent off, though the account of their mission is not recorded till further on. See ii. 1.—**Vers. 12-15.** Moses had been unwilling to settle the two tribes and a half on the east of Jordan, and consented only after laying down stringent conditions and giving solemn warnings, Num. xxxii.: which Joshua bids them remember. *Armed*, in ver. 14, is a very obscure word, again used of these men, ch. iv. 12, as it was used in Ex. xiii. 18 of the whole children of Israel coming up out of Egypt (A. V. 'harnessed'), and once again of the host which Gideon smote, Judg. vii. 11. The marginal rendering 'marshalled by five' is now abandoned: the word certainly indicated some preparation for war, so that perhaps only a select body of men fully equipped for war crossed Jordan and were kept up in full strength; see ch. iv. 13. *On this side Jordan*, in vers. 14, 15, is an expression which frequently occurs: literally it is, 'across Jordan,' the one side or the other being left to the understanding of the reader, unless when an addition is made, as here 'toward the sun-rising,' or 'westward,' v. 1, or virtually by the description as in ix. 1. '*Enjoy*,' in ver. 15, literally 'possess.'—**Vers. 16-18.** The eastern tribes were full of alacrity: if only Jehovah would be with him, and he would be strong and courageous, he would be to them all that Moses had been, and every rebellion should be instantly put down, though it should cost the life of the rebels. In point of fact, we never read of murmurings, not to speak of rebellions, during the life of Joshua. See on ch. iv. 14.

1. *What is meant by the servant of the Lord?*
2. *How does Joshua's work stand related to that of Moses?*
3. *What is the effect of promises of success upon a true servant of the Lord?*
4. *Who were the officers of the people?*
5. *Contrast the experience of Moses with that of Joshua in the matter of rebellion by the people?*
6. *How are we to understand the crossing within three days?*
7. *What duty was pressed upon the tribes settled east of Jordan?*

CHAPTER II. I.—THE SPIES SENT OUT BY JOSHUA.

Ver. 1. *Shittim*, that is, Acacias, was the name of the district in which the Israelites were encamped at the time of the idolatry of Baal-peor, Num. xxv. 1. And in Num. xxxiii. 49, the closing sentence in the list of journeyings and encampments from the exodus onward is, 'And they pitched by Jordan, from Beth-jeshimoth even unto Abel-shittim (margin, the plains of Shittim) in the plains of Moab.' If Shittim was the place of encampment before moving to the edge of the Jordan for the crossing, i. 11, the express mention of it may favour the supposition that these spies had been sent out beforehand. This act of sending out the spies was natural before moving the whole people forward: and it was specially natural to Joshua, who had himself been sent out by Moses to spy the land, Num. xiii. *Secretly*: a very peculiar word, indicating the utmost stillness, avoiding everything that might cause alarm among the Canaanites, perhaps even concealing their mission from the Israelites themselves. *Jericho*, now a village Eriha, though the situation may be a little altered, as the city has been repeatedly destroyed and rebuilt. The present village is small and wretched and filthy. The situation, however, is wonderful, in a flat region, formed by the widening of the deep Jordan valley, near the north end of the Dead Sea. Josephus speaks in the strongest terms of the fertility of the soil around it: and it is still watered by a noble spring, called 'Ain es Sultân, close by which the Canaanite city may have stood. This city was opposite the Israelite host, and gave name to the region where Israel had been for some time encamped, Num. xxii. 1, etc. It was natural to begin by attacking it, and taking possession of those 'plains of Jericho' which spread out here to the west of the Jordan. Besides, from this position the people would best be able to force an entrance into the centre of the land of Canaan, through one or other of the mountain passes by which one must ascend to the high-lying country from the Jordan valley. *A harlot's house*. Attempts have been often made, so long ago as by Josephus, to represent Rahab as simply an innkeeper. This she probably may have been, but not merely this: there is no ground for doubting the accuracy of the ordinary translation. The two spies sought nothing else than a place of rest and safety: and Rahab's house may have

 CHAP. II. 2-7.—*The King of Jericho searches for the Spies.*

been the place to which they could most readily find access without having inconvenient questions put to them. Moreover, they would not overlook the advantages it offered for effecting their escape, owing to its situation on the wall.

CHAPTER II. 2-7.—THE KING OF JERICHO SEARCHES FOR THE SPIES.

Vers. 2-7. Suspicion, which took shape and led to action that very night, must have been very prevalent, in connection with the state of widespread uneasiness and alarm afterwards described by Rahab, vers. 9-11. Not improbably she may have hid the spies before the king summoned her to bring them forth; since delay would have enhanced the suspicion and increased the danger of which she had a presentiment from the first. The Hebrew in ver. 4, literally rendered, 'the woman took the two men and hid *him*,' may possibly suggest that she hid each of them by himself. Her reply to the king's messengers was an untruth, which ought not to be defended. A harlot was very likely to be a liar too, when the temptation came in her way. And however striking her case is, on which account it is singled out by two writers in the New Testament to illustrate the saving work of God, Heb. xi. 31, Jas. ii. 25, still her salvation was of pure grace: a vile sinner to begin with, her faith nevertheless clung to the cause and people of God, at first very much for self-preservation. The seducer who had ruined her may have left her an unbeliever in patriotism as in every other virtue: and yet her very despair in reference to everything which the virtuous esteem may have been made the inlet to the grace of God: compare Eph. ii. 12, 13. The flat roof of an Eastern house is turned to account for many purposes: the stalks of flax, growing in the Jordan valley, would very naturally be spread there, and would afford an excellent opportunity for hiding. The Hebrew in ver. 6 might perhaps be rendered 'flax of wood,' or 'tree-flax,' which some have understood to be cotton; but this is unlikely. A comparison of ver. 5 with ver. 7 proves that the shutting of the city gates was not an exceptional act that night, but that this was done regularly as the sun went down; see vi. 1. *The fords of Jordan*, somewhere in the neighbourhood of Jericho, are mentioned again, Judg. iii. 28, though the way to Jordan over them cannot now be identified.

CHAPTER II. 8-21.—THE AGREEMENT BETWEEN RAHAB AND THE SPIES.

Ver. 8. She acted faithfully and promptly for their safety, not letting them even lie down, but at once making them aware of the situation. Her language indicates that she was not ignorant of the standing of Israel, as the chosen people of Jehovah, whose name she uses repeatedly, and whose purpose she acknowledges, as she makes it plain that she has learned the great lessons of their history, at least the beginning of it in the passage of the Red Sea, and the latest triumph when Sihon and Og were conquered and their land appropriated, Num. xxi. xxxii.—**Vers. 9-11.** Her language corresponds closely with the prediction in the song of Israel after they had passed through the Red Sea, Ex. xv. 14-16. In some cases this fainting and melting of the heart may nevertheless have stirred the Canaanites to a desperate resistance, in other cases it may have left them sunken and apathetic: we do not know of any instance besides Rahab's own, in which it led to faith in the living God and adherence to Him; she was like the one woman in the throng around Jesus, who drew virtue from Him by touching Him, Luke viii. 45-48. When she says, ver. 10, 'Sihon and Og, whom ye *utterly destroyed*,' she uses the technical word for that which was devoted to the service of Jehovah exclusively and inalienably, Lev. xxvii. 21, 28, 29. From the last of these verses it will be seen how this devoting led to utter destruction in the case of desperately wicked men, on whom He must be glorified against their will, since they are unwilling that He should be glorified in them; of which the seven nations of Canaan are the most remarkable example, and next to them the Amalekites; and how it also led to the forfeiture and consecration of the property of such persons, Ezra x. 8, Micah iv. 13, as was notably the case when Joshua took Jericho.—**Vers. 12-14.** She therefore asked the spies to swear and to give a token that her life and the lives of her family should be spared, to which they willingly consented, on condition of her continuing faithful to them, as they again and again made clear, vers. 17, 20.—**Vers. 15, 16.** She let them down through the window by a cord, literally **the cord**, the one habitually used for letting things down outside the wall, and here used for persons, as again in the case of Paul, Acts ix. 25; 2 Cor. xi. 33. Further, she bade them not go straight home, but remain hid for three days in the adjoining mountains.¹—**Vers. 18, 19.**

¹ Cp. Stanley's *Sinai and Palestine*, p. 308.

CHAP. II. 22-24.—*The Return of the Spies.*

The spies had already sworn, vers. 12, 14, and now, when let down, they gave the token. Many identify the line of scarlet thread with the cord by which they had been let down: but as the words are different, no certainty can be attained upon the point. She was to bring home her parents and other relatives, literally to gather them; and as they remained in the house or went beyond it, the spies or themselves would be responsible for the consequences. It is fanciful to make this scarlet thread a type of Christ; yet the spies may have been led to request that it should be bound in the window to make the house known, and to require those who wished for safety to keep within the doors, by reflecting on the safety during the tenth plague on Egypt vouchsafed to all who kept within the door on whose lintel and side-posts the blood of the passover had been sprinkled.—**Ver. 21.** There is nothing to inform us whether she bound the scarlet line in the window immediately or not: she would certainly do it in good time, and in such circumstances as to attract the least possible attention inside Jericho.

CHAPTER II. 22-24.—THE RETURN OF THE SPIES.

Ver. 22. Following Rahab's good advice, they eluded their pursuers by hiding in the mountains for three days, after which they returned in safety to Joshua and told him of the faint-heartedness of the people, and the inference drawn from this by Rahab (ver. 9) and themselves, that Jehovah had given the whole land into their hands.—**Ver. 24.** *Truly* is a doubtful translation: perhaps the word may best remain untranslated, as the mark of the commencement of a speech. *Delivered*, literally, given, as in ver. 9. Joshua could not but mark the contrast between the conduct of the spies and that of those among whom he had been, Num. xiii. And if he had kept the mission a secret at the first, he would make it thoroughly public now, for the encouragement of the whole camp of Israel.

1. *Why should Joshua have sent out the spies?*
2. *What is to be said of Rahab's falsehood?*
3. *What is the difference between Rahab and the rest of the people in their attitude toward Israel?*
4. *Is the red thread hung out by Rahab to be considered a type?*

CHAPTER III. 1-13.—THE ARRANGEMENTS IN VIEW OF CROSSING THE JORDAN.

Ver. 1. *Shittim*, see at ii. 1.—Vers. 2-4. *Three days*. As there is no definite article, the balance of probability seems against identifying these with the three days mentioned at i. 11: perhaps the command to the people to sanctify themselves in prospect of the working of Jehovah, ver. 5, ought to lead us rather to compare these three days with the three before the giving of the Law at Mount Sinai, Ex. xix, 10, 11. The command was sent through the camp by the officers (see at i. 10 as to them) to be ready to move forward or journey under the guidance of the ark of the covenant: it is the word which our version commonly employs to render the verb describing the movements of Israel under the guidance of God in the wilderness, especially throughout Num. xxxiii. and ix. 15-23, for which 'remove' here, vers. 1 and 3, and at ver. 14, is not a happy substitute. At times the ark moved in the very middle of the tribes, behind Reuben's division and in front of Ephraim's, yet not under the compulsion of mechanical uniformity, but as it were instinct with life, because inhabited by the living God; at other times it did go in front of all, as for instance to search out a place for them, see Num. iii. 31, 32, iv. 5-15, x. 17, 21, 33; and so it was to do now at the crossing of Jordan, as again at the siege of Jericho, vi. 6. There is no evidence to support the notion that the ark was too sacred to be approached within 2000 cubits or so: the only reason assigned here for the distance is of itself sufficient, that this space was left to let the people know how they were to go, in a way which they had not passed heretofore. The ark was to be borne in full state by *the priests the Levites*, that is, the appointed Levitical priesthood, Deut. xviii. 1, etc. The antitype is familiar to the mind of Christians, namely, the passage through the river of death into the heavenly Canaan, by the way along which the great High Priest has gone before us, and which He keeps open for us: the imperfection of the types leads us to combine into one the passage of the Red Sea and that of Jordan, at the beginning and at the end of the pilgrimage of Israel, which have so much of essential sameness, though not without important circumstantial differences.—Vers. 5, 6. These sentences may be regarded as the summary of the instructions afterwards given by him in more minute detail, and of the execution of them. Possibly these details were communicated to Joshua in

 CHAP. III. 1-13.—*The Arrangements in view of crossing the Jordan.*

successive revelations as he needed to know them ; or, rather, they may have been all revealed to him from the first, but only gradually communicated to the people. *Wonders*, ver. 5, is the term used to describe the working of Jehovah in Egypt and in the wilderness on behalf of His people, Ex. iii. 20, xxxiv. 10, Judg. vi. 13, and very often in the Psalms, sometimes in our version rendered ‘*marvels*,’ or ‘*miracles*.’ God is Himself described as ‘*wonderful in counsel and excellent in working*,’ Isa. xxviii. 29, for His work reflects His character ; and Abraham was asked, ‘*Is anything too hard (the same word) for Jehovah?*’ Gen. xviii. 14.—**Ver. 7.** Here is the promise to Joshua at a critical moment, that Jehovah should magnify him in the sight of the people, and that this should be the mere beginning of that magnifying : it was fulfilled, iv. 14. The comparison with Moses reminds us of what is said, Ex. xiv. 31, how after crossing the Red Sea ‘*the people feared Jehovah, and believed Jehovah and His servant Moses.*’—**Ver. 8.** The original expresses emphatically that on this high occasion Joshua was to command the very priests, and to direct their movements as they bore the ark. First of all he was to tell them, that after being the first to exhibit their faith by walking into the Jordan, they were to stand still there.—**Vers. 9-11.** He was next to bid the people come here and listen to the words of their God, who was among them, and who was distinguished by various titles of honour, in view of the work in which he was engaged for them. *Come hither* ; more literally, *come near hither* : see Ex. xx. 19-21. The command to sanctify themselves, ver. 5, implied that He is the Holy One : He now made Himself known as the living God, in opposition to all the lifeless idols of the nations with whom they were to come into conflict. He was Jehovah their God, of whose covenant with them the ark was the symbol and pledge ; but yet He was no mere tutelary God of Israel, He was the Lord of all the earth. A Jewish notion that the ark of the covenant itself is here called the Lord of all the earth, is in itself so strange that ver. 13 is scarcely needed to guide us to the right interpretation. The Hebrew construction in ver. 11 is certainly peculiar, yet the rendering of our version can be defended : otherwise it might be translated, ‘*Behold the ark of the covenant ! The Lord of all the earth ! He is passing over before you into Jordan.*’—In this passage the whole seven nations of Canaan are mentioned, as in other cases where the language is meant to be specially impressive, xxiv. 11 ; Deut. vii. 1. Much more frequently only part are named,

 CHAP. III. 14-IV. 18.—*The Passage of Jordan.*

as the Hittites, i. 4, the Amorites and Canaanites, v. 1, vii. 7, 9, etc., the Girgashites being always one of the omitted nations, except in Neh. ix. 8. Jehovah would without fail *drive them out*, or dispossess them; the same Hebrew verb expressing with great felicity that a possession is taken from one party, and that it is given to another.—**Vers. 12, 13.** At this time, as on some other occasions of great works of God for the people, the whole twelve tribes were to take part by representation, a man for each tribe: the men were to be ready beforehand, though their task was not assigned to them till iv. 2. Further information was given as to the effect of the priests bearing the ark forward. The soles of their feet should *rest* (when they were dipped, ver. 15) in the waters of Jordan, an expression never again used, as indeed water could not naturally give rest to the sole of any one's foot; see the case of Noah's dove, Gen. viii. 9. Yet in virtue of the Lord's presence and working, their feet should rest in the waters, these waters should be cleft asunder. Comp. so far Matt. xiv. 24-33. *The waters of Jordan shall be cut off [from] the waters that come down from above:* more literally, and in every way better, 'the waters of Jordan shall be cut off, [even] the waters that come down from above;' so that it was these upper waters that stood as a heap, as is said (ver. 16), whereas those below the point of crossing failed, and were cut off. *A heap*, as ver. 16, and Ex. xv. 8; with this difference, however, that the waters of the Red Sea were a wall unto the Israelites on their right hand and on their left, Ex. xiv. 22, 29.

CHAPTER III. 14-IV. 18.—THE PASSAGE OF JORDAN.

Vers. 14-17. *The waters were divided.* This had been foretold (ver. 13). It was indeed the most unlikely season of the year for such an event, the most hopeless for any explanation other than the immediate act of God without natural means: for at the passover season, about the spring equinox, which is the harvest time in the heated Jordan valley around Jericho (beside the deep depression of the Dead Sea, 1292 feet below the level of the Mediterranean), the melting of the snow on the mountains made the river overflow its banks and spread over into what may be called the outer channel, covered during the rest of the year with luxuriant undergrowth, the so-called glory of Jordan: see 1 Chron. xii. 15; Jer. xii. 5, xlix. 19. At the present southern fords the width of the river, in its proper bed, is said to be 80 or 90 feet, and its depth 9 feet; but the width of the outer channel,

 CHAP. III. 14-IV. 18.—*The Passage of Jordan.*

or Jordan valley, is two hours. The sites of Adam and Zaretan cannot be given, in spite of Tyrwhitt Drake's ingenious suggestion, that the Alexandrian Septuagint reading Siaram for Zaretan points to Tell Sârem, a very conspicuous and unusually large mound, 3 miles south of Bethshean; while Adam, meaning 'red,' is connected with Khurbet el Hamrath, the Red river, a mile farther south. Adam is mentioned nowhere else; Zaretan, more correctly Zarthanah or Zarthan, only at 1 Kings iv. 12, vii. 46, and in connection with Bethshean and Jezreel, near the former. Van de Velde and others incline to think that it is Kurn Surtubeh, a rocky ridge, said to have ruins on it, which sends a lower range of hills forward almost to the Jordan; at this point the Jordan valley is contracted more than anywhere else. The bed of the river course being dry where the Israelites crossed, the dammed up waters would raise the level of the river always higher, and always extending backwards in the direction of its source. But we have no means of settling the geography with precision. 'Very far *from* the city Adam' is the translation of the approved Hebrew text; but the older reading, though rejected by the Massoretic editors, 'very far *at* the city Adam,' has a strong claim to be received. How wide might be the space left dry in the river-course we cannot determine with any approach to accuracy, though Conder finds a trace of Adam near Kurn Surtubeh, in the Dâmieh ford S.E. of Shechem.—**Ver. 17.** The priests stood firm where they had been commanded, ver. 8. *Until all the people were passed clean over Jordan;* literally, 'until all the nation had finished passing over Jordan.' Israel is usually called 'the people,' as if this were a more honourable name; 'nation,' very often in the plural rendered 'heathen' or 'Gentiles,' seems less honourable, yet is also given to Israel, as here, and iv. 1, v. 6, 8, x. 13, Judg. ii. 20, though not in the English version. On the other hand, 'peoples' is applied to other nations, as iv. 24, xxiv. 17, 18, though in the English version the plural form of the word has been very rarely preserved. Perhaps the appellation is given to Israel here, as they were now seen to take their place among the nations of the world, as much a nation as any of them, in accordance with the promise to Abraham, Gen. xvii. 4, 6.—**Chap. IV. 1-3.** The Divine miraculous guidance, however inspiring and supporting in some respects, was apparently attended by peculiarities trying to faith; for instance, it often threw light upon no more than a single step, leaving all beyond in darkness. It was only now that Joshua, or

CHAP. III. 14-IV. 18.—*The Passage of Jordan.*

at all events the people, who are associated with him by the use of the plural verbs, vers. 2, 3, had the revelation made of the duties of the twelve representative men whom he had in readiness, v. 4, iii. 12.—**Vers. 4-8.** Each stone was probably as large as a picked man could carry on his shoulders. The twelve stones placed together, perhaps like one of our Scottish cairns, in their first lodging-place within the land of Canaan, were to be a sign to coming generations, ver. 6, and therefore a memorial, ver. 7. The book of Joshua records the history of primitive times, which retained this patriarchal method of keeping up the memory of great events, vii. 26, viii. 29, xxii. 10, 24, 26, xxiv. 26; see Gen. xxviii. 18, xxxi. 45, 46, 52, xxxv. 14, 20. The attention to instructing their children in the meaning of the sign is in complete harmony with the case of the passover and the consecration of the first-born, Ex. xii. 26, 27, xiii. 14-16. Observe, in ver. 8, that the action is attributed to the children of Israel in the mass, which was performed by their representatives. It is the same verb which is translated 'leave' in ver. 3, and 'laid down' in ver. 8, the latter being more precise.—**Ver. 9.** To mark the very spot where the crossing took place, other twelve stones were set up by Joshua, we may believe under Divine direction (see ver. 10), exactly where the priests' feet had stood; and since there is no proof that this was in the true bed of the Jordan rather than in the edge of the overflowed outer portion (for 'in the midst of Jordan,' iii. 17, iv. 10, is indeterminate), these stones might stand a long time, especially as they may well have been much larger than the others which were carried a long way on men's shoulders. These stones are mentioned first in the sentence, which literally is, 'And twelve stones did Joshua set up,' etc., as if to distinguish them as sharply as possible from the twelve stones in ver. 8, with which some writers have strangely confounded them. There is nothing surprising in a double memorial, as in the case of Jacob's pillar and heap, Mizpah and Galeed, when dealing with Laban; to say nothing of the important difference in their use, arising out of the difference of their situation.—**Vers. 10, 11.** Everything was done that day according to the commandment of Jehovah: and far from trifling or making needless delay, the people *hasted* and passed over, as in Ex. xii. 33; yet not as in Ex. xii. 11, and Deut. xvi. 3, where a word is used more expressive of hurry and confusion, comp. Isa. lii. 12.—**Ver. 11** resumes the narrative in ver. 1, yet carries it further forward; and it probably asserts that the ark now passed over, not merely 'in presence

CHAP. III. 14-IV. 18.—*The Passage of Jordan.*

of the people,' but so as to reoccupy its old position of going 'before the people,' iii. 11; see on iii. 2-4. This view deserves the rather to be taken, because we must assume that the pillar of cloud and fire no longer guided them now that they had left the trackless wilderness behind and had come into a land thickly peopled: see Ex. xiii. 20-22; Num. ix. 15-23, x. 33, 34.—**Vers. 12, 13.** As in general the commands of God had been thoroughly obeyed that day, so in particular the eastern tribes went across Jordan with their brethren, according to Joshua's instructions and their own promise: see i. 12-18. *Armed:* see on this word at i. 14. How came the number of those who crossed to be only 40,000, when the census in Num. xxvi. makes the fighting men of Reuben alone 43,730, of Gad 40,500, and of Manasseh (the half of this tribe being settled east of Jordan) 52,700? Perhaps the 40,000 were those disengaged at the moment, to be followed by those who were necessarily occupied in rebuilding the cities or protecting their women and children. Or perhaps they arranged to have 40,000 as their contingent of men always to be in the camp actually fit for fighting at the time, not sending men who from various causes might be ineffective. *The 'plains' of Jericho* is the rendering of a word very difficult to translate; we also read much more often of the 'plains' of Moab, and in the singular of the 'plain,' particularly the sea of the plain, iii. 16, that is, the Dead Sea. The word seems properly to denote a dry and desert plain. This scarcely agrees with our conception of the richness of the soil around Jericho; but it might describe it, and the whole depressed Jordan valley, after the summer heat had parched it up, or in those places where there were no springs of water to preserve the verdure.—**Ver. 14.** While the direct and principal end of the miracle was to bring the hosts of Israel safely into Canaan, two other important purposes were served by it, namely, the intimidation of the enemy, x. 1, and the magnifying of Joshua in the sight of all Israel, that they might draw a parallel between him and Moses, ver. 23, whom they honoured very specially in consequence of the miracle at the Red Sea, Ex. xiv. 31. See at i. 16-18 how completely this object was attained.—**Vers. 15-18.** The priests, who had stepped into the waters of Jordan and stood still there by express Divine command, now came out of it by the same authority. They had been the first to enter, and they were the last to leave: and no sooner had they left it, than the miraculous cleft in the waters ceased, and everything returned to its usual course. *The ark of the testimony* was so named

 CHAP. IV. 19-24.—*The Setting up of the Memorial of the Passage.*

on account of the two tables of the Law being laid up there, Ex. xxv. 21, 22, xxxi. 18. This name is more frequent in the Pentateuch than in the book of Joshua, which chiefly uses the synonymous phrase, 'ark of the covenant,' of which these tables written by the finger of God were the sign, Ex. xxxiv. 1, 28; also 'the ark of Jehovah,' whose testimony and covenant it contained, and whose presence it symbolized, iii. 10, 11.

 CHAPTER IV. 19-24.—THE SETTING UP OF THE MEMORIAL
OF THE PASSAGE.

Ver. 19. *Gilgal* is named by anticipation, see v. 9; of this use by a writer of a name given later there are many examples, from Bethel onwards, Gen. xii. 8. Josephus places it 10 stadia (fully 1 mile) from Jericho, and 50 from Jordan. It was identified with Tell Jiljûlieh, in the situation described, by the Austrian chaplain Zschokke in 1865. *The tenth day of the first month* was four days before the passover; it was the very day on which the Israelites had been commanded to look out the lambs for the first passover, Ex. xii. 3.—**Ver. 20,** fulfilling the command, ver. 2, as had been already mentioned so far, ver. 8. *Pitch*: the ordinary rendering is better 'exalt' or 'set up.'—**Vers. 21-24.** Joshua gave directly to the people the instructions for their children, in connection with this monument, of which he had spoken more briefly to the twelve men, vers. 6, 7. The mighty (or strong) hand of Jehovah is often mentioned by Moses with reference to the deliverance from Egypt; and it is now linked on to the new miraculous passage of God's people through the waters of Jordan. And this took place in order to teach Israel to fear Jehovah, yet also to let the peoples of the earth, its various nationalities, know His strong hand: comp. Ex. xiv. 31 and xv. 14-16.

1. *How do the commands of the Lord seem to have been given to Joshua, and to have been communicated to the people?*
2. *How many nations of Canaan are here mentioned; and how does the number vary? and what is the meaning of their names?*
3. *What titles are given to the Lord in this narrative, and for what reason, may we suppose?*
4. *In what state was the Jordan when the people crossed?*
5. *How did the priests act in this miracle?*
6. *How do the words 'people' and 'nation' seem to be used with a difference?*

 CHAP. V. 1-12.—*Preparations for taking Possession of Canaan.*

7. *What memorials of the crossing did Joshua set up?*
8. *What is natural in such acts to the age in which he lived?*
9. *What was the nature of the passing over in haste?*
10. *What purposes were served by the miracle?*
11. *With what transactions is the mighty hand of the Lord often associated?*

 CHAPTER V. 1-12.—THE CONSEQUENT PREPARATIONS FOR TAKING POSSESSION OF CANAAN, AND RENEWAL OF THE COVENANT.

Ver. 1. First of all, such terror fell upon the nations of the land that they had no spirit to resist a people thus manifestly guided and upheld by God: see ii. 11. The nations here singled out of the seven are the Amorites and Canaanites, not the Hittites as at i. 4. *Until we were passed over*: a reading well supported, and preferred by the Massorettes, is 'until they were passed over;' but it is unnecessary, and the first person is also used in ver. 6. This terror secured quiet for Israel at a critical time, and gave opportunity for the renewal of the covenant of circumcision.—**Ver. 2.** *Sharp knives*: literally, it would seem, 'knives of flint,' which were used in this rite according to Jewish tradition; see Ex. iv. 25. A story preserved in the Septuagint translation, xxiv. 30, is that these stone knives were buried with Joshua. *The second time* is an expression which has sometimes puzzled readers: but it merely gives definiteness to the adverb 'again' (as in Isa. xi. 11), which in Hebrew is only indicated by a verb, 'and return, circumcise the children of Israel a second time.' The circumcising *again* manifestly applies to the nation; nothing could be more erroneous than to imagine this sacrament repeated to any individual who had already received it.—**Vers. 4, 5.** The generation that came out of Egypt, however sunken in many ways, had preserved one part of the form of godliness, they were in a state of circumcision; whereas their children, perhaps in most respects far better than they, grew up uncircumcised.—**Vers. 6, 7.** Two explanations of this fact have been deduced from the statement in these verses. The one assigns a mere physical reason: the children were not circumcised 'by the way,' ver. 7, on account of the inconvenience of performing this rite in the midst of toilsome and uncertain marches. But, had this been all, opportunities might

CHAP. V. 1-12.—*Preparations for taking Possession of Canaan.*

easily have been furnished in the providence of God : indeed it is incredible that the people should not have readily found these for themselves, amid long periods of rest ('a month, or a year,' Num. ix. 22) in the course of the forty years, as there must have been multitudes of occurrences in families which caused vastly greater inconvenience for travelling than circumcision would have caused. The other explanation is certainly the true one : that from the time of the rebellion consequent upon the evil report of the spies, the children of Israel were under the severest possible ecclesiastical discipline, suspension from church privileges, which deprived their children of the sacraments ; see Num. xiv. 33, 34. The faith of this younger and better race was ready to make the profession anew which should publicly reinstate them in the position of Abraham's seed, Gen. xvii. 7, 8, 14 : but with their accumulated numbers, and after so long neglect, a fitting opportunity must be found. This had now come, if the passage of the Jordan was to them what the passage of the Red Sea had been to their fathers, who 'were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea,' 1 Cor. x. 2. They returned to the use of the two great ordinary sacraments, circumcision and the passover : and if participation in circumcision had been somewhat delayed, in their case, as in Abraham's, till after they entered the promised land, it was the more clearly, like his own, 'a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had, yet being uncircumcised,' Rom. iv. 11. Moses also had from some cause neglected to circumcise his child ; and this he was called in very solemn circumstances to do, ere he entered on the work of delivering Israel from Egypt, Ex. iv. 24-26.—Ver. 8. *The people*, more exactly, 'the nation,' and in ver. 6 : see at iii. 17. They took needed rest, after an operation which is painful to adults, Gen. xxxiv. 25, and which became truly a serious undertaking when so vast a number were to be circumcised at once and in the midst of dangerous enemies. Yet an exaggerated view has been taken of this, as if the narrative were incredible, because the whole men of war would have been incapacitated for defending the camp had it been attacked. To speak merely of one thing in reply to this objection : not all the men that came out of Egypt died in the wilderness, but only those of twenty years old and upwards, those who at the Exodus were 'the men of war,' ver. 6 ; from which fact the calculation has been made that a quarter or perhaps even a third part of the men would not need to be circum-

cised at this time.—**Ver. 9.** Some geographical questions about Gilgal may be deferred till ix. 6. *The reproach of Egypt* may grammatically mean either the reproach which is cast upon Egypt, or the reproach which Egypt casts upon them. The latter is the sense here: see Ex. xxxii. 12; Num. xiv. 13-16. During all the rebellious period in which the congregation had been almost in an excommunicated state, the Egyptians are conceived of as reproaching them, as if their hardships and calamities proved that God had forsaken them. The renewal of the miracle at the Red Sea and the restoration of long suspended sacramental privileges made it clear that they were as truly the people of Jehovah now as on that memorable night on which the passover was first observed. *Gilgal* means rolling. Those who overlook all the spiritual meaning of the history reject this derivation of the word, and generally incline to connect it with the rolling together of the great stones brought out of Jordan, iv. 19, or with some earlier historical circumstance unknown to us. If the place had this name already (of which there is no proof), at all events the old name received a new meaning from this important transaction.—**Ver. 10.** The covenant of circumcision having been renewed by the congregation, they were ready to renew the observance of the passover, which was for the circumcised alone, Ex. xii. 43-48. They had had four days' quiet, iv. 19, which for many reasons would be most grateful to them, and which were in this way turned to spiritual account. *At even*, as Deut. xvi. 6. When the institution took place, the time was fixed with greater minuteness, 'between the two evenings,' Ex. xii. 6, etc. *The plains of Jericho*: see at iv. 13.—**Vers. 11, 12.** *Old corn* is the conjectural rendering of a word which occurs only in this and the next verse; many render it more generally 'produce.' There is a plain reference to the law in Lev. xxiii. 14, that they were not to eat bread, or parched corn, or green ears until the self-same day in which they brought to Jehovah an offering, a sheaf of the first-fruits of the harvest, which they were to bring the morrow after the passover. And there were places in Palestine, for instance this half-tropical region between Jericho and the Jordan, in which the harvest was sure to be commenced at the time of the passover. As at the coming out from Egypt the law of God about eating unleavened bread was confirmed or made easier by His providence, since the Egyptians drove them out in haste and left them no time to leaven their dough: so here again His provi-

 CHAP. V. 13-VI. 27.—*The Commencement of the Holy War.*

dence and his law acted harmoniously; the people were now at liberty to use the produce of the land, and they would have been driven to use it on the cessation of the manna, granted to them by a standing miracle, suited to their condition in the wilderness, Ex. xvi. 35: the other standing miracle of the cloudy pillar had probably ceased four days earlier, as has been observed at iv. 10, 11. And in so far as the baptism of the cloud and the eating of that bread from heaven were two special or extraordinary sacraments provided for the Church on account of the peculiar trials and dangers of its condition in the wilderness, there was something manifestly suitable in their passing away just as the two ordinary sacraments of circumcision and the passover were restored to the revived Church.

 CHAPTER V. 13-VI. 27.—THE COMMENCEMENT OF THE HOLY
 WAR, AND THE FALL OF JERICHO.

Vers. 13-15. The true leader of the Israelites was not Joshua, but the mysterious representative of Jehovah, who appropriated his name and the honours due to him; whom we need have no difficulty about identifying with the Son of God, sent forth from the Father to the Church even then, though made known much more obscurely to the Church of the Old Testament than to us in 'the fulness of the time' (Gal. iv. 4). Hence the ancient believers who were privileged to see him had difficulty in deciding whether they were addressing a fellow-creature or the Lord of all. In the book of Genesis he appeared as the Angel of Jehovah (or of God) first to the outcast Hagar, Gen. xvi. 7-14, then to the patriarchs with whom the covenant had been made. In Exodus he appeared to Moses in the burning bush, Ex. iii. 1-6; and the Angel of God went before him and the children of Israel, in the pillar of cloud, Ex. xiv. 19, 24. To Moses also the promise was made, for the encouragement of the people, 'Behold, I send an Angel before thee, to keep thee in the way, and to bring thee into the place which I have prepared. Beware of him and obey his voice, provoke him not: for he will not pardon your transgressions: for my name is in him. But if thou shalt indeed obey his voice, and do all that I speak; then I will be an enemy unto thine enemies, and an adversary unto thine adversaries. For mine Angel shall go before thee, and bring thee in unto the Amorites,' etc., 'and I will cut them off,' Ex. xxiii. 20-23. This promise was now to be fulfilled: and only by giving due weight to it

 CHAP. V. 13-VI. 27.—*The Commencement of the Holy War.*

can we thoroughly appreciate the nature of the terrible war against those abominably degraded nations: in spite of its being a war of extermination, or indeed for this very reason, it was a holy war in which the Angel of Jehovah was himself the leader.—Ver. 13. *When Joshua was by Jericho*, literally 'in Jericho,' which might include the territory of the city (as seems to be the meaning at xvi. 7), as in the case of Hebron, Gen. xiii. 18: if the meaning 'in the city of Jericho' be pressed, it signifies that his mind was in it, engrossed with it, or perhaps that he was in a trance and felt as if he were already in it. *With his sword drawn in his hand*, as the Angel of Jehovah appeared to Balaam, Num. xxii. 31. Yet Joshua felt no fear, and questioned him, asking, Art thou for us or for our adversaries? He who was thus questioned was of too high rank to return a direct answer, he must reveal himself.—Ver. 14. The first half of the verse ought to be translated, 'Nay, for I am captain of the host of Jehovah: now am I come.' *Captain of the host*: for in this martial character did the Angel now reveal himself, when the Church had passed from a state of habitual pilgrimage to a state of constant active warfare. What Joab was to David, and other captains of the host to other kings of Israel, that was this Angel to the God and invisible King of Israel. The favourite title, God or Lord of hosts, in the historical books later than Joshua and Judges, in the Psalms, and in the prophetic books, does not occur till Eli's time, 1 Sam. i. 3. Yet from the time of the Exodus the children of Israel are habitually spoken of as His hosts (or armies, for it is the same Hebrew word), Ex. vii. 4, xii. 17, 41, etc.; and Joshua was but the earthly lieutenant of this invisible Captain of the hosts alike in heaven and on earth. For the title 'the God of hosts' is usually understood as pre-eminently connected with the heavenly host: and there is every reason to include this idea here, inasmuch as He who was the supreme captain of the hosts of Israel had innumerable other hosts under His command: see Isa. xxiv. 21-23; not merely 'twelve legions of angels,' Matt. xxvi. 53, but also all 'the armies which were in heaven,' Rev. xix. 14; in this last quoted passage we see Him in His full glory, as Joshua did not. It is indeed difficult to find a word in English adequate to express what is here translated 'captain:' and accordingly it is also translated 'general,' 'chief,' 'captain that had rule,' 'governor,' and very often 'prince,' as 'Michael your prince,' 'Michael the great prince,' Dan. x. 21, xii. 1, who may well be this very captain of the Lord's

host. It is the same word, in the feminine, that became the new name of Abraham's wife, Sarah, princess: and we find the kindred verb in the new name given to Jacob, on occasion of his wrestling with this mysterious being, who met him, as he now met Joshua, on his entrance to the promised land, 'Israel, for as a prince hast thou power with God and with men, and hast prevailed,' Gen. xxxii. 28. '*Now am I come,*' long looked for and much needed: see Dan. ix. 22, x. 11, 14, Mal. iii. 1, as in the days of his flesh this was a favourite form of expression, 'Art thou he that should come?' Matt. xi. 3. *And Joshua fell on his face and worshipped,* etc., giving him profound reverence, and awaiting his command.—**Ver. 15.** Joshua may not yet have been clear as to the divine nature of him who spoke to him: and therefore that very same token of religious worship was required of him which the Angel at the burning bush had required of Moses, Ex. iii. 5. The passages are word for word the same with two exceptions: the shoes (properly sandals) and the feet are there in the plural, and an additional word is used there, not simply 'holy,' but 'holy ground.'—**Chap. VI. 1, 2.** Jericho was strong in itself, and strongly guarded¹ with every possible precaution since the adventure of the spies; nevertheless it must be taken. It was the key to the country, and all the future success of Israel depended on victory here; see at ii. 1. Therefore the Captain of Jehovah's host, who now is called Jehovah (as the Angel of Jehovah is in like manner, Ex. iii. 4), promises to give it into Joshua's hand, with all that it contains: and the promise is put in the most striking form, as many a time it is, in the past tense, 'See I have given,' etc.—**Vers. 3-5.** All the men of war were to take part in the movement against Jericho, while yet the result was to be manifestly due to the working of Jehovah exclusively, 2 Cor. x. 3-5. Six days' labour, and a seventh at once of intensified labour and of glorious rest, could scarcely fail to remind them of the work of creation and the first Sabbath; and it certainly was meant to carry within it the pledge of a glorious rest in Canaan after all their wars had been ended (apparently in seven years, see xiv. 7, 10), and a pledge to all the people of God to the end of time that the victory shall yet be complete when the kingdoms of the world become the kingdom of our Lord and of His Christ (Rev. xi. 15), and the rest in the true Canaan shall be brought in by the true Joshua. Therefore, while the men of war compassed the

¹ *Straitly* shut up, i.e. strictly, closely; cp. Gen. xliii. 7.

city in the manner prescribed, the priests bearing the ark and blowing the trumpets are the central and most important figures: comp. at iii. 2-4. The trumpets were of *rams' horns*, according to an old Jewish tradition; but it is now almost universally rejected, the simple translation being 'trumpets for loud sound,' though from the unquestionable use of the word 'horn,' we may infer that they were trumpets of the shape of a horn. The same word is used very often to express the great year of recovery and restoration, Lev. xxv. 9, 10, etc., and it has been retained in our language under the form 'jubilee;' and the opinion has much to recommend it, that the jubilee year received its name from the trumpet by whose sound it was ushered in. The only other time the word occurs, Ex. xix. 13, it is rendered 'trumpet,' in the description of Jehovah meeting His people at Sinai. No doubt it indicated a similar meeting here, and also in the jubilee year; as will be the case too when the trumpet shall sound at the resurrection, 1 Thess. iv. 16. If the sacred and symbolic meaning were less clear than it is, there need be no doubt left in the mind of any one who notices the use of the number seven, which to the Hebrews represented sacredness, the number of the covenant, and hence perhaps also completeness; seven priests, seven trumpets, seven days, seven compassings.—Vers. 6-11. The command issued by Jehovah to Joshua, was transmitted by him to those who carried it into execution. He commanded the priests, ver. 6, and the people, ver. 7; and both obeyed, vers. 8, 9. We need not hesitate to say that all the directions given by Joshua had been received by him from Jehovah, though they are not mentioned in vers. 3-5. The priests blowing the trumpets were followed by the priests bearing the ark: they occupied the centre of the procession, the troops preceding and following them being named respectively 'him that is armed,' ver. 7, or 'the armed men,' vers. 9, 13 (which ought to have been uniformly translated), and 'the rear-ward.'¹ It is the opinion of some good Jewish commentators that these 'armed men' were the two and a half eastern tribes, certainly it is the same word that is used of them in iv. 13; and then the rear-ward would be the main body of the other tribes. In ver. 10 a further direction is given to maintain perfect silence in the meantime, which would add to the mystery and impressiveness of their movements: in the English Bible this is

¹ Rereward = rearguard, 'guard and ward being related as *guise* and *wise*; French *guerre*, and English *war*.'—*Bible Word Book*.

CHAP. V. 13-VI. 27.—*The Commencement of the Holy War.*

unnecessarily put in the pluperfect tense : rather we should think of the directions being issued as they were needed, ver. 16, iii. 12, iv. 2.—**Vers. 12-14.** So the city was compassed daily for five days more.—**Ver. 15.** The seventh day was like any of the preceding ones, except that they compassed the city seven times, therefore they must have begun very early.—**Vers. 16-19.** Now at the seventh circuit, when the trumpets sounded, the people were to shout in token of victory (comp. Rev. xi. 15), and the wall should fall flat, and every one should march straight forward into the city, vers. 5, 20. The city and all that it contained was devoted to God ; the inhabitants were devoted to destruction, and the metals were devoted to the treasury of Jehovah, according to the law in Lev. xxvii. 28, 29, of which there had already been an example in the cities of Arad, Num. xxi. 2, 3. The metals alone are mentioned here, because everything else perished by fire, ver. 24. The translation ‘accursed,’ ver. 17, ‘accursed thing,’ and ‘curse,’ ver. 18, and ‘utterly destroyed,’ ver. 21, ought to be uniform. Then ver. 18 might be more closely rendered as explained at ii. 10, ‘And ye, in any wise keep yourselves from the devoted thing, lest ye devote and [yet] take of the devoted thing, and make the camp of Israel into a devoted thing, and trouble it,’ as Achan actually did, and as king Saul did with the Amalekites, 1 Sam. xv. This warning had been given already, Deut. vii. 26. The only exception to universal destruction was to be in favour of Rahab and her family, in accordance with the agreement, ii. 12-14. It would seem that Jericho and its spoils were regarded as the first-fruits of this holy war, to be given to God like all first-fruits ; and the more manifestly so, since it had been given into their hands by miracle.—**Vers. 20-25.** The solemn command was executed in every particular : and Joshua sent the two spies (‘young men,’ ver. 23) to take care that the promise to Rahab was performed. She and her ‘kindred,’ ver. 23, better ‘families,’ were left, or set down (see at iv. 3 and 8) outside the camp, as being in the meantime unclean ; comp. Num. xxxi. 12, 13, 19. Perhaps this discipline may have been blessed to her, as she now needed to learn the lesson of a holy life ; certainly she lived on, dwelling in Israel unto the day this account was written, ver. 25 ; and she was married to a prince of the tribe of Judah, Salmon, an ancestor of David, and so of Christ, Matt. i. 5, whose human nature was linked on at various points to the most outcast Gentile races.—**Ver. 26.** This curse must be understood as uttered by Joshua under inspiration ;

 CHAP. VII.—*The Sin of Achan and its Consequences.*

and it was fulfilled upon the man who ventured to disregard it in that age of unbelief and apostasy in which Ahab was king, 1 Kings xvi. 34. Probably the whole family, from the eldest to the youngest, were to be swept away. Yet this curse upon the man who should rebuild the walls, gates, or fortifications which Jehovah had thrown down ('cursed before Jehovah') did not interfere with the rebuilding of the houses; considering how desirable it was as a residence, we are not surprised to read very soon of it again as a city of Benjamin, xviii. 21.—**Ver. 27.** This success against Jericho filled the country with the fame of Joshua, as of one with whom Jehovah was; though this fame was quickly to receive a check, that the human instrumentality might be estimated at its real value.

1. *What was the state of mind of the Canaanites after Israel had crossed the Jordan?*
2. *Why had the observance of circumcision been interrupted among the children of Israel?*
3. *What was the reproach of Egypt which was now rolled away?*
4. *How did the Law and the providence of God act together in the matter of the food of the people?*
5. *In what manner did the Son of God appear to the ancient Church usually?*
6. *How specially did He appear at this time, and why?*
7. *What use of symbolical numbers appears in the account of Jericho being taken?*
8. *What were the trumpets of rams' horns?*
9. *How were the spoils of Jericho to be regarded and treated?*
10. *What was the nature of the curse pronounced on him who should rebuild Jericho?*

 CHAPTER VII.—THE SIN OF ACHAN AND ITS CONSEQUENCES.

Ver. 1. Achan did the very thing against which the people had been warned, vi. 18. *Committed a trespass*, an emphatic expression in the laws of Moses and in references to them, Lev. v. 15, vi. 2, Num. v. 6, 12, etc.; though doubly disguised in the A. V., which sometimes translates it 'transgression,' and habitually uses 'trespass' and 'trespass-offering' for an entirely different Hebrew word, 'guilt' and 'guilt-offering.' This word seems to include the notion of treachery as involved in certain sins, such as covenant-breaking, charged against Israel here at ver. 11; hence it is even translated 'falsehood' in Job xxi. 34. *The accursed thing*, as also vers. 11, 12,

CHAP. VII.—*The Sin of Achan and its Consequences.*

13, 15; literally 'the devoted thing,' see at vi. 17, 18.—**Vers. 2-5.** The first expedition of Joshua was directed against Ai, a place near Bethel, but E. of it, already mentioned in Abraham's history, Gen. xii. 8, xiii. 3. If Bethel be the modern Beitin, fully 10 miles N. of Jerusalem, on the road to Shechem, as is now agreed, Ai is the ruins of Et Tell (meaning 'a mound') $1\frac{1}{2}$ miles to the S.E.; or more probably the ruins as far to the south named Khurbet Hayân, which is essentially the same word; possibly it was Khurbet el Haî, $2\frac{1}{2}$ miles farther S. beyond Mukhmas. The whole of this ground is so intersected with ravines and irregularly-shaped hills as to be most suitable for the stratagem narrated in chap. viii. Shebarim, in ver. 5, is quite unknown; some take it, according to its etymology, to be 'dashing to pieces,' 'destruction;' others, more naturally, 'stone quarries,' or 'precipices' in 'the going down' which is mentioned in the next clause. The population of Ai, men and women, amounted to about 12,000; so Joshua's men sent to view ('spies,' as ii. 1, vi. 25) were justified in suggesting that two or three thousand troops might go up and smite it. When, on the contrary, these troops were smitten, though the loss in point of numbers was trifling, it is no wonder that the hearts of the people melted, as those of their enemies had done, ii. 11, v. 1, as had happened, too, when the unbelieving spies brought back their evil report of the land to Moses, Deut. i. 28.—**Vers. 6-9.** Making use of the ordinary signs of mourning, garments rent and earth upon the head, Joshua associated the elders with him in a day of humiliation and prayer, lying prostrate before the ark which had led them to victory. The enemy are called the Amorites in ver. 7, and the Canaanites in ver. 9; see on iii. 10. Joshua, in his prayer, wished that his people had been content rather to stay on the east of Jordan than be led across to be environed (the same word as in vi. 3, 4, of Israel compassing Jericho) and cut off: his grief and anxiety, however, being for the dishonour to the Lord's great name, as in the similar intercessions of Moses, Ex. xxxii. 12, 13; Num. xiv. 13-19; Deut. ix. 26-29.—**Vers. 10-12.** Jehovah replied to the confession and prayer by pointing out the actual state of the case: for it was now time to follow up the confession by action. Ver. 11 is remarkably emphatic, with six verbs to describe the wicked act, three of which are said to be more directly with reference to God; and the emphasis in the original is the plainer on account of the conjunction 'also' prefixed to every verb but the first, though this in the

CHAP. VII.—*The Sin of Achan and its Consequences.*

English is twice mistranslated 'even,' and is twice misplaced. Having appropriated the devoted thing to their own use, Israel made the curse involved in devoting recoil upon themselves, according to the warning : see the corrected translation of vi. 18. It is instructive to observe how the act of the individual Achan was held to be that of the people (comp. xxii. 20) till they repudiated it and cleared themselves of it. There are numberless examples of this in God's moral government of all societies of men ; but they are especially manifest in His Church, in which we are all 'members one of another,' bound to 'look every man on the things of others' in love and yet in faithfulness.—**Vers. 13–15.** The devoted thing was to be removed from among them the next morning by the use of the lot, that is, by a direct appeal to Jehovah on the part of the people who had first sanctified themselves (comp. iii. 5) ; and by ever narrowing circles, from whole tribes to individual men, the guilty one should be marked out and fall into the hands of the living God, Heb. x. 31. On him should judgment then be executed by the terrible death of burning, as in Gen. xxxviii. 24, Lev. xx. 14, xxi. 9 : *because he hath wrought folly in Israel*, an expression always elsewhere employed to indicate the actings of unbridled lust, Gen. xxxiv. 7, Deut. xxii. 21, Judg. xix. 23, 24, xx. 6, 10, 2 Sam. xiii. 12, and therefore rendered 'villany' in Jer. xxix. 23 : this is peculiar, yet covetousness and uncleanness are placed side by side in the New Testament, 1 Cor. v. 10, 11 ; Eph. v. 5 ; Col. iii. 5 ; Heb. xiii. 4 and 5. Death by burning is mentioned as the cruel act of degenerate Israelites, burning their children to idols, Jer. vii. 31, xix. 5, in imitation of the heathen, Deut. xii. 31, 2 Kings xvii. 31 ; and even in cases of civil dissension it was threatened by them, Judg. xii. 1, for which again there was heathen example, Judg. xiv. 15, xv. 6 ; Jer. xxix. 22. In the case in hand, however, it was only the lifeless body which was to be burned after the man had been put to death by stoning, ver. 25.—**Vers. 16–18.** The lot fell upon Achan in the manner described. Another example of the lot, with language almost identical, is to be found in the designation to office of the first king of Israel, 1 Sam. x. 19–21 ; and there is a third case when Jonathan had tasted the honey after Saul's oath of abstinence, 1 Sam. xiv. 38–42. The process is narrated much more fully here than in those passages : yet even here there are probably omissions, for instance of the taking of Carmi, vers. 1, 18. And the word 'family' is used in ver. 17, first in a wider sense, as equivalent to

CHAP. VII.—*The Sin of Achan and its Consequences.*

'tribe,' and then for a branch of the tribe; while 'man by man' must be understood, not of individual men, but of individual households. In these verses, as in ver. 14, 'brought' and 'come' is a less accurate translation than 'brought near' and 'come near,' a word habitually employed in the law of Moses in reference to persons, animals, and things, presented to Jehovah in a religious service.—**Vers. 19–21.** The solemn duty laid on Joshua and the congregation could not be shifted from their shoulders: and Achan knew this as well as every one around him, Num. xv. 30, 31. All that could be done was to bring him to a sense of his sin, and to help him in approaching Jehovah against whom he had sinned presumptuously and directly. Joshua named him tenderly, 'My son,' and, as the Hebrew construction shows, urged him persuasively to make public acknowledgment, which Achan did. *Make confession*, ver. 19, was an excellent rendering in the time of our English version, the verb and the noun being used then in a wider sense than now, Rom. xv. 9; 1 Tim. vi. 13: it is 'make profession,' 'offer praise,' much the same as the preceding 'give glory.' Achan had been tempted by a *goodly Babylonish garment*, perhaps better 'a single goodly mantle of Shinar,' Gen. xi. 2 (language which is apparently an evidence of trade between Jericho and Shinar), and by some silver, not improbably coined, and by a wedge of gold: and he told where he had hid them.—**Vers. 22–26.** His statement having been tested and proved true, the sentence was executed. Joshua and the children of Israel had the coveted objects brought to them, and they laid them out before Jehovah. Then in a sad procession they brought him up into a neighbouring valley, with the objects of his desire, his family, his cattle, and his tent; and having denounced on him trouble (a more emphatic word in ancient than in modern English) from Jehovah for the trouble which he had caused to Israel (vi. 18), they stoned him and burned them. It is inconceivable that his children were burned alive, when only the dead body of Achan was burned: it is even grammatically possible to construe the passage so as to understand that his children were merely spectators of the ruin he had brought on himself. Yet the more natural impression on the reader is that they shared his punishment; if so, we must infer that the eye of God, who was Himself the judge and executioner here, saw them to be partakers of his guilt, as they must have been if they aided in concealing the articles in the tent. There is, however, undoubtedly some obscurity in the latter half of

 CHAP. VIII. 1-29.—*The Renewed Attack upon Ai.*

ver. 25, which has two different verbs in the original though not in the English. Perhaps it may be better rendered, 'And all Israel stoned him with stones, and burned them with fire, and cast stones upon them,' namely after they were dead, to make the heap spoken of in ver. 26. Only thus could the kindled wrath (ver. 1) of the righteous God be turned away. The place was named 'the valley of Achor,' or trouble, with an allusion to his name such as the Hebrews often made by some slight change in a word. It is never mentioned again except in marking the northern boundary of Judah, xv. 7, and in two passages where it is mentioned with the view of conveying spiritual lessons, Isa. lxx. 10; Hos. ii. 15.

1. *What was expected from the expedition against Ai, and what actually occurred?*
2. *What was the nature of Joshua's pleading in prayer on the occasion?*
3. *What had the congregation of Israel to do with Achan's sin?*
4. *How was the guilty person found out?*
5. *Give other examples of similar use of the lot.*
6. *What was the duty to which Achan was called, and how did he act?*
7. *How was his punishment inflicted, and by whom?*
8. *Is the place of his punishment ever afterwards referred to in Scripture?*

 CHAPTER VIII. 1-29.—THE RENEWED ATTACK UPON AI, AND ITS COMPLETE SUCCESS.

Vers. 1, 2. Jehovah now encouraged Joshua, much as already in i. 5-9. He was to take his army and to renew the attempt upon Ai, which was given into his hand, and was to be treated as Jericho had been (to be devoted, ver. 26), except that the spoil was to be their own. Note here the direction to make use of stratagem: violence and fraud are equally abhorred by God; yet in whatever circumstances war is lawful, the two means of waging war cannot be excluded.—

Vers. 3-8. The directions were given by Joshua to the people. Comparing these with ver. 12, it is obvious that there were not two ambushes, one of 30,000 and another of 5000; for (1) the former number would be too large an ambuscade for these confined hills and valleys; (2) there is no appearance of two ambuscades acting in the battle; (3) it is the same position that is assigned to the supposed two bodies in ver. 9 and ver. 12. We seem to be shut up to one of two explanations: either to take 30,000 to be the entire body of troops called into action, the so-called 'people of war,' as it would be out of the question to apply this expression to the 600,000 fighting men of

CHAP. VIII. 1-29.—*Complete Success of Attack on Ai.*

Israel; out of which 30,000 there were 5000 drafted off to lie in ambush, ver. 4, while ver. 5 indicates the division of them; or else to consider the number 30,000 in ver. 3 to be somehow an error of writing for 5000, and to suppose that Joshua put in motion, not indeed the whole 600,000 men, but as large a portion of them as could advantageously be engaged in action, so as to remove every fear from the minds of the disheartened people (ver. 1), when this overwhelming force had taken the field. It is just possible, however, that the narrative is very incomplete: for we read that the men of Bethel all joined in the fight, and left their own city empty, ver. 17; and it was taken, though we cannot fix the date of this event with precision. If it was taken now, the 30,000 may have been sent out to lie between Bethel and Ai: 5000 of them were in ambush against Ai, and the rest may have acted against Bethel.—**Vers. 9-12.** All these plans were carried out, the ambuscade being placed in the uneven ground to the west of the city, while the main body remained on the north of the city, with a valley between it and them.—**Ver. 13** had better be translated, 'And the people set all the camp, which was on the north of the city, and their liers in wait (a different word from that used in ver. 4 and ver. 12, perhaps better, "their rear," literally, "their heel") on the west of the city,' etc. Prominence is given to the pitching of the camp, perhaps as it misled the king of Ai to think they would not come down into the valley to risk another battle: but into the midst of the valley Joshua himself went that very night, in all likelihood for retirement and prayer.—**Ver. 14.** The king of Ai and his people hastened to offer battle. *At a time appointed;* better, 'at the place appointed,' the very place fixed by Joshua for carrying out his plan. *The plain,* see at iv. 13.—**Vers. 15-17.** The stratagem was completely successful, emptying not only Ai but also Bethel.—**Vers. 18-23.** The signal was a spear which Joshua held in his hand and stretched out when the Divine command was given, somewhat as Moses stretched out his rod: it has been conjectured that the spear might be made more conspicuous by having a flag fixed upon it. To take the city and to set it on fire was the work of so short a time, that, as soon as Joshua and his men turned on their pursuers, no resistance could be attempted: the men of Ai were slaughtered without mercy, and the king was taken alive.—**Vers. 24-27.** As a devoted city, none of its inhabitants were spared; but the cattle and the spoil were not included in this act of devoting. *Utterly destroyed,* ver. 26; see

 CHAP. VIII. 30-35.—*The Covenant publicly established.*

at ii. 10 and vi. 18.—**Vers. 28, 29.** *Heap* in these two verses is the rendering of two different Hebrew nouns: that in ver. 29 is a heap of stones; that in ver. 28 is more general, 'a mound.' Ai was certainly rebuilt, but apparently not in Joshua's time, or else on a new site: the name means 'a heap of ruins.' The captive king was hanged, as one accursed of God. But the dead body remained hanging only till nightfall, according to the law, Deut. xxi. 22, 23; then it was cast at the place for doing business and administering justice in his own city, and a heap of stones raised over it, as already over Achan's, vii. 26, and again over others, x. 27.

 CHAPTER VIII. 30-35.—THE COVENANT PUBLICLY ESTABLISHED
 IN THE LAND OF PROMISE.

Ver. 30. The command to set forth the blessing and the curse upon the mounts Gerizim and Ebal had been given in Deut. xi. 29, 30, and again much more minutely in Deut. xxvii., where twelve curses are recorded to be pronounced, to which all the people were to say, Amen. It was necessary to have an altar for this: only in sight of the blood of sprinkling could these tremendous words be uttered. Joshua was now in circumstances to raise such an altar to the God of Israel in the land of Israel.—**Ver. 31.** This altar was of whole stones, that is, of stones undressed, according to the special directions given, and indeed according to the general rule, Ex. xx. 25.—**Ver. 32.** If he was to write upon these undressed stones, they would have presented a surface very ill adapted for writing: but the direction to plaster them with plaster would ensure a smooth surface, easy to write on so long as it was newly laid on. The directions in Deuteronomy, however, make it almost certain that 'the stones,' ver. 32, Deut. xxvii. 2, 8, on which the Law was written, were a building different from the altar (compare the altar and the twelve pillars in Ex. xxiv. 4); but even so, the stones would be similar, and the use of the plaster would be the same for either.¹ It is wholly erroneous to think that the words of the Law were engraved in the stones themselves, like the tables of the covenant written with the finger of God: what was wanted was for the moment, though it might stand long; it is not said, as such things elsewhere are said, to be 'there unto this day.' *A copy of the Law* (Deut. xvii. 18), literally the 'repetition of the Law,' the second Law,

¹ On the custom of plastering stones to receive inscriptions, cp. Thomson's *Land and Book*, p. 471; and Oehler's *Theology of O. T.*, i. 120 (Clark's Transl.), where this passage is discussed.

CHAP. VIII. 30-35.—*The Covenant publicly established.*

of the same meaning as the Greek name Deuteronomy, with which it is simplest to identify this, though good authorities have supposed it to be something shorter; in Deut. xxvii. 3, 8, it is said to be, as here, ver. 34, 'all the words of this Law.'—VERS. 33-35. The whole people, male and female, old and young, native-born and sojourners, and all ranks, both civil and ecclesiastical, were ranged about the ark, which must have stood at or very near the town of Shechem, which lies in the narrow valley between the two mountains Gerizim and Ebal, along the slopes of which the tribes were ranged, six upon each. Here Joshua read all the words commanded by Moses, though there is no necessity for asserting that he did this in person; rather he did it by the aid of the priests the Levites, 'as Moses had commanded *before*,' ver. 33, in the Hebrew more strongly, 'at the first.'

The importance of this transaction can scarcely be overrated: for thus Joshua and the people served themselves heirs to the promises made unto their fathers. As soon as Abram entered the land of promise, he made his way to this beautiful, fertile, and central position, the place of Shechem, the oak (not 'the plain,' as in the English) of Moreh; Jehovah appeared unto him and said, 'Unto thy seed will I give this land,' and there Abram built his first altar to Him, so far as known to us, Gen. xii. 6, 7. Passing over other interesting points in patriarchal history that are connected with this place, the language of Moses, when first enjoining this proclamation of the blessing and the curse, points evidently to the incident in Abraham's history; for he asked in reference to Ebal and Gerizim, 'Are they not on the other side Jordan where the sun goeth down, in the land of the Canaanites, which dwell in the champaign (the plain or Jordan valley) over against Gilgal, beside the oaks of Moreh?' Deut. xi. 30. And he enlarged and repeated the directions just before his death, to which the account of Joshua's proceedings refers continually. And so Joshua took possession of the land by faith, just after these victories at Jericho and Ai, hastening to fulfil the command laid upon him, and looking upon the land as virtually won for the people of God. In accordance with this view taken by his faith, though his wars lasted some seven years, yet we have only three additional detailed accounts of what he did in the course of them, with the Gibeonites (ch. ix.), with the southern confederacy (ch. x.), and with the confederacy in the north (ch. xi.): the work was as good as accomplished, when he followed in the steps of his father Abraham

 CHAP. IX.—*Stratagem of the Gibeonites to save themselves.*

at the beginning of his course in Canaan. Perhaps here and now he buried Joseph's bones, which had been carried up from Egypt, Gen. l. 25, 26, Ex. xiii. 19, although it is not recorded till ch. xxiv. 32: for it was a similar act of faith in Joseph when he gave commandment concerning his bones, Heb. xi. 22. And ere he died his mind reverted to this spot; he gathered the people once again to Shechem, and gave them his parting charge, xxiv. 1-28.

It was an act of faith in Joshua to move up to Shechem after these first victories, with all the people, women and children included: and his movement has been unintelligible to those who were strangers to this grace. Yet we may see that his faith was not tried excessively; for—(1) Terror had already fallen on his enemies, and this must have been augmenting. (2) His course of conquest from Jericho to Ai pointed him northward; and Shechem was not very far beyond Ai, in a straight line about 21 or 22 miles. (3) It is highly probable that the permanent camp was now moved forward from Gilgal beside Jericho, to another Gilgal not far from Ebal and Gerizim, by which as a well-known place Moses had marked out the position of these mountains, Deut. xi. 30.

1. *How can stratagems be commanded by God?*
2. *What is the difficulty in following this narrative, and how may it be cleared up?*
3. *Where do we read the command to renew the covenant, which Joshua now obeyed?*
4. *Why was an altar specially suitable here?*
5. *How was it constructed?*
6. *How much may have been written upon the stones?*
7. *Wherein consists the meaning and importance of the transaction here recorded?*

 CHAPTER IX.—THE STRATAGEM OF THE GIBEONITES TO SAVE THEMSELVES.

Vers. 1, 2. There was general alarm on account of Joshua's victories; and this roused the courage of despair if not of hope; compare x. 1, xi. 1. The common danger seems to have united the nations of Canaan: six out of seven being here enumerated, see at iii. 10; they occupied three great geographical divisions of the land, 'in the hills, and in the valleys, and in all the coasts of the Great Sea,' better, 'in the mountain (the backbone of the country running north and south), and in the low country (or lowland, or Shephelah,

CHAP. IX.—*Stratagem of the Gibeonites to save themselves.*

a broad strip of land among the low hills, stretching inward from the southern half of the sea-shore), and in all the coast,' etc.—**Vers. 3–13.** *Gibeon*, see x. 2, a city famous in the history of Israel, lay to the S.W. of Ai, 5½ miles N.N.W. of Jerusalem, now known by the name of El-Jîb : its inhabitants, and those of three neighbouring towns which acted with them, ver. 17, belonged to the race of Hivites, ver. 7. No king of Gibeon is mentioned, only elders, ver. 11. Joshua had made use of stratagem : and now in turn, as the original suggests at ver. 4, his adversaries were resolved to work by fraud and not by fighting : and yet their stratagem was so overdone that it could scarcely have deceived any but these simple tribes who had been dwelling alone in the great wilderness for a generation, and who had been thrown off their guard by Rahab's report of the impression already made by Israel on the Canaanites, ii. 9–11. *Made as if they had been ambassadors* : the ancient versions render 'took for their provision,' as in ver. 12, where the Hebrew word differs by a single letter from the word in the Hebrew text here : but they may have made a conjecture ; the present reading gives an excellent sense, not likely to have originated by mistake.—*Gilgal*, in ver. 6, as was hinted in the closing remarks on viii. 30–35, is almost certainly Gilgal, a town about 13 miles S. of Shechem, and 7 N. of Bethel, still existing under the name Jiljilia. It is very unlikely that the entire people of Israel, including women and children, should have been brought up from beside Jericho to near Shechem, their flocks and herds of course accompanying them, only to return thither : this central spot, in a high situation, at once healthy for those who had come from the bracing air of the Desert, and strong against assault, was more likely to be the site of the permanent camp, than the Gilgal of the relaxing feverish Jordan valley. The solitary argument against it is that nothing is said of the movement from the one Gilgal to the other ; but that is of little weight, considering how fragmentary the history certainly is, if we judge it by the standard of secular histories : as a parallel, it is only incidentally that we hear of the camp (in the English Bible, the host) having been moved to Shiloh, ch. xviii. 9. The identity of the names might lead the people the more readily to think of this place for their camp, especially as Moses had used it for a landmark. Joshua did conquer 'the king of the nations of Gilgal,' xii. 23, either Jiljilia or still another Gilgal. And in general it is now agreed that this must be the Gilgal mentioned in the history of the

CHAP. IX.—*Stratagem of the Gibeonites to save themselves.*

kings ; for instance, going down to Bethel from Gilgal beside Jericho, 2 Kings ii. 2, is impossible. Nor is there any absolute proof that a city ever existed at the scene of the first encampment of Israel in Canaan. The objection has been started that it could not have taken three days to go from that Gilgal to Gibeon, ver. 17 : but this tells as much against Gilgal at Jericho ; and the three days might refer to the three days in ver. 16. *We are thy servants*, ver. 8 and ver. 11, is no offer of submission, but merely an oriental phrase of no more meaning than the similar polite subscription to letters among ourselves.—**Vers. 14, 15.** After touching and tasting the old victuals, without going for direction to Jehovah, the Israelites made an alliance with an oath, the chief engagement of which was that the lives of the Gibeonites should not be touched : compare Deut. xx. 10, 11, which some apply to a case like this. The word for *congregation* in 15 is different from that in viii. 35, which might be rendered ‘assembly :’ the two words are interchanged often in the English Bible, whereas there is a manifest propriety in adopting words which shall preserve the differences of the original in the translation.—**Vers. 17–21.** The site of Chephirah and Beeroth will be noticed at xviii. 25, 26, and that of Kirjath-jearim at xv. 9. It is impossible to avoid noticing the right feeling of the people, their broad views of what ought and what ought not to be done ; but, along with this, the more thoughtful and circumspect action of the princes, admitting that they had done wrong once in swearing to the covenant, yet apprehensive of contracting additional guilt if they broke the oath now that it had been made. There are difficult points of casuistry involved in the case : the princes certainly took the safer course, for manifestly it would have been wrong to fall upon the Gibeonites at once, as upon other Canaanites. Possibly the best solution would have been to confess that it was an unlawful oath, and to warn them that after ample time had been allowed for preparation, they must expect to be treated as enemies with whom no covenant had been made. If the covenant was to stand, the princes were certainly right in seeing that as little as possible was granted except life : life and slavery, yet not for political advantage to the Israelites, but rather as near an approach to devoting as could be, judging from the analogy of things without life, vi. 24 ; Lev. xxvii. 21, 28.—**Vers. 22–27.** A holy fear of the wrath of God, which led the princes to respect the oath, ver. 20, was quite different from the Gibeonites’ fear for their lives, ver. 24 : and when Joshua

 CHAP. X.—*The Great Campaign in Southern Canaan.*

denounced their conduct and intimated their fate, they acquiesced without a complaint. The words 'cursed' and 'bondmen' in ver. 23 are applied by Noah to their forefather Canaan, Gen. ix. 25. No doubt the appointment of these hewers of wood and drawers of water was a vast relief to the Levites, who had to do all the work of helping the priests in discharging the labours imposed by a burdensome ritual: while underneath the severity there was a certain mercy to the heathen Gibeonites in bringing them so near to God. *The place which he should choose* for his altar, ver. 27, Deut. xii. 5, etc., was not yet known; see at xviii. 1.

1. *What was the effect produced by Joshua's victories upon the Canaanites generally?*
2. *How did the Gibeonites act?*
3. *What was the error of Joshua and the princes?*
4. *How were they led by this to treat the Gibeonites afterwards?*
5. *What were the difficulties in trying to settle the path of duty?*

 CHAPTER X.—THE GREAT CAMPAIGN IN SOUTHERN CANAAN.

Vers. 1, 2. The terror inspired by Joshua is described here as in ix. 1, 2. Adoni-zedec, meaning 'Lord of righteousness,' reminds us of his great predecessor Melchizedek (Gen. xiv. 18), 'first being by interpretation king of Righteousness, and after that also king of Salem, which is king of Peace,' Heb. vii. 1; Salem being now lengthened into Jerusalem, a name which is variously interpreted, the 'foundation of peace' and the 'possession of peace.' The tribe to which it belonged was that of the Jebusites, and hence it was also named Jebus or Jebusi ('the Jebusite'), xv. 8, etc., though they are comprehended among the great Amorite community, ver. 5.—Vers. 3-5. Occupying the middle of the land of Canaan, Joshua might have turned either northwards or southwards upon his divided enemies; but the Gibeonites had drawn him southward, and to the south he had to give attention first, on their account, since it was their submission to him which had brought a formidable allied force against them as traitors. The five allied kings are three times enumerated, and always in the same order, vers. 3, 5, 23. *Hebron* has been already often mentioned in the history of the three patriarchs, whose burial-place in the cave of Machpelah is still distinguished by the mosque Haram built over it. It is one of the oldest cities in the

 CHAP. X.—*The Great Campaign in Southern Canaan.*

world, Num. xiii. 22. It lies in a fertile valley, 19 miles S. of Jerusalem, and is now a city of 10,000 inhabitants. *Farmuth*, now generally identified with Yermûk, or as Van de Velde spells it, Yarmûth, a village about $1\frac{1}{2}$ miles W.N.W. of Beit Nettif; answering to the description in the Onomasticon, which calls it a village Jermuchâ, 10 Roman miles from Eleutheropolis (Beit Jibrîn), towards Jerusalem. This was in the N.W. of the territory of Judah. *Lachish* and *Eglon* lay more to the S.W. Eglon is to all appearance 'Ajlân, a mere ruin; and Lachish is supposed by Robinson and others to be Um Lâkis, another ruin, 2 miles W. of it, fully 12 miles W.S.W. of Beit Jibrîn. Conder strongly denies the existence of ancient ruins here, and finds Lachish $1\frac{3}{4}$ miles S. of 'Ajlân, $10\frac{1}{2}$ miles W.S.W. of Beit Jibrîn, on the road to Gaza, at Tell el Hesy, a conspicuous and important site, supplied well with water, and giving its name to a great valley.—Vers. 6-9. The Gibeonites lost no time in taking advantage of their eague with Joshua; nor did he delay to help them, being himself supported by a special promise from Jehovah.—Vers. 10, 11. A double intervention of Jehovah is mentioned here. First He 'discomfited' the enemy; an expression occurring repeatedly in the description of critical junctures, Ex. xiv. 24, xxiii. 27, Deut. ii. 15, Judg. iv. 15, 1 Sam. vii. 10, 2 Chron. xv. 6, Ps. xviii. 14, cxliv. 6, Esth. ix. 24, etc., in the Hebrew, perhaps 'brought a panic on them,' if the original notion of a panic be retained, as of an unaccountable disturbance, accompanied by terror, the effect of Divine interposition; compare the idea in Ps. liii. 5. Secondly, He caused more death among them by a terrific hailstorm (comp. Ex. ix. 19, 25; Job xxxviii. 22, 23; Ps. xviii. 12-14; Isa. xxx. 30; Ezek. xiii. 11, 13; Rev. xi. 19, xvi. 21) than by the swords of the Israelites.¹ The Canaanites fled westward and somewhat northward from Gibeon; whether this was owing to the circumstance that Joshua had blocked up the way to Jerusalem and Hebron, or whether it was that they sought to reach home by a long circuit through the valley of Ajalon, or to take refuge among their countrymen in the lowlands and on the coast. *Beth-horon*, still known as Beit 'Ur, was the name of two places, distinguished as the upper and the lower (el Fôka and et-Tahta), which are in a steep and narrow

¹ 'There was such a storm at Constantinople in 1831. Many of the hailstones, or rather masses of ice, weighed from half a pound to above a pound. . . . Many persons were killed, animals were slain, and limbs were broken.'—Kitto, *Biblic Illus. in loc.*

 CHAP. X.—*The Great Campaign in Southern Canaan.*

defile in the road still commonly in use between Jerusalem and Jaffa. The upper Beth-horon was reckoned to be 12 Roman miles from Jerusalem; in a direct line it is 10 English miles. The lower Beth-horon is nearly 2 miles farther off. *Azekah* and *Makkedah* are very hard to identify, especially the former: but they seem to have been near one another. The Onomasticon places them between Eleutheropolis (Beit Jibrîn) and Jerusalem. Thus it places Makkedah 8 Roman miles eastward from Eleutheropolis; which seems a manifest error, for it would carry us into the hill country, whereas undoubtedly it lay in the low country, see xv. 33 and 41. Suppose it were an error for 'westward,' this might suit what has on other grounds been selected as the site by Van de Velde, followed by Keil and Arnold, namely Summeil, about 7 English miles to the N.W., an important village, with remains of antiquity, and a great cave. Porter prefers to look for the two cities on the road from Beit Jibrîn to Jerusalem, about the distance mentioned in the Onomasticon, at or near Tell Zakariah. But 12 miles farther north, the Palestine Exploration surveyors have fixed on El Mûghâr, or The Caves, 3 miles above Yebnah (Jabneh), and $2\frac{1}{2}$ s.w. of 'Akîr (Ekron), on the north side of the lower part of the great Wâdy Surâr, on the ground that 'at this site only of all the possible sites for Makkedah in the Philistine plain, do caves (see Josh. x. 22) still exist.' Following up this view, Conder placed Azekah at Deir el 'Ashék, on the south side of the Wâdy Surâr, 8 miles s.e. of El Mûghâr, and as much N.W. of Shuweikeh (Shocoh); but he now considers the site unknown.

—Vers. 12–15. These verses are, in part at least, a quotation from the book of Jasher; probably the impression left on every mind would be that it is wholly so, if 'Is not this written in the book of Jasher?' occurred at the end instead of in the middle of the supposed quotation. Yet this difficulty is not decisive: the words following have as much the look of a quotation as those preceding; ver. 15 is a natural termination to the extract, whereas it presents a certain difficulty when compared with ver. 43, if both verses are taken as parts of the same narrative; one fair example has been offered of the source of a quotation being mentioned in the middle of it, Gen. iii. 3; or otherwise, there may be two quotations, that is, there may be something

¹ Stanley calls this battle 'one of the most important in the history of the world.' The reader should turn to his description of the scene (*Sinai and Pal.* p. 207) and of the battle (*Jewish Church*, i. 238).

CHAP. X.—*The Great Campaign in Southern Canaan.*

intermediate omitted between the two parts quoted, and so the reference may be given at the end of the first. The quotation from the book of Jasher is not meant for a corroboration of the author's credibility in reference to the wonderful narrative he has given us, any more than the quotations from 'the book of the Wars of Jehovah,' and from those 'that speak in proverbs' or parables, Num. xxi. 14 and 27, in reference to events a year or so earlier than this. But, like those quotations, and like another poetical fragment in Num. xxi. 17, it is an indication of the warmth and high tone of the spiritual life in that generation of Israelites, bursting out in spiritual songs under the experience of God's marvellous goodness to Israel. The book of Jasher (more correctly, Jashar) is known to us only from this passage and the lament of David over Jonathan, 2 Sam. i. 18, and there has been abundance of conjecture regarding it. The most modest assumption, in view of the known facts, is that it was a collection of poems celebrating the upright, which the Hebrew word Jashar means; whether this be understood of God, Deut. xxxii. 4, Ps. xxv. 8, Isa. xxvi. 7, or of Israel, according to their calling and profession, Num. xxxiii. 10, Ps. cxi. 1; hence named lovingly Jeshurun, Deut. xxxii. 15, xxxiii. 5, 26; Isa. xlv. 2.

If the passage be a poetical extract, there is nothing absolutely to forbid an interpretation which regards its language as a poetical description of the interference of God on Israel's behalf: as in the song of Deborah, Judg. v. 20, 'The stars in (better, from) their courses fought against Sisera;' and in the great song of David, 2 Sam. xxii. 9, 'There went up a smoke out of His nostrils, and fire out of His mouth devoured, coals were kindled by it; He bowed the heavens also, and came down,' etc. For more than a generation, now, this has been a favourite interpretation among even the strictly believing continental scholars. And all that is said in ver. 13 is, that the sun and moon stayed and stood still until the nation had avenged themselves upon their enemies, which might be attained by the increase of strength in the Israelites, and the intensified work of destruction described in vers. 10 and 11: for the sun's not hastening to go down is a metaphor, however the passage be understood. Nevertheless, the fact that this is poetry is in itself no argument against the plainest interpretation of the words, as any one may see by comparing the song of Moses in Ex. xv. with the preceding prose narrative of the passage of the Red Sea. And when understood

literally, the miracle bears a certain analogy to Isaiah's miracle on behalf of Hezekiah, 2 Kings xx. 8-11, into connection with which the Jewish Church seems to have brought it, if we may judge from Eccus. xlv. 4; perhaps it also bears an analogy to the darkening of the sun at the crucifixion, Luke xxiii. 44, 45. It is also natural enough to see a reference to this miracle in Hab. iii. 11, though that passage has been otherwise translated; and another in Isa. xxviii. 21. And he who accepts the sense which lies upon the surface need have no more scientific difficulty, in consequence of modern astronomy, about the sun and moon being said to stand still, than about their being said to rise and set; and till an explanation is given as to how any miracle took place, he need not greatly concern himself whether this one may have been wrought by suspending the rotation of the earth or by altering the laws of refraction.

Two other questions have been asked. First: What relation does the event in vers. 12-15 bear to that in vers. 10, 11? Those who espouse the poetical interpretation generally identify them, or make them descriptions from different points of view of the same miracle. Those who adhere to the old opinion differ as to the order of time; though the sameness of construction in the Hebrew here and at viii. 30 favours the belief that the narrative in vers. 10-14 advances in regular order of time, yet without the second event being dependent on the first. Secondly: At what period of the day did Joshua utter these words? Many reply, In the forenoon: perhaps pressing too much what is said of the sun standing in the midst of heaven; but also relying on the position of the sun over Gibeon, to the E., and of the moon over the valley of Ajalon (now a village, Yâlô), nearly 10 miles to the W. of it. But others reply, In the afternoon, as the more natural period for anxiety about time being too short, and better suiting the sequence of the narrative; and they understand the description to be, not of the orb of the sun, but of the sunshine being in Gibeon, falling on the E. when the sun's orb was in the W.; and in like manner of the moonlight falling upon the valley of Ajalon while the orb of the moon was in the eastern sky.—Vers. 16-21. The five kings fled, apparently down the great Wâdy Surâr, to the cave (not a cave), well known henceforward at least, if not previously; but, by Joshua's direction to his people, who were much better fitted for battles than for sieges, the pursuit was kept up with wonderful vigour and success, while the cave was turned into a temporary

 CHAP. X.—*The Great Campaign in Southern Canaan.*

prison. The freedom from annoyance or resistance is expressed in ver. 21 by a proverbial expression, which looks as if borrowed in a shortened form from the promise in Ex. xi. 7.—Vers. 22–27. The judgment on the five kings (as on the king of Ai, viii. 29) took place at the close. *Captains*, ver. 24, is a rather uncommon word, not of clearly defined meaning, yet more properly applicable to a judge or other civil magistrate than to a captain in an army, applied to Jephthah, Judg. xi. 6, 11, and employed in Prov. vi. 7, xxv. 15; Isa. i. 10, iii. 6, 7, xxii. 3; Dan. xi. 18; Mic. iii. 1, 9. The call to them to put their feet on the necks of these kings has no appearance of gratuitous cruelty or insult, of which there is not a trace throughout this book; it is interpreted in next verse as a lesson of confidence to the captains (the words there being the same to them as those in viii. 1 to Joshua himself), to have no fear of those enemies who were to be made a footstool to them, see Ps. cx. 1. There is much to be said in favour of translating the latter half of ver. 27 thus: ‘they cast them into the cave wherein they had been hid, and on which cave’s mouth they had laid great stones unto that very day.’—Vers. 28–39. Joshua preferred military operations in the open field, yet manifestly he could not always avoid sieges. There are here seven cities named which he took in succession, devoting them (the correct rendering at vers. 28, 35, 37, 39, 40): and it is not unlikely that the number seven is meant to convey the idea of the sacredness or else the completeness of his work (see on vi. 3–5), for it is a mere specimen of what he did, vers. 40–42. A camp is named in connection with three of them, vers. 21, 31, 34; of only one of them is a second day’s siege or attack mentioned, ver. 32. Three of the original five allied cities are among these seven, Lachish, Eglon, and Hebron; the king of which last, ver. 37, may have been the successor of him who was in the cave in vers. 23–27. One king, from Gezer, seems needlessly and of his own accord to have rushed upon his ruin, v. 33; possibly, however, his city was not taken. See more at xi. 21. *Libnah*, ver. 29, has naturally been sought between Makkedah and Lachish; but no trace of it has been found, unless we accept Van de Velde’s conjecture that it is ‘Arák el Menshíyeh, on a hill 6½ miles w. of Beit Jibrín. *Gezer*, ver. 33, is said in the Onomasticon to be 4 Roman miles northward from Nicopolis, that is, Emmaus, now ‘Amwás. Its site was recovered by Clermont Ganneau at Tell Jezar, beside the village Abu Shúsheh, on a commanding hill,

CHAP. X.—*The Great Campaign in Southern Canaan.*

4½ miles w. of 'Amwās, or slightly N. *Debir*, ver. 38, was a place of considerable importance, as is seen from the narrative in xv. 15-17, but afterwards it is unnoticed in Scripture. To identify it seemed impossible, till Conder found it in edh Dhâheriyeh (meaning the same thing, 'of the back'), almost 12 miles s.w. from Hebron, from which Joshua had to return or turn back to this city lying far s., in what is pre-eminently a dry land, which yet had near it, though not properly belonging to it, the finest collection of springs in Southern Palestine; see ch. xv. 19.—Vers. 40-43. The campaign extended over the s. and s.w. portion of Palestine, of which four districts are named in ver. 40: the hills, or mountains, the backbone of the land, running N. and S.; the south, or, as it might be left untranslated, the Negeb, the south land in which the patriarchs loved to pasture their flocks and herds; the vale, better the low land, see at ix. 1; and the springs, or slopes towards the base of the mountain range, sometimes left untranslated, *Ashdoth*, in connection with Mount Pisgah on the E. of Jordan. These divisions will partly come up again in the list of the cities of Judah, xv. 20-62. Four towns are named, probably at the extremities of the territory: Kadesh-barnea (Num. xxxii. 8, xxxiv. 4), far south, see at xv. 3; Gaza, the southernmost of the five great Philistine cities, and still a place of importance, with some 15,000 inhabitants, on the w.; Goshen (xv. 51), apparently in the southern part of the mountains; and Gibeon, the immediate occasion of this war, in the north of the mountain range. Between Gaza and Gibeon no line of conquests can be drawn, for nothing very determinate was done; hence the renewed labour to Joshua, recorded at xi. 21, 22. In the meantime the war was at an end, and Joshua and all Israel returned to the camp to Gilgal; see the beginning of the notes on v. 12-15. As to *Gilgal*, see on ix. 6.

1. *What led to the great southern confederacy against Joshua?*
2. *What promise was given to him, and how was it fulfilled?*
3. *What is known about the book of Jashar, and what is often conjectured?*
4. *How has the account of the sun and moon standing still been variously understood?*
5. *To what extent did the wars in this campaign go beyond the limits of the confederacy as it was formed at first?*
6. *How did Joshua deal with the towns and the kings?*

CHAPTER XI. 1-15.—THE CONQUEST OF NORTHERN CANAAN.

Vers. 1-5. We cannot tell what led to this very formidable alliance, in which all the six nations of Canaan (all but the Gergashites, see on iii. 10) are represented. The head of these allies, apparently already acknowledged to be above the rest (ver. 10), was the king of *Hazor*, a city afterwards assigned to Naphtali (see chap. xix. 36, 37), where it is named along with Kedesh (as it is again in 2 Kings xv. 29), and near which it probably stood, in Mount Naphtali (xx. 7) a very few miles w. or N.W. of the waters of Merom, above which it lies, according to Josephus. Robinson thinks of a ruin Tell Khureibeh about $3\frac{1}{2}$ miles w. of that lake, and $2\frac{1}{2}$ s. of the village Kades; while Bachmann (on Judg. iv. 2) follows Ritter, and thinks of a place retaining the ancient name, pitching on Hazîreh, a ruin 5 miles w. of Bint Umon Jebail, and nearly 14 w. of Lake Hûleh. But Conder points out that the exact Arabic equivalent of Hazor is preserved in Jebel and Marj- Hadîreh (the mountain and the meadow of H.), within $1\frac{1}{2}$ miles w. of Robinson's site. *Madon* is possibly identified by Conder in the ruin Madîn beside Hattîn, fully 5 miles w. of Tiberias. *Achshaph* became a frontier town of Asher (xix. 25). Conder says it is probably the village Kefr Yâsîf, 6 miles N.E. of Acre. *Shimron*, if it be the same as Shimron-Meron (xii. 20), perhaps is the modern Meirôn, $3\frac{1}{2}$ miles w. of Safed; but if so, it is not the city given to Zebulun (xix. 15), which is Semûnieh, 5 miles w. of Nazareth. Ver. 2 had better be read, 'And to the kings that were on the north, in the mountain, and in the plain (or Jordan valley, see on iv. 13) south of Chinneroth, and in the low land, and in the heights of Dor, on the west,' Chinneroth being the same as Gennesaret in the New Testament (Luke v. 1); and Dor being a well-known city on the coast between Mount Carmel and Cæsarea, $7\frac{1}{2}$ miles from the latter, now a village, Tantûrah. From ver. 3 it would seem that this confederacy embraced the remains of the southern confederacy of chap. x., namely the Amorites, the Hittites, the Perizzites, and the Jebusites. *Mizpeh* in ver. 3 (but not in ver. 8) ought to be written Mizpah, though the kindred forms are often confounded: there were many places bearing this name, which means a watchtower. This land of Mizpah is sufficiently marked out by the description, under Hermon; geographers point us to the level land south of Hasbeiya, west of Tell el Kâdy (Dan), where there is a

Druse village, with a name of the same signification, Mutallah, commanding a magnificent view. In ver. 5 the marginal rendering 'assembled by appointment,' is much to be preferred. The *waters of Merom* are mentioned only here. The traditional view is that they form the first of the lakes through which the Jordan runs, the marshy Bahr el Hûleh, as it is now named, called by Josephus, Samechonitis; and by the Talmud, Samei or Sabe; some recent writers, with very little reason, deny this, and think of a brook whose source is at Meirôn, above mentioned, w. of Safed.¹—Ver. 6. Joshua must have been already near, or the renewed encouragement given by God to him (like viii. 1, x. 25) could not have included the promise of victory next day. To hamstring the horses was to make them useless in all time coming, and to burn the chariots was to take from the Canaanites a source of strength on which they greatly relied; compare the account of the younger Jabin, king of Hazor, in Judg. iv. 2: whereas, horses and chariots were little known to the Israelites, if not positively forbidden (Deut. xvii. 16, xx. 1; 2 Sam. viii. 4; Ps. xx. 7).—Vers. 7-9. The promise was fulfilled, and the routed enemy fled, yet without making good their escape, whether N.E. (Mizpeh), or N.W. (Zidon, also spelt Sidon, here first mentioned, a city at this early time in all its greatness), or w., if Misrephoth-maim (water-burnings, or water-heights, conjectured to be salt-pans, or limekilns, or glass-factories) be a ruin Musheirefeh at the promontory Râs en Nâkûrah, 11 miles N. of Acre. Others think of Zarephath, a name of kindred derivation and meaning, the Sarepta of the New Testament, now Sarafend.—Vers. 10-15. Joshua devoted (vers. 11, 12) the cities, their kings, and their people, yet he took the prey; as already in the case of Ai. The only possible explanation and defence of such unvarying severity is the command given by Jehovah to Moses, and by him to Joshua, of which more is said in the next paragraph. For some exceptional reason, perhaps its dangerous strength if the enemy were to recover it (as must have happened before the time described in Judg. iv.), or its pre-eminence generally, and especially in this Canaanite alliance (ver. 10), Hazor was burned with fire. Not so the other cities, 'that stood still in their strength' (ver. 13), or 'that stand each on its own mound,' an unusual expression, understood by some to indicate extraordinary strength, by others merely to indicate that they remained standing upon their respective sites, as in Jer. xxx. 18.

¹ Cp. *Rob Roy on the Jorâan*, p. 278.

CHAPTER XI. 16-23.—THE COMPLETION OF JOSHUA'S CONQUESTS.

It has been already noticed that after the covenant engagement publicly made by Israel at the altar on Ebal (viii. 30-35), the land was virtually theirs, and they had but to take possession by means of a series of assured victories : of which we have evidence in the artful submission of the Gibeonites, and in the shattering of the two great confederacies, that in the south (chap. x.), and that in the north (xi. 1-15). We do not know the circumstances which led to these confederacies, except the natural conviction that union is strength, and in the case of the southern one a desire for vengeance on Gibeon. But there must have been many battles and sieges of which no record is preserved; and the least laborious part of Joshua's work, however anxious at the moment, was when his enemies massed themselves together and perished almost by a single blow. These verses may be regarded as a recapitulation to some extent; yet they are chiefly meant to gather up the results of other expeditions of which we have no details.—**Ver. 16.** The country is spoken of as comprising several districts, apparently seven: compare ver. 21 and see on x. 40-43. *The hills*, better, 'the mountain,' denotes the range stretching through the whole length of Canaan, which is, however, not a mere mountain ridge, but a high tableland or plateau, occupying the entire central section of the country between the lowlands on the w., and the plain or depression of the Jordan on the e. The great tribe of Judah having had its territory assigned to it earliest of all (chap. xv.), appears to first have marched off and taken possession (compare Judg. i. 16), so that the southern portion was called the mountain of Judah (ver. 21). The rest of the tribes kept longer together, first about the camp at Gilgal, and afterwards about the tabernacle in Shiloh, both being places within the only other assigned territory, that which fell to the other great tribe, namely Ephraim: the northern portion of this mountainous tableland, therefore, received indifferently the names of the mountain of Israel and the mountain of Ephraim. The south country (Negeb), the land of Goshen, and 'the valley,' which ought to be the 'lowland,' have been already noticed at ix. 1 and x. 40-43. And as this name, the lowland, was by habitual usage restricted to the land stretching back from the sea-coast in the southern part of Canaan, while yet there was a similar district connected with the northern

CHAP. XI. 16-23.—*The Completion of Joshua's Conquests.*

coast, though of less intrinsic importance, and also coming less into view in the sacred history, it is implied here that the same name was suitable for it, when we read of 'the mountain of Israel and the valley, that is, the lowland, of the same.' In the Samaritan book of Joshua, a very late apocryphal production, which may, however, contain some genuine traditions, there is a full account of Joshua's campaign in central Palestine, their own territory of Samaria.—**Ver. 17.** The southern and northern boundaries of Joshua's conquests are named, as again xii. 7, and partly at xiii. 5. In the south, toward Seir (which Israel was forbidden to touch, Deut. ii. 4, 5), there was Mount Halak, the smooth or bare mountain, by some said to be the ascent of Akrabim (xv. 3; Num. xxxiv. 4), usually identified with a ridge running E. and W. about 8 miles S. of the Dead Sea; by others with the northern edge of the Azizimeh range, much farther to the S.W., perhaps Jebel el Halâl, where the Wâdy el 'Arîsh turns to the S., or Jebel Yelek at the S. end of that chain. Northward, under Mount Hermon (as at ver. 3), his limit had been Baal-gad (the place of the god of good luck, mistranslated 'a troop' in Gen. xxx. 11; Isa. lxx. 11), which has by some been supposed to be Baal-bek, with its magnificent ruins; but this is now generally considered too far north, and from a comparison of xiii. 5 with Judg. iii. 3, it is held to be the same as Baal-hermon, very probably Bâniâs, the Cæsarca Philippi of the Gospels, or some ruins $1\frac{1}{2}$ or 3 hours to the north of it, towards Hasbeiya.—**Ver. 18.** 'Many days' is the literal rendering for 'long time,' but both are indefinite. The ordinary calculation is that seven years elapsed between the death of Moses and the first partition of the land: see chap. xiv. 7 and 10.—**Vers. 19, 20.** The fearful ruin of these nations is expressed by the translation 'utterly destroyed,' in vers. 20 and 21; yet properly it is 'devoted,' as explained at ii. 10, etc., leading to the result expressed by the different word 'destroying,' mentioned at the end of ver. 20. The agency of God, however mysterious and beyond our power to explain, is not to be explained away, when it is said that He hardened their hearts for the very purpose of destroying them; but we must never forget that we read of this act of His only in the case of the desperately wicked. Some little alleviation of the difficulty may perhaps be had by considering that three different verbs are used in the memorable case of Pharaoh, though unfortunately confounded in the A. V., namely, to make dull, heavy, or stubborn; to harden

 CHAP. XI. 16-23.—*The Completion of Joshua's Conquests.*

or stiffen ; and most commonly, to make strong or stout, as here, not putting any evil into them, but supplying them with strength and spirit to make efforts, yet not supplying grace to ensure a right use of the strength imparted. Had others besides the Gibeonites offered to make submission, it is likely enough that the Israelites might have been tempted to make peace with them : but the strong mind and spirited conduct of the Canaanites prevented the rise of any such temptation. *Favour*, in ver. 20, is always elsewhere translated 'supplication ;' and the clause could be rendered, 'that there might be no supplication for them.' For the ultimate reason we must fall back on the fact that God's long-suffering had waited from the days of Abraham, 'because the iniquity of the Amorites was not yet full' (Gen. xv. 16) ; but now the whole people were like the men of Sodom and Gomorrah : 'The land is defiled, therefore I do visit the iniquity thereof upon it, and the land itself vomiteth out her inhabitants' (Lev. xviii. 25). God might have destroyed them by His own hand directly, but He devoted them, and called on the Israelites to execute His awful sentence, no doubt to deepen their abhorrence of sin, and to make them feel inexcusable if they fell into the vices of those whom they had destroyed ; the prophets many a time declared this, and Joshua himself gave the same warning in chap. xxiii.—**Vers. 21, 22.** The work, whose accomplishment is narrated in chap. x., was in one respect incomplete, because Joshua did not push his way down to the sea-shore, on the s.w., where the wealthy and warlike Philistines resided (Ex. xiii. 17) ; three out of five of their chief cities (xiii. 3 ; 1 Sam. vi. 17, etc.) being mentioned here as the refuge of the Anakim, the giants who had terrified the spies his companions, and so had misled Israel into failure of faith, and brought on them the forty years' wandering (Num. xiii. 28, 31, 33, etc.). The execution of his military duties could not be considered satisfactory if we had not had this assurance that he actually did overcome and destroy these Anakim, as he had expressed his confidence nearly half a century before, that by God's blessing he could and would do so. Possibly what is said here in ver. 21 refers to the victories in chap. x., with this additional information, that the Anakim were cut off : certainly Hebron and Debir were there mentioned, though not Anab, a ruin retaining its name 'Anâb unaltered to this day, a mile w. of Dhâheriyeh, which was identified with Debir at x. 38. However, it seems much more likely that Joshua had to come a second time to

 CHAP. XI. 16-23.—*The Completion of Joshua's Conquests.*

make war in these regions, and in that mountainous country which had been mentioned in ver. 16 of this chapter, when the Anakim whom he had put to flight returned: for he achieved only a preliminary conquest of the land, so that continued or renewed efforts were required before the Canaanites were exterminated. And the ominous statement that after all they lived on in these Philistine cities (as we find there a colony of them long afterwards, and by that time reckoned to be one people with them, 1 Sam. xvii. 4; 2 Sam. xxi. 15-22), prepares our minds for the necessity of a third war at Hebron and Debir, of which we read in xv. 13-17.—**Ver. 23.** Joshua took the whole land, but only in the sense that has just been explained, for it was 'according to all that Jehovah said unto Moses.' And that was, 'I will not drive them out before thee in one year; lest the land become desolate, and the beast of the field multiply against thee. By little and little will I drive them out before thee, until thou be increased and inherit the land' (Ex. xxiii. 29, 30); so also Deut. vii. 22. Having in this sense taken the whole land, he turned from military service to the other task, that of apportioning the land to Israel for an inheritance. *According to their divisions, by their tribes.* The Hebrew word here rendered 'divisions' is used frequently; in this book also at xii. 7, xviii. 10, but especially in Chronicles (where it is oftener rendered 'courses' of the priests), with direct reference to the genealogical divisions of Israel into fathers' houses, families, etc., as vii. 14. This genealogical tendency is strongly marked throughout the Sacred History. And in the book of Joshua it affords the most natural explanation of the occurrence of two Hebrew words for 'tribe'; the one properly 'a sceptre,' alluding to the tribal sovereignty, used predominantly in histories; the other predominantly in the geographical and genealogical details, and indicating a family branching out, for instance at vii. 1, 18, xiv. 1-4, xix. throughout. Here it is the sovereign tribes, as in xviii. 2, 4, 7, etc.

1. *What was the great northern confederacy, and who was its leader?*
2. *What special encouragement was given to Joshua, and what command was laid upon him?*
3. *What is left untold of the details of Joshua's wars?*
4. *To what extent did the Canaanites seek to make peace with Israel?*
5. *What agency of the Lord is mentioned in connection with their conduct?*
6. *In what sense did Joshua take the whole land?*

CHAP. XII.—*List of the Conquered Canaanite Kings.*

CHAPTER XII.—LIST OF THE CONQUERED CANAANITE KINGS.

This list may be regarded as an appendix to the history of Joshua's wars, and a means of transition to his peaceful labours in dividing the land and settling the people upon their allotted portions.—Vers. 1-6. A recapitulation of what Moses did to Sihon and Og, destroying them and dividing their land, already referred to in ii. 10, and narrated at large in Num. xxi. 21-35, xxxii. ; Deut. ii. 26-iii. 17. It is therefore unnecessary to go over this matter in detail : it is enough to say that *Aroer*, ver. 3 ; *Ashtaroth* and *Edrei*, ver. 4 ; and *Salcah*, ver. 5, are towns whose names are preserved to all appearance in Arâir, Tell Ashtereh, Edhr'a, and Sulkhâd. Many cities were, no doubt, dedicated to Ashtaroth, which makes identification more difficult : and some seek for Ashtaroth in the Roman Bostra, now Busrah, capital of the Haurân, through the form of the name Beeshterah in ch. xxi. 27. Conder (*Handbook*, p. 296) says of it : 'A city which appears to have been known in the fourth century as being 4 Roman miles from Edrei (edh Dhr'a). In the Talmud, Ashtaroth is said to have been situated between two mountains, the shadow of which covered the town. The Samaritan version of the Pentateuch renders Ashtaroth Karnaim by the names Sunamein and Aphnith : the first being the present es Sunamein, 28 miles s. of Damascus ; the second, the later Phenutus or Phænos, 11 miles N.E. of es Sunamein.' In reference to the *Geshurites* and *Maachathites*, see at xiii. 11. One or two points in translation may also be noticed. *Plain*, vers. 1, 3, 8, is the Jordan valley ; see on iv. 13.—In ver. 2, *from the middle of the river*: the word rendered 'river' in these verses, and often 'brook' and 'valley,' answers to the term Wâdy in the modern geography of Palestine and neighbouring countries : sometimes a mountain stream or torrent, oftener the dry bed in which water occasionally runs, and the valley in which the course of the stream lies. 'The midst of the valley' might better express the meaning here. *Half Gilead*, ver. 2, and 'the plain to the Sea of Chinneroth,' ver. 3 (that is, the Sea of Galilee, as noted at xi. 2), should probably not be preceded by 'from,' but be regarded as the districts over which he ruled. *Ashdodh Pisgah*, ver. 3, 'the springs' of Pisgah, as ver. 8, or better, its 'slopes ;' see at x. 40 ; said to be the springs under Mount Nebo, which are now called 'Ayûn Mûsa. *Moses, the servant of Jehovah* : see on i. 1. All this had been already detailed in the book of the

CHAP. XII.—*List of the Conquered Canaanite Kings.*

Law, which was in the hands of the people; and yet it could not be passed over without some notice in the history of his successor, who carried out his work to its conclusion, since without Sihon and Og the list of kings would be essentially defective.—Vers. 7, 8. Now the list is made out of Joshua's own conquests, of which sketches have been given, ch. vi. viii. x. xi.—Vers. 9-24. A list of thirty-one kings is given: beginning with the kings of Jericho and Ai, ver. 9; proceeding to those engaged in the southern campaign, vers. 10-16; and ending with those in the great northern confederacy, vers. 19-24. Conder says (*Palestine Exploration Statement*, Jan. 1875, p. 49): 'A careful inspection of the various groups in the lot of Judah has led me to a discovery, which, as I have never met with it in any standard work, I am led to consider new. It is one of immense interest, as showing that the topographical system is far more perfect than would at first be imagined. It may be briefly stated thus:—The list given in the twelfth chapter of Joshua, and preceding all other topographical lists, forms the key to the whole. Nothing could be simpler than the system depending on this definition. The towns here referred to, thirty-one in number, were royal cities of the Canaanites. They reappear in the succeeding lists, and it will be found that, with one exception easily explained, every separate group of towns contains a royal city (that is in ch. xv.). The larger groups occurring in the plains and lowlands contain naturally more than one; but the country is at once divided by these royal cities into districts, which will, on inspection, be found to have natural boundaries, and to be to a certain extent preserved to the present day.' But in both parts of the list some new names are to be found. In ver. 13, *Geder* has not yet been identified; perhaps the same as *Gederah*, xv. 36, or rather *Gedor*, xv. 58. In ver. 14 both the names are new. *Hormah*, 'a thing devoted,' was the name given by the Israelites to Zephath, not improbably near Arad, Judg. i. 16, 17, as also to the cities of Arad, Num. xxi. 1-3: being named along with *Arad* here (which is thought to be Tell 'Arâd, nearly 17 miles s. of Hebron), it has been generally supposed to be one and the same place in all these narratives. If so, it is another instance of a city which the Israelites took over and over again; see on xi. 21, 22. It seems to have been at the place where the Israelites presumptuously attempted to force an entrance into Canaan, Num. xiv. 45; by Robinson it is identified with the pass El Safâh, but this seems too far to the E., like his *Kadesh*.

 CHAP. XII.—*List of the Conquered Canaanite Kings.*

Is it the ruin Sebâta or Sebaita, on the western precipitous side of the plateau Rakhmeh, $2\frac{1}{2}$ hours S. of Khalasa, the ancient Elusa? This, however, would be fully 35 miles to the S.W. of Arad. *Adullam*, ver. 15, see at xv. 35. *Bethel* we might have expected to find named along with Ai in ver. 9; see viii. 17: yet this merely shows how little we know of the history of these wars. Again (passing in the meantime, vers. 17, 18), in ver. 20, *Shimron-meron*, see at Shimron, xi. 1; if the same as at xix. 15, it proves the extent of this formidable confederacy, for that town was given to Zebulun. *Taanach*, ver. 21, is never mentioned (unless at xxi. 25) but in connection with *Megiddo*, as here; and a modern village, T'annuk or Ta'annuk, stands on a hill $4\frac{1}{2}$ miles S.S.E. of Lejjûn, the modern corruption of Legio, said to be the Roman name for Megiddo; both were geographically in the tribe of Issachar, yet both were assigned to Manasseh: see xvii. 11. Conder now inclines to place Megiddo at the important ruin Mujedd'a, $3\frac{1}{2}$ miles S.W. of Beisân, the ancient Bethshean, for which he produces curious evidence; but the traditional site has strong defenders, and cannot as yet be pronounced erroneous. *Kedesh*, ver. 22, afterwards a city of refuge, in Mount Naphtali, xx. 7, fully 4 miles N.W. of Lake Hûleh, as Robinson pointed out. *Jokneam*, ver. 22, near the well-known Mount Carmel, is the ruin Tell Keimûn, about 7 miles N.W. of Lejjûn, commanding the pass of the W. end of the great valley of Jezreel or plain of Esdraelon: it was given to Zebulun, and became a Levitical city, xxi. 34. *The coast of Dor*, ver. 23, ought to be 'the heights or uplands of Dor;' see at xi. 2, where it is mistranslated 'border.' *Gilgal*, ver. 23, cannot be the first camping place, iv. 19; it might be the second: see at ix. 6; but it is now generally taken to be Jiljûlieh, a village nearly in ruins, 2 miles S.S.E. of Keft Sâba. Others think of Kalkîlieh, nearly 2 miles E. of Keft Sâba. *Tirzah*, ver. 24, was the capital of the early kings of the ten tribes, in the tribe of Ephraim. It is supposed by recent authorities to be Tallûza, a village beautifully situated 4 miles to the N. of Shechem, though again a recent suggestion of the explorers points to Teiâsîr, about 8 miles further to the N.E.—The chief geographical difficulty relates to vers. 17, 18; it is this, whether to assign these four kings of cities, not previously named, to the northern or to the southern confederacy: a difficulty aggravated by the fact that we know of at least three cities called *Aphék*, three called *Tappuah* (simply or with a prefix), and

 CHAP. XIII.—*The Divine Command to allot the Land to the Tribes.*

probably two called *Hepher*; and these in different parts of the country; while *Lasharon* is unknown, and is by some read Sharon. Conder, relying partly on the consecutive geographical order from s. to N., partly on the identifications of an Egyptian itinerary older than the time of Joshua, makes Aphek the northern Aphek near Jezreel, probably Fukûa' (6 miles s.e.), though in his *Handbook* he is silent as to this; and in explanation of Sharon, relies in general on Jerome's statement, 'even to the present day the region between Mount Tabor and the Lake of Tiberias is called Sarona,' also noticing that it may be the town named by the Egyptian Sarâna. Nor is he averse to think of Kedesh, ver. 22, as another place named by this Egyptian, now Tell Abu Kudeis, 2 miles s.e. of Lejjûn. (*Palestine Exploration Statement*, 1876, pp. 95, 141.) *Tappuah* he understands as the Tappuah of ch. xvi. 8, in the territory of Joseph. It is strange that so few kings are named in connection with the central part of Palestine, even if these four in vers. 17, 18 belonged to it. And yet, in addition to the consideration that we know so little of the details of Joshua's campaigns, it is to be remembered that Gibeon had no king: see ix. 11; and other states may have had the same republican constitution, which might therefore not appear in this list of kings.

1. *Why is the conquest of the lands of Sihon and Og mentioned here?*
2. *What list of Joshua's conquests is given here?*
3. *What influence have geographers traced from this list upon the lists of cities in the tribe of Judah?*

 CHAPTER XIII.—THE DIVINE COMMAND TO ALLOT THE LAND TO THE TRIBES, WITH THE ACCOUNT OF WHAT MOSES HAD ALREADY ACCOMPLISHED.

Ver. 1. Caleb was eighty-five years old about this time, xiv. 10: Joshua's age may not have been much different, but we cannot determine it. His victories, great though they had been, had still left very much to do; see on xi. 21, 22.—Vers. 2-6a. The chief remaining strength of the Canaanites (though they were formidable elsewhere, even in districts overrun by Joshua, and in a sense already possessed by Israel, xv. 63, xvi. 10, xvii. 11-18) was to be found in the s.w. and in the N. As to the s.w. see x. 40-43; of which general statement the particulars are given here. *The border of the Philistines,*

 CHAP. XIII.—*The Divine Command to allot the Land to the Tribes.*

ver. 2, literally, their 'circuits,' or districts surrounding their five principal cities, named in order from S.W. to N.E. in the next verse, except that Ashkelon is south of Ashdod. They are all well known, and easily recognised by the names which they still bear, except Gath. But Porter's conjecture that it is Tell es Saffiyeh, or Sâfi, the Alba Specula of the Middle Ages, suits Eusebius' description, 5 miles from Eleutheropolis towards Diospolis, and it is now pretty generally accepted; yet see at Gathrimmon, xix. 45. The Philistines seem only sometimes to have had a king; and even then, he was much under the power of these 'lords,' 1 Sam. xxix. 2-9: this title 'lords' is appropriated exclusively to them, and is the same word as that used for the axles of chariots or wagons. The Philistines not being of Canaanite descent, but foreigners, who seem to have conquered earlier inhabitants of the land like the Avites mentioned here (see Gen. x. 14; Deut. ii. 23), it was not properly their territory, but the districts around them which Israel was to take. *Geshuri*, ver. 2, ought to be 'the Geshurite,' not the Geshurites afterwards named, vers. 11, 13, and already, xii. 5, but a southern tribe, 1 Sam. xxvii. 8. *Shihor*, more correctly Shihor, means 'black, dark,' and is an appellation of the Nile, in Isa. xxiii. 3, Jer. ii. 18; but the sense here, and the description of it as 'before Egypt,' or 'in front of Egypt,' as well as the use of 'Shihor of Egypt' in 1 Chron. xiii. 5, for the S.W. boundary of Canaan, lead us to think of 'the river (better, torrent) of Egypt,' xv. 4, etc., now called Wâdy el Arîsh, which enters the sea some 45 or 50 miles by the road S.W. of Gaza. *From the south*, ver. 4, stands connected with what follows, according to the present punctuation in the Hebrew; but it is difficult to attach any sense to it. Hence commentators feel justified in following three of the principal ancient versions—the Syriac, the Septuagint, and the Vulgate—in connecting it with what goes before, as much as to say, 'These [were] on the south: we proceed to the north.' *The Canaanites*, ver. 4, is here to be taken of that one of the seven nations which had its home on the low-lying sea-coast; in this case the coast about Sidon. *Mearah*, ver. 4, means a cave, and is by many believed to be the cave of Jezzîn, in the precipices of Lebanon 10 miles E. from Sidon, on the road to Damascus: Conder thinks it is probably Mogheiriyeh, north of Sidon. *Aphék*, ver. 4, is often supposed to be the modern Afka, anciently infamous on account of its temple to Venus, near the source of the river Adonis, now Nahr Ibrahim, on

CHAP. XIII.—*The Divine Command to allot the Land to the Tribes.*

one of the heights of Lebanon, 12 miles E. of Jebeil, the Gebal of the next verse: it is a name of several cities, one already met with, xii. 18, another belonging to Asher, xix. 30, by many thought to be the city intended here. *The Gibletes*, ver. 5 (1 Kings v. 18; Ezek. xxvii. 9), inhabitants of Gebal, the Greek Byblos, the modern Jebeil, a maritime city, nearly 18 miles N. of Beyrût. *Baal-gad*, ver. 5, see at xi. 17. *Hamath*, v. 5, a city far N. on the slope of the mountains away from Palestine, built on the river Nahr el Asy, the ancient Orontes, still called Hamah, having thrown off its Greek name Epiphania. The entering in of Hamath is often mentioned as the northern limit of the land of Israel, Num. xiii. 21, etc.: this could scarcely be Hamath itself, but either the southern portion of the great valley between the two Lebanon ranges, or some marked point in it; for instance, the entrance from the sea or west, Num. xxxiv. 7, 8, as Porter believes. *The hill country*, ver. 6; properly, 'the mountain,' as at x. 40, xi. 16. *Misrephoth-maim*, ver. 6; see at xi. 8.—**Vers. 6b-8.** This land, as yet unconquered, was as secure to the tribes of Israel as those portions already enjoyed by the two tribes and a half, to whom Moses had given their inheritance E. of Jordan; therefore Joshua was to have no hesitation in allotting it, but to trust to Jehovah that He would dispossess these nations. They were all one body, the tribe of Manasseh, on both sides of Jordan, forming a connecting link.—**Vers. 9-13.** The geographical boundaries and general characteristics are given much as in xii. 2-5: see also Deut. iii. 8-17. The exact position of Geshur and Maachah may not be ascertainable, but they certainly lay to the E. of Jordan and to the S. of Mount Hermon. It is a probable conjecture that Geshur is the same word as Ituræa, Luke iii. 1, and is preserved in the modern name Jedûr. We shall know more from the coming survey of Eastern Palestine. But the Geshurites and Maachathites having been mentioned in ver. 11, it is added, ver. 13, that these were also nations remaining among the Israelites, and therefore needing to be cast out as truly as those named in vers. 2-6; not perhaps without a hint that already a dangerous spirit of slackness threatened to creep in among God's people. *Medeba* and *Dibon*, ver. 9, are named together, along with Heshbon, in Num. xxi. 30, and are easily recognisable in the modern names Medaba or Madîyabah, a place with considerable ruins, half an hour S.E. of Hesbân, and (considerably to the S.) Dhîbân, one hour N. of Aroer ('Arâir). But 'the plain' here, and

 CHAP. XIII.—*The Divine Command to allot the Land to the Tribes.*

vers. 16, 17, 21, xx. 8, as also Deut. iii. 10, iv. 43, is not a good rendering: it is the high tableland which formed the eastern part of the territory of Reuben.—**Ver. 14.** Yet, in assigning inheritances to the tribes, Moses had given none to Levi: Joshua reminds the people of this significant fact, lest the earthly Canaan should too much occupy their thoughts. For the Levites had not been overlooked: they (including the priests, iii. 3) had a nobler portion in the fire-offerings of Jehovah, which was, in fact, to say that Jehovah Himself was their portion, ver. 33. This had been said to them, to Aaron their head, in Num. xviii. 20: and since all Israel was a kingdom of priests (Ex. xix. 6), every spiritual Israelite took the promise to himself, Ps. xvi. 5, 6, and desired a better country than the land promised to Abraham, which Joshua was now about to allot to them, Heb. iv. 8, xi. 9–16.—**Vers. 15–23.** The inheritance of the tribe of Reuben (compare Num. xxxii. 37, 38) was situated at the southern extremity of the territory E. of Jordan. *Heshbon* lay towards the N. of the land assigned to Reuben, and seems to have passed into the hands of the Gadites, xxi. 39; while *Dibon* in the S. naturally remained with Reuben, though in the first instance the Gadites had rebuilt it, and seem to have called it Dibon-gad; Num. xxxii. 34 and xxxiii. 45. These cities are little known to us: *Fahaza*, or *Jahaz*, was the scene of the defeat of Sihon by the Israelites, Num. xxi. 23; as Kirjathaim, many centuries before, of the slaughter of the Emim by Chedorlaomer, Gen. xiv. 5. Burckhardt thought it might be et Teym, half an hour from Medeba; Porter conjectures that it is Kureyât on the southern side of Mount Attârûs, and to this Conder inclines so far. Several of these cities were occupied by the Moabites in the declining age of Israelite history, Isa. xv. 2, xvi. 9; Jer. xlvi. 21–24. Among those which are recognisable in modern names, there are, besides Medeba, Dibon, and Heshbon (see at ver. 9), and perhaps Kirjathaim; *Aroer*, now 'Arâir, N. of the Mojib, or Arnon; *Beth-baal-meon* (without Beth, Num. xxxii. 38, and without Baal, Jer. xlviii. 23), perhaps Myûn or Maîn, S.W. of Heshbon. Zareth-shahar, says Conder, is probably the ruin Zâra, on E. shore of the Dead Sea. Moses tells of their names being changed by the Israelites, probably on account of their heathenish character: to which Bamoth Baal ('the high places of Baal,' perhaps the point from which Balaam looked on Israel, Num. xxii. 41), Beth-baal-meon, and Beth-peor bear witness. **Vers. 21, 22** reproduce from Num. xxxi. 8 the account of the slaughter of the five dukes of

 CHAP. XIII.—*The Divine Command to allot the Land to the Tribes.*

Sihon, and also that of the seducing prophet Balaam, here called a soothsayer: this naturally arises out of the mention of Sihon's kingdom immediately before. 'Dukes' is not a bad translation of the word for these 'princes,' who were also vassal-kings of Sihon (styled simply 'kings of Midian' in Numbers); yet with the disadvantage that it is the rendering of another word applied to the aristocracy in Edom, Gen. xxxvi. 40-43.—Vers. 24-28. The tribe of Gad lay between Reuben and the half tribe of Manasseh, and shared the land of Gilead with the latter: compare ver. 25 with ver. 31. They had half the land of the children of Ammon, ver. 25: not certainly anything Moses had conquered, for Israel had been expressly and stringently prohibited from touching Edom, Moab, and Ammon (Deut. ii. 1-23); but it would seem that Sihon had conquered and annexed to his kingdom much that previously belonged to the Moabites and Ammonites, which the Israelites retained in their own hands after conquering Sihon (Num. xxi. 25-30); on account of this Jephthah was involved in controversy with the Ammonites (Judg. xi. 13-27). And as the kingdom of Sihon was divided between Reuben and Gad, in like manner Gilead was divided between Gad and Manasseh: the Gadites seem to have stretched very considerably northward of the river Jabbok, at least in the Jordan valley they reached as far north as the Sea of Chinnereth, ver. 27. We do not yet know the site of *Mahanaim*, ver. 26, though Conder says it is possibly Maneh, 12 miles N. of Gerasa, the modern Jerash, and Porter inclines to think of Jerash itself: it was the most famous of their cities, mentioned in history so early as Jacob's days, and again in the reigns of Ishbosheth and David, who both resided in it. The like uncertainty attaches to the site of Succoth, ver. 27, mentioned in the history of Jacob and in that of Gideon, though Burckhardt pointed out a suitable site, Sükkôt, nearly opposite to Bethshean, immediately under Pella, a little to the N. of the Wâdy el Mûz: but since the Talmud names it Tar'ala, Conder follows the American explorer Meril, who finds it in Tell Dar'ala, in the Jordan valley, a mi N. of the Jabbok. *Ramath-mizpeh*, ver. 26, is generally admitted to be Ramoth in Gilead (observe the combination of Gilead and Mizpeh in Gen. xxxi. 48, 49), one of the cities of refuge, xx. 8, famous afterwards in the Syrian wars of Ahab and his successors, which is thought to be the modern Salt or Es Szalt, where the roads unite from Jericho and from Shechem (now Nablûs) to Damascus; but

 CHAP. XIII.—*The Divine Command to allot the Land to the Tribes.*

Conder says it 'is probably Remtheh, about 25 miles w. of Bozrah, and a little s. of the river Yermûk,' the classical Hieromax, 'which formed probably the N. tribe border,' while he looks on Ramoth-gilead as still unknown. Of the other cities we know only the names; not even this with certainty in the case of *Debir*, ver. 26, which may equally well be Lidebir. *Fazer* (Num. xxi. 32) is perhaps Beit Zâra, 4 miles N.E. of Heshbon; or Es Syr or Sz'ir, about 7 miles W. of Rabbath-ammon, now Ammân; *Aroer* is expressly distinguished from the other already mentioned in vers. 9 and 16; besides, there is the fact that it is placed 'before Rabbah,' the Ammonite capital; *Betonim* may possibly be the present Batneh, 5 miles s.w. of Es Szalt; *Beth-aram* (a misprint for Beth-haram; in Num. xxxii. 36, Beth-haran), called by King Herod Libias or Livias, now Er-ramah or Beit-harân, 3 miles E. of Jordan, opposite Jericho; *Beth-nimrah* (without the Beth in Num. xxxii. 3, and Nimrim in Isa. xv. 6), now Nimrîn, about 4 miles to the N. of Livias; and Zaphon, traditionally identified with Amathus, now Amatâ or Amâteh, about 3 miles from the mouth of the Wâdy Ajlûn or Rajîb.—**Vers. 29-31.** The portion assigned to the eastern half-tribe of Manasseh is passed over rather summarily, though it must have been of very great extent, and extremely valuable as a rich pasture-land: possibly the largeness of their portion was owing partly to their intermarriage with the tribe of Judah, 1 Chron. ii. 21-23, where Jair is celebrated, as he is here and in the parallel passage, Num. xxxii. 39-42; Deut. iii. 13-15: yet also on account of their valour, xvii. 1. For Ashtaroth and Edrei, see xii. 4. All the geography E. of Jordan is still very uncertain. In ver. 29 both the words for 'tribe' occur; see on xi. 23: 'and Moses gave to the [sovereign] half-tribe of Manasseh, and it was to the [genealogical] half-tribe of the children of Manasseh according to their families.' **Vers. 32, 33** sum up these details, and end by repeating ver. 14 in a stronger form.

1. *What guess can be made as to the probable age of Joshua at this time?*
2. *Where were the masses of unconquered heathens chiefly found?*
3. *Which tribes had already received their inheritance, and how had this come about?*
4. *What tribe received no inheritance in the land, and what reasons are given for its being shut out?*
5. *How does Balaam's history come in here?*

CHAP. XIV.—*The Partition of the Land begun.*

CHAPTER XIV.—THE PARTITION OF THE LAND BEGUN.

Vers. 1-5. Now Joshua's second great task was on the point of being commenced; but whereas Moses had been supreme, both in conquering and in assigning the land, Joshua was no longer alone and supreme, as he is represented in chap. i. when going forth to war. In Num. xxxiv. 16-29, Jehovah had appointed a commission to divide the land, consisting of ten princes, one for each of the nine and a half tribes, and Eleazar the priest, and Joshua at the head of them; but there, as here (and at xvii. 4, xix. 51, xxi. 1), Eleazar takes precedence of Joshua, no doubt on account of his representing more peculiarly the sacredness of the work, when the land was distributed by lot (Prov. xvi. 33); whilst yet Joshua must have been really the prominent person in the work, so that he alone is named, vers. 6, 13, xvii. 14, xviii. 3, and to him the people gave a city, as a testimonial of affection and confidence in relation to this work, xix. 49, 50. In consequence of this, Joshua is himself said to cast lots, xviii. 6, 8, 10, though certainly by means of Eleazar. According to the Divine command in Num. xxvi. 52-56, though the land was to be divided by lot, yet the people themselves were to give the inheritances larger or smaller in proportion to the population of the several tribes. From this it has been justly inferred, that the lot determined the relative position of the tribes, yet not their boundaries, and consequently not the magnitude of their territorial possessions, which the commissioners had the responsibility of settling, while Jehovah prevented jealous disputes between north and south, maritime and inland tribes, by Himself fixing their place in the land. In this way it is easy to see why the *position* assigned to a tribe is never recorded to have been altered, but the *magnitude* was liable to changes, chap. xix. 1, 9, etc. Some things requiring further notice will come up in connection with xviii. 2-10. How precisely the lots were cast is a matter of curiosity, on which Scripture does not throw any light: no conjecture, however, is simpler than the Rabbinical statement, that there were two urns, the one with the names of the ten tribes (one of them, strictly speaking, a half tribe), and the other with the names of ten districts, and that one of these was drawn alternately. The case of the Levites, alluded to in ver. 4, will come up at chap. xxi. It is to be noticed, however, that the internal spiritual reason for giving to Levi no territorial inheritance, xiii. 14, 33, fitted into a historical fact, which furnished an

CHAP. XIV.—*The Partition of the Land begun.*

external reason, that otherwise there would have been thirteen tribes, ver. 4, since Joseph's birthright led to his having two tribes, Gen. xlviii. 5; Deut. xxi. 17; 1 Chron. v. 1, 2. Compare the historical circumstance which compelled the Israelites to carry out the law that forbade the use of leaven at the passover, Ex. xii. 34, with vers. 15-20.—**Vers. 6-12.** Before the partition by lot actually commenced, Caleb lodged a preferential claim on his own behalf, supported by the children of Judah, who must have felt honoured by the position of that faithful spy who had well represented their tribe in the day of failure and disgrace; had it not been settled before any lots were cast, there might have been difficulties. *The man of God*, ver. 6, is a beautiful title given to Moses again in the inscription of the 90th Psalm. *To espy out*, ver. 7, is the word invariably used in this book (though at vii. 2 it is twice rendered 'to view'), and, with one exception, invariably in Judges, its etymology hinting at going on foot to make the search: a different verb is used by Moses in the history, Num. xiii. and xiv., to which narrative this whole passage constantly refers us. *Made the heart of the people melt*, ver. 8, which ought to have been the case only with the enemies of Israel, ii. 11, v. 1, though Caleb saw it again in Israel after the defeat at Ai, vii. 5. *I wholly followed*, etc., ver. 8, as in Num. xiv. 24. These holy men, conscious of the honesty and integrity of their walk with God, spoke out plainly and without fear of being thought presumptuous or boastful: why should we be less so? Comp. 2 Cor. i. 12, etc.—**Ver. 9.** This is one of those minor circumstances left unrecorded by Moses: but it is thoroughly in harmony with all that is recorded, especially in Num. xiv. 24, 30, Deut. i. 36: and his readiness to go against the giant Anakim, ver. 12, to whose land he accordingly went, is a fine termination to his faithfulness and hope in contending against the unbelieving spies whom these very Anakim had dispirited (Num. xiii. 30, xiv. 9). To the evil reports of these spies, and the consequent murmurs of the people, there is a graphic reference, when Caleb says to Joshua, ver. 12, 'Thou *heardest* that day,' rather than 'thou thyself *sawest*.' Perhaps there is a hint of such a promise of land, not to Caleb only, but to the two faithful spies, when we read that the portion given to Joshua was 'according to the word of Jehovah . . . the city which he asked,' xix. 50, which is the expression used when the claim of Caleb is recognised as having a preference even over the decision of the lot, xv. 13: just as here, ver. 6, Caleb refers to what Jehovah said to Moses concerning

CHAP. XIV.—*The Partition of the Land begun.*

both of them.—**Ver. 10.** This furnishes data for determining approximately the length of time during which Joshua made war with the kings of Canaan: see xi. 18. For Caleb was forty years old when he was sent as a spy, ver. 7; that is, forty-five years before the time at which he now spoke: of these forty-five years, thirty-eight were spent in the penal wandering, Deut. ii. 14, though in this verse 'wandering' should have been simply 'walking:' this leaves seven years since Moses' wars with Sihon and Og, which were about six months before his death and the appointment of Joshua.—**Ver. 11** gives an account of Caleb's strength that reminds us of what is said of Moses, Deut. xxxi. 2 with xxxiv. 7. *If so be Jehovah will be with me*, ver. 12, might be rendered, 'Perhaps Jehovah will be my standard:' as Isa. liv. 15 may be rendered, 'Behold, they shall surely gather together, but not by my standard:' comp. Jehovah-nissi, Ex. xvii. 15.—**Vers. 13-15.** The meeting of the two aged saints, the only men above sixty years of age in the camp, and the appeal to their experience on that day of Israel's trial and fall, is very touching, as is the blessing which Joshua was entitled by his official superiority to pronounce upon his friend. The actual possession of Hebron (and 'the mountain' generally, ver. 12) by Caleb is narrated in xv. 13-15. It is impossible to arrive at certainty in regard to the chronological order of the repeated captures of Hebron and the surrounding cities, see on xi. 21, 22: only the history carefully informs us, that at this time 'the land had rest (or, as often rendered, was quiet) from war,' v. 15 (as at xi. 23), with nothing to disturb the process of allotment. The form of the sentence in the original disconnects this last sentence of the chapter from what goes before; and it is linked on to what follows by the form of the opening words of chap. xv. Nor is it possible to be certain as to the relations of the names Hebron and Kirjath-arba, that is, the city of Arba; both names are already conjoined in Gen. xxiii. 2. Nothing can be established in opposition to the conjecture that Abraham gave this name among his people to this city on account of his union or confederation (the meaning of the word) with the three Amorite brothers, Gen. xiv. 13. But the influence of Arba among the Anakim may be inferred from the repeated mention of him in this book, xv. 13, xxi. 11.—There have been speculations about Caleb's own descent from the Canaanite tribe of Kenizzites, Gen. xv. 19. But (apart from the fact that no hint is given of the incorporation of this stranger with the tribe of Judah, while the family of the

 CHAP. XV.—*The Portion allotted to Judah.*

Kenites, who were to some extent incorporated with them, retained a marked individuality and isolation) it is antecedently improbable that a stranger should have been chosen to represent the great tribe of Judah among the twelve spies; and no solid reason has been advanced for refusing to identify him with the Caleb whose genealogy and connections are given in 1 Chron. ii. 9, 18, 24, 42, 49, in which last verse his daughter Achsah is named, just as here in xv. 17. And as he had a grandson or descendant Kenaz, 1 Chron. iv. 15, and, it would seem, a brother also, chap. xv. 17, his name 'Kenizzite' probably refers to an ancestor of the same name; for links in the genealogies are often omitted, and family names often recurred among the Israelites, just as with ourselves.

1. *To whom was the division of the land entrusted?*
2. *Who appears to have presided?*
3. *What did the lot settle, and what did it not settle?*
4. *How has it been supposed that the lots were cast?*
5. *What outward circumstance in Providence worked to support the law that Levi should have no inheritance, except the sacrifices of the Lord?*
6. *Who urged a preferential claim to the land?*
7. *On what fact, not mentioned in the books of Moses, did he rely?*
8. *To whom else might this also apply?*

 CHAPTER XV.—THE TERRITORY AS DIVIDED: FIRST, THE PORTION ALLOTTED TO JUDAH.

Vers. 1-12. Its boundaries, in the first instance (afterwards modified, xix. 9), took in the whole southern block or square between the Dead Sea and the Mediterranean, which are here named the Salt Sea and the Great Sea. Hence its southern boundary, vers. 2-4, coincided with that of the land of Israel, Num. xxxiv. 3-5, ending at the so-called river of Egypt; not the Nile, however, but better translated the torrent of Egypt, the same as Sihor in xiii. 3, where see notes. The geographical details must remain uncertain, until it be determined, first, whether *Maaleh Akrabbim* (that is, the ascent of Akrabbim) be the ridge of white rocks running E. and W. 8 or 9 miles S. of the Dead Sea, as has been commonly believed; and next, whether *Kadesh-barnea*, where the unbelieving spies brought back their message and led the people astray, be 'Ain Hasb, 'Ain el

CHAP. XV.—*The Portion allotted to Judah.*

Weibeh, or Petra, to the E., in the neighbourhood of the great valley from the Dead Sea to the Red Sea, running N. and S., the Arabah, or whether old geographers were right in placing it much farther to the w., as Rowlands, Wilton, Tyrwhitt Drake, etc., now do, at 'Ain Kadeis, with a cliff such as Moses smote. If this be correct, as it very probably is, their opinion is also to be taken into account, that the ascent of Akrabbim is the pass of Sufâh, entering Palestine on the s. from the great Wâdy el Fikreh. Zin was the eastern part of the desert s. of Canaan. Wilton is disposed to stretch the curve or compass at Karkaa, so as to include the south country on the w. of the Azâzimât. Conder now inclines to the eastern position (though farther off than 'Ain el Weibeh), for Kadesh-barnea; and he believes he has found Hezron in Jebel (mount) Hadîreh, north of the head of Wâdy el Fikreh: but more light is needed. See remarks at the end of the Introduction. The northern boundary of Judah became the southern boundary of the tribe of Benjamin, and is given therefore again in xviii. 15-19, but there from w. to E., whereas here it is from E. to w. *Beth-hogla* (better, Beth-hoglah), ver. 6, identified with the threshing-floor of Atad (Gen. l. 11) by Jerome, is now 'Ain Hajlah, $3\frac{1}{2}$ miles S.E. of Eriha (Jericho), and $2\frac{1}{4}$ miles from Jordan. The *valley of Achor*, ver. 7, is known from vii. 26, but not its site, though it may be the Wâdy el Kelt, the same as the river or torrent, ver. 7; nor can we be certain whether *Gilgal* (called Gelliloth in xviii. 17, which Tyrwhitt Drake thinks may be the mounds, so conspicuous a feature of the landscape) is the site of the first encampment of Israel or not. *En-shemesh* (the fountain of the sun) and *En-rozel* (the fuller's fountain) are now the 'Ain el Hodh, or Hawdh, a mile E. of Bethany on the road to Jericho, along which Drake makes the border run, finding Adummim at Tel'at ed Damm, and the well of Job (Bîr Eyûb), at the junction of the valley of Hinnom and the valley of the Kidron, or rather, perhaps, the Virgin's Fount, a little higher up. *Febusi* (here less well translated 'the Jebu-site'), or Jerusalem, has been noticed at x. 1: the *valley of Hinnom*, afterwards infamous on account of cruel idolatrous rites, lies on the s. of Jerusalem; and 'the valley of the giants' (usually left untranslated; 'the valley of Rephaim,' 2 Sam. v. 18, 22) is the plain on the s.w. of the city. The boundary w. of Jerusalem depends chiefly upon determining the position (ver. 9) of Kirjath-jearim, which Robinson fixed at Kuryet el 'Enab, $7\frac{1}{2}$ miles w.n.w. of Jerusalem; and of Nephtoah, thought to be Lifta, 2 miles N.W. of Jerusalem. The

 CHAP. XV.—*The Portion allotted to Judah.*

recent explorers, induced partly by the identification of the fountain of water of Nephtoah with Etam, that is, 'Ain 'Atân, close to the pools of Solomon, $2\frac{1}{2}$ miles S.W. of Bethlehem, look for Kirjath-jearim (one of the cities of the Gibeonites, ix. 17) at a ruin 'Erma, 5 miles S.W. of Kuryet el 'Enab, 4 miles E. of Beth-shemesh, and fully 2 miles S. of Chesalon (now Kesla), both named in ver. 10. 'Erma resembles the form of the name Arim, in Ezra ii. 25; and Kirjath-jearim means 'the city of woods,' which Conder says is a suitable description of it to this day. Moreover, its position suits all that we know of the town. This throws the northern boundary of Judah farther to the S. than we have been accustomed to do; but, as Conder says, the Hebrew text gives no towns in a position farther N. than the new line, though the Septuagint Greek translation inserts some between vers. 59 and 60; this may have had weight in leading him to agree with those who call that list of towns an interpolation. *Mount Seir*, ver. 10, is manifestly different from the well-known mount of this name in the land of Edom; it and *Chesalon* are thought to have their names preserved in the ruin Bâtnes Saghîr, or S'airah and the village Kesla, 10 miles W. of Jerusalem. *Beth-shemesh*, often named in subsequent history, is now a ruin, 'Ain Shems, fully 5 miles S.W. of Kesla; and $2\frac{1}{2}$ miles farther W., the ruin Tibneh no doubt represents the ancient *Timnah*, which is repeatedly mentioned in the history of Samson: both cities were afterwards assigned to Dan, xix. 41, 43, if Ir-shemesh is the same as Beth-shemesh. *Ekron*, now 'Akir, has been named already in xiii. 3; *Jabneel* or *Jabneh*, in the books of Maccabees and in Josephus named Jamnia, is still a considerable village, Yebnah, nearly $4\frac{1}{2}$ miles W. of 'Akir.—Vers. 13–19. The preferential claim of Caleb to Hebron having been allowed, xiv. 6–15, and the Divine lot having determined that it should lie within (for 'among,' ver. 13, is properly 'in the midst of') the tribe of Judah, the account is given of his taking possession of it: see on xiv. 13–15. The account, vers. 14–19, is also to be found, almost word for word, in Judg. i. 10–15. The three sons of Anak—Sheshai, and Ahinan, and Talmi—are also named in Num. xiii. 22, only there Ahiman stands first; the repetition of the names at the distance of forty-five years is proof that they represent not the individuals, but the tribes sprung from them. Debir (see at x. 38) has here an older name preserved to us, which means 'the book-city' or 'city of writing;' and yet another name borne by it, Kirjath-sannah, v. 49, is interpreted 'city of sacred law,'

CHAP. XV.—*The Portion allotted to Judah.*

or 'of doctrine': whether these were Canaanite names, or whether they were of still greater antiquity, we cannot even guess, though their careful preservation is an indication of the importance attached to them. Othniel, the winner of the bride in virtue of his prowess (comp. 1 Sam. xvii. 25, xviii. 17-27), is understood by many, following some Jewish traditions, to have been the brother of Caleb; and there is nothing ungrammatical in this. But various reasons recommend the other interpretation, that his father Kenaz was Caleb's brother; and this is favoured by 1 Chron. iv. 13, 15, and ii. 18, 24, 42, styling Othniel the son of Kenaz, yet never giving this appellation to Caleb. It is also the more probable, owing to the difference of age that existed between Caleb and Othniel, as may be inferred from the circumstances of this marriage, and still more from the fact that Othniel at a considerably later time became the first judge of Israel. Achsah appears to have been much more eager than her husband to obtain this field: she had urged him to ask it, but he failed to do so; and she grasped at an opportunity, when she met her father, and lighted off her ass, or perhaps sprang from it, to make her request. In ver. 19, instead of 'Thou hast given me a south land,' an old translation more favoured by the Hebrew construction is, 'Thou hast sent me into the south land,' or Negeb: see on x. 40.—Ver. 20. This forms, as it were, the title to the geographical lists which follow, arranged in four districts (see, as above, on x. 40), namely, the south or Negeb, ver. 21; the valley, better, the lowland, ver. 33; the mountain, or hill country, ver. 48; and the wilderness, that is, toward the Dead Sea, ver. 61. It was a vast district for a single tribe, but its extent was reduced at a later time. In reference to these lists of towns, it is to be said, once for all, that by far the larger part of them may be passed over without remark, being never named in the subsequent books of Scripture, or appearing only in some other list. Often we cannot even guess their position: only see as to this the statement of Conder quoted under chap. xii. Such lists are peculiarly liable to errors in transcription: and in this book of Joshua the following cases have been noted, in which the numbers in the sum total and the detailed lists do not agree:—

	Total or Sum.	Detail.		Total or Sum.	Detail.		
Chap. xv.	32	29.....	36, at least.	Chap. xix.	15; 12.....	5	
"	"	36	14.....	"	"	38; 19.....	16
"	xix.	6	13.....				
"	"	30	22.....				23 probably.

CHAP. XV.—*The Portion allotted to Judah.*

In the former column the sum is too small, in the latter column it is too great. Besides, between xv. 59 and the next verse there is some suspicion that eleven cities have been left out; while xxi. 36, 37 are not in the authorised or Massoretic Hebrew text, yet seem to be necessary. Critics have taken opposite sides on the question, whether names have come to be dropped or to be inserted, by accident or by design, or whether the numbers have come down to us in a faulty state; and there is no likelihood of the controversy being soon settled conclusively.

Vers. 21–32. *Cities in the south, or Negeb*, probably from E. to W., as the boundary was traced: groups of 9 cities, vers. 21–23; of 5 or 6, vers. 24, 25; of 9, vers. 26–28; and of 13, vers. 29–32. In these it will be observed that there are three *Hazors*, vers. 23, 25; of which it is now believed that the second has an additional name, Hazor-Hadattah, or 'New Hazor,' taking the two names to apply to one city; and it is probable that the equivalent name of the third is also a double one, Kerioth-Hezron. *Kabzeel*, ver. 21, has been conjectured to be Sebbeh (the Masada of Josephus?), a strong fortress above the Dead Sea: but this is very doubtful. *Dimonah*, ver. 22, may be the same as Dibon (an easy change in Hebrew, found also in Isa. xv. 2 and 9), Neh. xi. 25, where it is beside Jekabzeel, no doubt the same as Kabzeel here; with equal uncertainty it is conjectured to be a ruined Dheib or Et-Teibeh, on the E. side of the Wâdy of the same name, 2 miles N.E. of Tell 'Arâd. *Adadah*, says Conder, is found in a ruin with the name unchanged, in the desert S.E. of Beersheba. *Kedesh*, ver. 23, may be Kadesh-barnea, ver. 3, if we adopt the western site for this, 'Ain Kadeis. *Ziph*, ver. 24, is to be distinguished from a better known city of the same name, ver. 55; possibly it is at the southern pass 'Sufâh. *Kerioth*, ver. 25, is perhaps Kureitein, 4½ miles N. of Tell 'Arâd, the ancient Arad (xii. 14). *Moladah*, ver. 26, also in the list Neh. xi. 26, is mentioned by Josephus as an Idumean fortress, Malatha; and from ancient measurements it is usually identified with el Milh, nearly 8 miles S.W. from Tell 'Arâd. Conder, however, thinks that place may be the city of Salt (or Melahh in Hebrew), ver. 62; in which case Moladah might be farther W., perhaps at Tell Melâha. *Beersheba*, ver. 28, now Bîr-es Seb'a, on the Wâdy of the same name, is well known from the patriarchal history, and is often mentioned as the most southern city of Israel. *Baalah*, ver. 29, is named Balah in xix. 3, among the cities of Judah transferred to Simeon, and Bilhah in 1 Chron. iv. 29; it is conjectured by some

CHAP. XV.—*The Portion allotted to Judah.*

to be Deir Belah, $8\frac{1}{2}$ miles s.w. of Gaza, which the geographer Ritter notes as the only place in Palestine where dates now ripen. *Azem*, or *Ezem*, ver. 29, means 'strength,' and by those who extend the territory of Israel far south has been recognised in a name of the same signification, *Abdeh*, a ruinous place of some importance, the classical *Eboda*, 20 miles s. of Elusa, now *Khalasa* or *Khulasa*, which is nearly 12 miles s.s.w. of Beersheba: *Khalasa* itself being of late by some identified with *Chesil*, ver. 30, either on account of an affinity in the names, or because Elusa was a famous seat of heathen idolatry, and *Chesil* here has been thought equivalent to Bethul in xix. 4, called Bethuel in 1 Chron. iv. 30, and Bethel, 'the house of God,' 1 Sam. xxx. 27. As to *Hormah*, ver. 30, see on xii. 14. *Ziklag*, intimately connected with David's history, cannot be said to have its site determined. The conjectures vary from Sallûjeh, a ruin $7\frac{1}{2}$ miles n.w. of Tell es Sâfi (supposed to be Gath), to a ruin in the distant south, 'Aslûj, beyond *Khalasa*. *Madmannah*, ver. 31, the classical *Menois* close by Gaza, is perhaps the modern *Minyay* or *Miniey*, 15 miles s.s.w. from Gaza: the Hebrew letters of *Madmannah*, however, may be recognised in *Umm Deimneh*, a ruin 12 miles n.e. of Beersheba. This and the next city, *Sansannah*, recognised by some in *Simsim*, 9 miles n.e. of Gaza, are generally held to be the same as *Beth-marcaboth* and *Hazar-susah*, in xix. 5, which are then understood as descriptive names, 'house of chariots,' and 'horse-village.' *Shilhim*, in ver. 32, is called *Sharuhem* in xix. 6, and *Shaaraim* in 1 Chron. iv. 31, which may be preserved in Tell Sherî'ah, on the great Wâdy of the same name, 12 miles n.n.w. of Beersheba: but if we seek these towns far south, it may be better perhaps *Khurbet es Serâm*, the remains of an ancient site, on a Wâdy of the same name, 10 miles beyond S'baita, 25 beyond *Khalasa*. *Ain* and *Rimmon* appear in two other lists as close together as possible, in xix. 7 and in 1 Chron. iv. 32, and in Neh. xi. 29, as one place, *En-Rimmon*: probably they were so near as sometimes to be considered one. *Rimmon* is named as a place in the s. of Judea, Zech. xiv. 10, and since Eusebius places it 16 Roman miles s. of Eleutheropolis, it is the ruin *Umm er Rumâmîn*, 10 miles n.n.e. of Beersheba; while a great ancient well, half in ruins, 30 minutes distant, known in history as an important drinking-place, may be *Ain*, 'the fountain,' unless we look for it in the Wâdy el 'Ain, south of the Wâdy es Serâm.—Vers. 33–47. *Cities in the valley*, better, *in the lowland*, or *Shephelah*, towards the sea, w. of the mountain

 CHAP. XV.—*The Portion allotted to Judah.*

range of Judah : groups of 14 cities (15 enumerated), lying towards the N. on the slopes, vers. 33-36 ; of 16 cities, lying to the w. and s. of the preceding, vers. 37-41 ; of 9 cities, vers. 42-44 ; and of 3 cities, not summed up, either because remaining almost entirely in the possession of the Philistines, or because presenting difficulties in summation, since these Philistine cities had towns (literally 'daughters') connected with them. *Eshtaol* and *Zoreah* or *Zorah*, ver. 33, are often mentioned together, as in Samson's history, being transferred to the Danites, though at an early time occupied by colonists from Judah, 1 Chron. ii. 53, 54, iv. 2 : their names appear now in *Eshû'a* and *Sur'ah*, the former $1\frac{1}{2}$ miles E. of the latter, and $12\frac{1}{2}$ w. of Jerusalem. The next town, *Ashnah*, is found by Clermont-Ganneau in 'Aslîn, a ruin close to them both on the N. ; but Conder found it in Beit-shenna, a ruin $2\frac{1}{2}$ miles N. of 'Amwâs, and 15 W.N.W. of Jerusalem, as probably the Onomasticon makes it ; and now he says it is unknown. *Zanoah*, ver. 34, now *Zânû'a*, $1\frac{1}{2}$ miles N. of Beit Nettîf. *Engannim* is thought to be Umm Jîna, $2\frac{1}{2}$ miles S.S.W. of Sur'ah ; and *Enam* (the same as Enaim, according to the true translation of Gen. xxxviii. 21, margin) is 2 miles S. of Sur'ah, and $3\frac{1}{2}$ E. of Timnah, if it be the ruin 'Alîn : while *Tappuah* has been conjectured to be Artûf, still a village, about a mile from Sur'ah and Eshû'a to the S. *Farmuth*, ver. 35, now Yarmûk : see on x. 3. The recovery of *Adullam*, ver. 35, was really an achievement by the Palestine explorers ; so much doubt has existed, both as to the position of the town and as to its connection with the cave of Adullam, in which David hid his men. Conder and Clermont-Ganneau are at one in recognising the name (transformed) in 'Aid el Ma, on the great Roman road on the Wâdy Sûr, or upper Wâdy Sunt, fully 2 miles S.E. of Shuweikeh : this site appears to suit every requirement. *Socoh*, ver. 35, now Shuweikeh in the Wâdy Sunt (supposed to be the valley of Elah, where David slew Goliath, the Hebrew name being the same, though it is spelt Shochoh in the A. V., 1 Sam. xvii. 1), scarcely 2 miles S. from the ruin of Jarmûk, and still less to the S.W. from Beit Nettîf. *Azekah*, ver. 35, see on x. 10. *Sharaim*, ver. 36, more correctly written Shaaraim in the A. V. at 1 Sam. xvii. 52, from which text we infer that it lay w. of Socoh and Azekah, has been thought to be Tell Zakariya and Kefr Zakariya, in the Wâdy Sunt, $3\frac{1}{2}$ miles w. of Beit Nettîf, though Conder perhaps inclines with Clermont-Ganneau to a ruin S'aîreh, $3\frac{1}{2}$ N.E. of it. *Gederah*,

CHAP. XV.—*The Portion allotted to Judah.*

ver. 36, meaning 'a wall, a fortified place,' was an extremely common Canaanite and Phenician name for cities, being the feminine form of the masculine Geder, xii. 13; the plural is Gederoth, ver. 41; and an added dual form is found in the next city, in ver. 36, *Gederothaim*, which the Septuagint translation seems to make a part of a dependency of Gederoth. It is impossible to arrive at certainty about their sites; there has probably been much confusion in reference to these names. Conder and others find *Gederah* (according to the Onomasticon, it should be Gedor, ver. 58), 10 Roman miles from Lydda toward Eleutheropolis, at Jedîreh, a ruin 4 miles N. of Sur'ah (Zorah); if so, *Adithaim*, named just before it, may be Hadîd, another ruin 3 miles to the E. *Zenan*, ver. 37, probably the same as Zanaan, Mic. i. 11. *Dilean*, ver. 38, according to Conder, is Beit Tîma, 15 miles w. of Beit-Jibrîn; but he now seems to think it still unknown. *Mizpeh*, ver. 38, a common name, a 'watch-tower,' is thought by some to be Tell es Saffiyeh or Sâfi, which however is probably Gath: Conder suggested el Musheirifeh, a ruin near Gaza, but no longer does so. *Lachish* and *Eglon*, ver. 39, now Umm Lâkis, or Tell el Hesy, and Ajlân; see on x. 3. *Lahmam*, ver. 40, according to a reading strongly supported, is by many read Lachmas: names somewhat resembling this and the preceding one in ver. 40 have been found in the neighbourhood of Beit-Jibrîn, Cabbon being identified with El-Kubeibah, scarcely $3\frac{1}{2}$ miles s.w. of it, and Lahmam, with a ruin, el Lahm, $2\frac{1}{2}$ E. of Kubeibah. *Gederoth*, ver. 41, according to both Warren and Conder, is probably Katrah, $3\frac{1}{2}$ miles s.e. of Yebnah; thus little more than a mile s. from *Makkedah*, mentioned in this verse, if it be El Mûghâr; see at x. 10. *Naamah*, named between them, is Nâ'aneh, $5\frac{1}{2}$ miles e.n.e. of El Mûghâr, 11 miles N. of which stands Beit-dejan, apparently *Bethdagon* here, $5\frac{1}{2}$ s.e. of Jaffa. *Libnah*, ver. 42; see on x. 29. *Ether*, ver. 42, is recognised in El 'Atr, a mile n.w. of Beit-Jibrîn. *Nezib*, ver. 43, was fixed by Jerome at 7 Roman miles E. of Eleutheropolis (Beit-Jibrîn) toward Hebron, where Beit Nuzîb now is, 6 English miles distant: some make a difficulty that this would lie rather in the first group, vers. 33-36; however, Jerome places the next city, *Keilah* (known in David's early history), a mile farther E. (fully $1\frac{1}{4}$ n.n.e.), and a ruin called Kîla stands there now. But Wilton identifies it with Khuweilfeh, on the way from Beit-Jibrîn to Bîr es Seb'a (Beersheba), $10\frac{1}{2}$ miles from it. *Achzib*, ver. 44, or Chezib, in Gen. xxxviii. 5, perhaps also Chozeba in 1 Chron. iv. 22, has been said

CHAP. XV.—*The Portion allotted to Judah.*

to be ruins with a fountain Kussâbeh or Kesâba, about 5 hours s. by w. from Beit-Jibrîn, on the way to Kheweifeh and Bîr es Seb'a; Conder makes it 'Ain Kezbeh, half a mile s.e. of Beit-Nettif, as Jerome says, a ruin near Adullam. *Mareshah*, ver. 44, repeatedly mentioned in the Old Testament, in classical times the city Marissa, was destroyed by the invading Parthians, and its ruins in Robinson's opinion were used for building Eleutheropolis, the modern Beit-Jibrîn; a good half mile s. of which lie the ruins called Marash or Mer'ash, agreeing with Jerome's account of the site. *Ekron*, *Ashdod*, and *Gaza*, three of the great Philistine cities, with their 'daughters' and villages, are mentioned very briefly, as noticed at the beginning of this section: not improbably Gath and Ashkelon, which are not named along with the others here, as they are usually, for instance at xiii. 3 (see the notes on this), were reckoned 'daughters' of some of the others. Many recent critics pronounce these verses spurious, on subjective grounds which a plain reader has difficulty in understanding: certainly this silence as to Gath and Ashkelon would not be less surprising in a later writer than in one of the age of Joshua.—**Vers. 48-60.** *Cities in the mountain country*, a rich and populous district between the slopes and the plain, which lay to the west, and the wilderness stretching to the Dead Sea, which lay on the east. These are arranged in five groups: in vers. 48-51, 11 cities in the s.w.; in vers. 52-54, 9 cities around Hebron, therefore north of the first group, mostly if not all; in vers. 55-57, 10 cities lying to the e. of both of these; in vers. 58, 59, 6 cities n. of Hebron, and of these two groups; and in ver. 60, 2 cities to the w. of Jerusalem, in the n.w. corner of what ultimately was the territory of Judah. But between vers. 59 and 60 the Septuagint Greek translation has a list of 11 cities with their villages, which, according to the prevailing opinion of critics (following Jerome, who notes the places in his geographical list), is a genuine part of the book of Joshua, presenting a list of the cities which lay near Jerusalem on the s., where a multitude of ruins are to be seen, with places still inhabited, at least 15. A reason for disbelieving their genuineness, however, has been given in connection with the boundary of the tribe, at xv. 9. *Shamir*, according to Conder, is probably the ruin Sômcrâh, 2½ miles n.w. of Dhâheriyeh, the ancient Debir (x. 38). *Fattir*, ver. 48, suits the situation of a ruin; Attîr, s.w., about 13 miles from Hebron: this is the more probable, as the next city, *Socoh*, answers to the present Shuweikeh (see the same ancient name and modern

CHAP. XV.—*The Portion allotted to Judah.*

equivalent at ver. 35), $3\frac{1}{2}$ miles N. of it, fully 10 from Hebron. *Dannah* was first recognised by Conder in Dômeh, fully 2 miles N.W. of Shuweikeh; he now finds it in Idhna, a village in the low hills, 8 miles from Hebron along the western Roman road. *Kirjath-sannah*, which is *Debir*, ver. 49, see on x. 38. *Anab*, ver. 50, was an Anakite centre, xi. 21; the name 'Anâb appears a mile W. of Dhâberiyeh (*Debir*). *Eshtemoh*, ver. 50, elsewhere called *Eshtemoa*, now *es Semû'a*, a village with remains of walls and a castle, $3\frac{1}{2}$ miles E. of Socoh, $8\frac{1}{2}$ miles S. of Hebron; according to Conder, of great antiquity and very interesting. *Anim*, ver. 50, probably *Ghuwein*, the name of two places about 3 miles S. of *es Semû'a*. *Goshen*, ver. 51, named already in x. 41, xi. 16, but unknown. *Holon*, ver. 51, is called *Hilen* in 1 Chron. vi. 58, formerly Conder thought of *Beit Aûlâ*, a village $6\frac{1}{2}$ miles N.W. of Hebron. *Giloh*, famous as the city of *Ahithophel*, may well be the ruin *Jâla*, $6\frac{1}{2}$ miles N. of Hebron. Conder finds *Arab* in *er Rabîyeh*, 8 miles S.S.W. of Hebron. *Dumah*, ver. 52, a destroyed village *ed Daumeh* or *Dômeh*, in the *Wâdy Dilbeh*, nearly 10 miles S.W. of Hebron. *Eshean*, says Conder, is possibly the ruin *es Sîmia*, fully 8 miles S.S.W. of Hebron, and nearly 3 E. of *Dômeh*. *Fanum* may be the village *Beni N'aîm*, nearly 3 miles E. of Hebron. *Beth-tappuah*, ver. 53, may be the village *Tuffûh*, $3\frac{1}{2}$ miles W. of Hebron. *Zior* is the village *Si'aîr*, $4\frac{1}{2}$ N.N.E. of Hebron. *Maon*, ver. 55, in the wilderness named from it, mentioned repeatedly in David's early history, recognised in a ruin at *Tell M'aîn*, on a conical hill from which there is an extensive view, 4 miles E. of *es Semû'a* (*Eshtemoh*), and 8 miles S. from Hebron. *Carmel*, ver. 55, associated with *Maon* in the history of *Nabal* and *David*, is a mile N. of it, a place now called *Kurmul*, with great ruins of ancient and mediæval times. *Ziph*, ver. 55, also familiar to the reader of *David's* history, is the ruin on the hill *Zif*, less than 4 miles S.S.E. from Hebron. *Futtah*, ver. 55 (by some identified with the city *Juda*, according to a different translation of *Luke* i. 39), is still a large Mohammedan village, *Yutta*, $5\frac{1}{2}$ miles S. from Hebron. In the next town, *Fezreel*, ver. 56, Conder thought of the ancient ruin *Sirreh*, fully 5 miles W. of *Yutta*: now he says it is unknown. *Zanoah*, different from that named at ver. 34, is recognised by Conder in the ruin *Zânûta*, $4\frac{1}{2}$ W.S.W. of *es Semû'a*, in a *Wâdy* of the same name. *Cain*, ver. 57, according to Conder, is *Yukîn* or *Yekîn*, 3 miles S.E. from Hebron. He says: 'Perched on the edge of a steep cliff, dominating the desert plateau W. of the Dead

Sea, it is one of the most conspicuous objects against the sky-line looking from the E. To Balaam, on the summit of Nebo, it was in full view, and the words of his prophecy thus receive fresh force and significance: Strong is thy dwelling-place, and thou puttest thy nest in a rock.' *Gibeah*, ver. 57, seems to be the modern village Jeba, $7\frac{1}{2}$ miles W.S.W. of Bethlehem, on a hill in the Wâdy Musurr: though the situation is out of the way of this group, and the name proves little, it means 'a hill,' and occurs frequently. Yet Conder speaks of a ruin Tibna, 2 miles N.W. of it, which might well be *Timnah*, the next named. *Halhul*, ver. 58, has preserved its name hardly altered in a village $3\frac{1}{2}$ miles N. of Hebron: as has also the next city, *Beth-zur*, now Beit Sûr, a mile N.W. of it, often mentioned in the Maccabean history as a frontier stronghold against the Idumeans, who by that time possessed southern Judea. *Gedor*, ver. 58, is in like manner recognised in the ruin Jedûr, 3 miles N. of Beit Sûr, rather nearer Hebron than Bethlehem. *Maarath*, ver. 59, seems to be the village Beit Ummar, fully 6 miles N. of Hebron. *Beth-anoth* is thought to have its name and meaning (if this be 'house of fountains') preserved in the ruins Beit Ainûn, S.E. of Hulhûl, 3 miles N.N.E. of Hebron. *Kirjath-jearim*, ver. 60, has been already noticed at ver. 9. *Rabbah*, says Conder, is possibly the ruin Rubba, in the hills near Beit-Jibrîn, 6 miles N.E. of it, and 8 miles S.S.W. of Khurbet Erma, which he and others take for Kirjath-jearim. The additional names given between vers. 59 and 60, in the Septuagint version, to which there has been reference made already in that account of the situation of Kirjath-jearim, and generally, of the northern border of Judah, ver. 9, are no doubt altered somewhat in transcription from Hebrew into Greek. They are 'Thcko, and Ephratha (that is, Bethlehem), and Phagor, and Aitan [another reading, Aitam], and Kulon, and Tatam [another reading, Tatami], and Thobes [another reading, Sores], and Karem, and Galem [another reading, Gallim], and Thether [another reading, Bether], and Manocho: 11 cities and their villages.' *Theko* is certainly Tekoa, to which the prophet Amos belonged, now Tekûa, on the top of a hill covered with ruins, 5 miles S. from *Bethlehem*, which is named next (now Beit-Lahm), the city of David and of Christ: its meaning, 'the house of bread,' answers to 'fruitful,' the meaning of Ephrath: it lies 5 miles S. of Jerusalem. *Phagor*, now a ruined place, Phâghôr or Fâghûr, 4 miles S.W. from Bethlehem. *Aitan*, the Etam which Rehoboam fortified

CHAP. XVI. AND XVII.—*The Portion allotted to Joseph.*

along with Bethlehem and Tekoa (2 Chron. xi. 6), is recognised in the Wâdy and 'Ain 'Atân, between Bethlehem and Phâghôr. *Kulon* may be Kulônich, a village with ruins, 4 miles w. by N. from Jerusalem, on the road to Ramleh and Yaffa (Joppa). *Sores* is probably Saris, a little village 9 miles w. of Jerusalem; and *Karem*, now 'Ain Karim, a flourishing village s. from Kulônich, nearly 4 miles w. from Jerusalem. *Bether*, a dirty little village Bittîr, with a fine fountain and terraced gardens, about 6 miles s.w. from Jerusalem, on a high ridge: the spelling is the same in English at Cant. ii. 17, but it might differ in Hebrew.—**Vers. 61, 62.** *The cities in the wilderness of Judah*, in which David lived during part of Saul's persecution, and in which John the Baptist began his ministry. This wilderness lies along the western shore of the Dead Sea, and inward till the region is reached in which lie the cities named, vers. 48-60. It is a thoroughly desolate country, except where running water fertilizes a Wâdy. *Beth-Arabah*: see ver. 6. The *City of Salt* is naturally looked for beside the Valley of Salt, which again is to be looked for towards the southern part of the Dead Sea, as it is mentioned only in connection with defeats of the Edomites. Yet see on Moledah, ver. 26. *En-gedi*, on the Dead Sea (Ezek. xlvi. 10), mentioned in David's wandering, and celebrated for its vineyards and plants (Cant. i. 14), now 'Ain Jidy, with a hot spring, and the remains of many ruins; a place of vast antiquity, if it was an Amorite city Hazezon Tamar, Gen. xiv. 7; 2 Chron. xx. 2.—**Ver. 63.** The Jebusite inhabitants of Jerusalem were indeed, strictly speaking, within the territory of Benjamin, xviii. 28; yet so close to Judah, ver. 8, that interest as well as the obligation lying on all Israel to act unitedly, perhaps also military reasons connected with a siege, laid the duty on this powerful tribe to conquer it: but they did not, whether from indolence, or carelessness, or tribal jealousies; nay, they were content to inhabit it along with the Jebusites. The Benjamites at a later time did the same; yet, sooner or later, the men of Judah did take the city and burn it, Judg. i. 8, 21.

CHAPTERS XVI. AND XVII.—SECOND, THE PORTION ALLOTTED TO JOSEPH.

Although the descendants of Joseph formed two tribes, nevertheless a single lot was all that fell to them, xvii. 14; with which xvii. 1 does not conflict, for, translated with rigid accuracy, it runs, 'And the lot was for the tribe of Manassch,' that is, for this tribe as well as for

 CHAP. XVI. AND XVII.—*The Portion allotted to Joseph.*

those of Ephraim. The reason of only a single lot being taken for Ephraim and Manasseh may very well have been to prevent the undue weakening of the half-tribe of Manasseh, a result which might have been apprehended had separate lots been cast for them, and a position assigned to this half-tribe at a distance from Ephraim, its brother-tribe, as well as from the other half-tribe of Manasseh.—

Chap. XVI. 1-3. *The water of Jericho*, ver. 1, is understood to be the noble fountain es Sultân, a good mile N.W. of Erîha, the modern Jericho. *Mount Bethel* was the site of the city Bethel, or *Luz*, now a village Beitîn; see at vii. 2. *Ataroth* is called Ataroth-addar in the parallel account of this boundary in xviii. 13, also here at ver. 5, probably a different town from that in ver. 7; it is perhaps Attâra, a ruin nearly 2 miles S. of Bîreh, the ancient Beeroth. Yet it seems too far E. of nether Beth-horon, xviii. 13, where we expect it to be: so that Conder finds it in et Tîrch, a mile S. of the upper Beth-horon; or better, in Dârieh, 1 mile W. of the nether. *Archi* and *Japhleti* are unknown adjectives of country, the Archite (2 Sam. xv. 32) and the Japhletite, the former perhaps from 'Ain Arîk, a village $3\frac{1}{2}$ miles E. of nether Beth-horon with a Wâdy of the same name. *Beth-horon* and *Gezer*, see at x. 10, 11, 33.—

Ver. 4. It is remarkable that the two tribes are said to have taken their inheritance, while yet nothing is mentioned of the boundaries except on the south, that which afterwards divided between Ephraim and Benjamin, xviii. 11, though also modified by Dan, xix. 40-46. Of course on the W. it was bounded by the sea; and on the E. by the Jordan, at all events in part. But the northern boundary is never given; see xvii. 10. Perhaps Joshua was not in circumstances to fix that boundary line with precision, according to the principle already laid down, that the lot fixed the position generally, but not the magnitude nor the shape.—

Vers. 5-8. There are difficulties in tracing the boundary of Ephraim, which have been enhanced by the less perfect exploration of this part of Palestine. The southern boundary of Ephraim was certainly that of the whole descendants of Joseph: and Ataroth and Beth-horon in ver. 5, perhaps the most southern points, have been mentioned in vers. 2 and 3, and may represent the whole, especially since the Septuagint also repeats Gezer from ver. 3. The other three verses no less certainly give the northern boundary, and are much more minute, as indicating the line of division between Ephraim and Manasseh. Ver. 6 should be translated (the same Hebrew word

CHAP. XVI. AND XVII.—*The Portion allotted to Joseph.*

being used for 'west' and for 'sea'): 'And the border went out westward to Michmethah on the N.,' or else, 'on the N. of Michmethah,' a place unknown indeed, but 'before Shechem,' xvii. 7, that is, near the scene of the covenanting, viii. 31-35, and therefore not at the sea. Michmethah might be the plain S. and S.E. of Shechem, called el Muknah, or some spot in it, such as el 'Azeir, 4 miles S. of Shechem; if so, we have probably to combine Asher and Michmethah (xvii. 7) into one compound name. Conder rejected this site, and thought of a remarkable precipice, Sheikh es Sîreh, immediately W. of Shechem and in sight of it, which might well be a great landmark, as Michmethah certainly was. The geographical peculiarity is that the northern boundary is not given from the one end to the other, but begins at the middle, at what was a prominent point, whether owing to its being the watershed of the country, or whether owing to some temporary prominence given to Michmethah on account of its nearness to that place of covenanting and to the camp at Gilgal; just as Moses takes the position of his camp and covenanting for the starting-point northwards and southwards, in Deut. iii. 16. (Other similar geographical puzzles occur in the account of Zebulun, xix. 10 and 12; of Asher, xix. 25; and of Naphtali, xix. 33, etc.) *Taanath Shiloh* is perhaps to be recognised in the classical city Thena, the modern ruin T'ana or 'Ain T'ana, nearly 7 miles E.S.E. from Nâblus (Shechem), though Conder at first suggested Th'alah, $6\frac{1}{2}$ miles N.E. of this again, 2 miles S.S.E. of 'Atûf, which from Robinson's time has been generally identified with Entappuah or Tappuah, ver. 8, xvii. 7; and *Janohah*, or Janoah, is the classical Jano, now a wretched village, Yânûn, 8 miles S.E. from Nâblus. *Naarath* (the same as Naaran, 1 Chron. vii. 28) is placed by Jerome at the fifth Roman mile from Jericho, and may well be the ruin el Aújeh, on the Wâdy of the same name, as Conder believes; in which case, Tell et Trûny, beside it, may be *Ataroth*. Having thus given the northern boundary eastward from Michmethah, the writer traces it westward to the sea in ver. 8. *Tappuah* cannot be held to be a settled position as yet: Conder thinks of Yâsûf, fully 7 miles S. of Shechem. The river *Kanah*, or 'reedy torrent,' is one still bearing an equivalent name, Nahr el Kusab, or Wâdy esh Sh'aîr, rising on the north side of Mount Ebal, and reaching the sea in the Nahr Abû Zabûra or Nahr Iskanderûneh, according to many high authorities; it is, however, a safer view that the Kanah is the

 CHAP. XVI. AND XVII.—*The Portion allotted to Joseph.*

stream which preserves this name to the present day, on a tributary of which Yásûf stands. The difficulty about this has been that it makes Ephraim too small, and would naturally give Shechem to Manasseh, whereas it was one of the most important towns of Ephraim. But there are several difficulties about the relations of these two tribes hinted at here, ver. 9, and xvii. 8, which have never been cleared up. If the modern Kánah be the boundary river, Robinson and others think that the line may have run straight to the sea, instead of following the river in its final windings, the Nahr el 'Auja, a crooked river.—**Ver. 9.** We do not know on what principle these separated cities in Manasseh (of which Tappuah is named in xvii. 8) were given to Ephraim: perhaps to knit the two tribes more closely; or perhaps in connection with the readjustments of territory which are mentioned or hinted in chap. xviii. and xix. Manasseh had a like interest in towns within the territory of Issachar, xvii. 11.—**Ver. 10.** The bad example of Judah, mentioned at xv. 63, was paralleled by this of Ephraim; it was the more inexcusable since the kings of Jerusalem and Gezer had been already destroyed with their armies, x. 1-27, 33: nor were they finally subdued till the time of David and Solomon, 2 Sam. v. 7-9; 1 Kings ix. 16. 'The tribute' to which the Canaanites of Gezer were put is properly 'a bondsman's tribute,' 'tribute of service,' as if personal servitude; in the original it is not the same as at xvii. 13.—**Chap. XVII.** 1-6. Manasseh, being the elder of Joseph's two sons, had territorially the double portion which fell to the first-born, a territory on each side of Jordan. Vers. 1 and 2 might be more precisely rendered, bringing out both this fact and that of the one lot for Joseph, 'And the lot was for the tribe of Manasseh, because he was the first-born of Joseph: [it was] for Machir,' etc.; 'and it was for the rest of the children of Manasseh by their families,' etc. To the English reader there is a source of confusion in the circumstance that two Gileads are mentioned here, namely the country and the man: Machir had a son Gilead, ver. 3, whose family was settled on the w. of Jordan; but Machir's family which bore his name was settled E. of Jordan, in the land of Gilead and Bashan, and hence he is called 'the father of [the land of] Gilead,' ver. 1. The usage in the original language prevents any ambiguity: for the land habitually has the article prefixed, with exceptions which can be easily explained; but the man never has the article. With reference to the warlike character of Machir's

 CHAP. XVI. AND XVII. — *The Portion allotted to Joseph.*

family, see Num. xxxii. 39-42. In ver. 2 six families of Manasseh are reckoned up, bearing the names of six male heads, as in Num. xxvi. 30-33; the first name being slightly abbreviated there (Jeezer), and the second last here being placed last there, because his male line in the eldest family died out. The daughters, however, brought their case before Jehovah, and their land was conserved for them under certain conditions, Num. xxvii. 1-11, and xxxvi. They now made a successful petition to have effect given to their rights by those who were charged with the allotment of the land; see at xiv. 1. Thus, as there had been six male heads of families for Western Manasseh, ver. 2, and one of these was now divided under five female heads, ver. 3, there came to be ten portions in all, ver. 5, though probably of very unequal extent.—**Vers. 7-13.** The coast, of course not the sea-coast, but the border line of Manasseh, is given in vers. 7-9, namely, the southern boundary, coinciding with the northern boundary of Ephraim given in xvi. 6-8. A very great difficulty occurs in connection with the geography of Asher in vers. 7, 10, 11. (1) The simplest view is that it is the tribe named along with Issachar and Ephraim. The only (yet a serious) objection to this is, that the towns of Zebulun seem to lie south of Asher, and to stand between it and Manasseh: see xix. 27; and such is the testimony of Josephus. If we can believe that Asher had territory s. of Mount Carmel (even supposing this afterwards given up when the settlement of Dan produced some derangement, in the boundaries of Judah and Ephraim at all events), the tribe of Manasseh might get Dor from Asher (ver. 11) and the sea-coast from the river Kânah northward, say to Mount Carmel or near it; and draw a line s.e. to Michmethah, close beside Shechem, then e. or s., to Tappuah, undetermined; and back westwards by the river Kânah to the sea. (2) If the difficulty about the tribe of Asher be too great, there is some probability in the view which identifies Asher with the town Teiâsîr, nearly 12 miles n.e. of Shechem, which would leave the shape of the territory of Manasseh much as before, only extending somewhat farther to the e.: yet by no means lying all along Ephraim, parallel to it on its north side, and reaching to the Jordan, as our old maps represent it. (3) Others make Asher a part of the name of Michmethah or Michmethath, as it would then be written: see note on xvi. 6. The latter half of ver. 10 (better translated, 'And they reached to Asher on the n. and to Issachar on the e.')

 CHAP. XVI. AND XVII.—*The Portion allotted to Joseph.*

Manasseh on the N. and E., except in so far as ver. 11 tells indirectly that certain localities belonged to Issachar, while yet the cities were Manasseh's. There is some obscurity in ver. 9, 'these cities of Ephraim are among the cities of Manasseh'; probably the 'separate cities,' xvi. 9. These cities were *Beth-shean* or *Beth-shan*, in classical times Scythopolis, the largest city in Decapolis, now Beisân, $3\frac{1}{2}$ miles w. from the Jordan, a squalid village, which might by its natural advantages easily become what it was of old, a very important and thriving city. *Ibleam* or *Bileam* (2 Kings ix. 27; 1 Chron. vi. 70), perhaps the ruin Bel'ameh, 1 mile s. of Jenîn (Engannim); or possibly en Jelameh, between Zerîn (Jezreel) and Jenîn: *Dor*, on the sea-coast, now Tantûra, see at xi. 2: *En-dor*, still a village of the same name, on the north-eastern shoulder of the so-called little Hermon, Mount Duhy, to the s. of Mount Tabor: *Taanach* and *Megiddo*, now T'annuk and (as usually believed) Lejjûn, see on xii. 21, where the recently proposed site for Megiddo, near Beisân, is noticed. The last two words of ver. 11 ought to be translated 'three heights,' or upland districts; a similar correction was made at xi. 2 and xii. 23; the last three named cities were in high situations, though in relation to Canaan as a whole they all lay in the great Jezreel valley, ver. 16, except Dor, which was on the Mediterranean. The Canaanitish character of these cities was long preserved; Beth-shean was ever reckoned a foreign city by the Jews, and it shared with Philistine cities in the trophies of victory over King Saul, who had found a witch to consult at En-dor, after such persons had been cut off by him out of Israel, 1 Sam. xxxi. 9, 10, xxviii. 7, 9. The policy which led the Israelites to be so negligent may be considered at Judg. i. 27, 28, where this statement is repeated: unfortunately it had encouragement from Judah and Ephraim, xv. 63, xvi. 10.—**Vers. 14–18.** The complaint here made by the house of Joseph may possibly have arisen from the discovery of the vast extent of Judah's territory: see xix. 1, 9; but on its merits, it was wholly unjustifiable: they had 'one lot,' which was really an advantage, securing to them geographical unity; and the 'one portion' was no doubt large enough if they only were not too lazy or too faint-hearted (xviii. 3) to turn it to account. The central part of Palestine, which fell to them, is regarded generally by travellers as the richest and most desirable part of the country, including the forests here mentioned, and the fertile vale of Sharon along the Mediterranean shore. Nor were they to forget that

 CHAP. XVI. AND XVII.—*The Portion allotted to Joseph.*

Joshua was not acting on his own responsibility and at his own pleasure, even if any of them had the baseness to suspect that he might show partiality to his own tribe; he was only one of the heads of that commission whose duties and powers had been laid down by Moses at the command of Jehovah: and they overlooked the very extended territory which Moses himself had assigned to half Manasseh beyond Jordan, so that really and practically they had not only one lot, ver. 17, but two. Rather, their own reference to the blessing of Jehovah on them, ver. 14, must have reminded Joshua how completely it provided for their success (Deut. xxxiii. 13-17), and must have contrasted painfully with Caleb's faith and hope, xiv. 12, 13. A slight vein of irony runs through Joshua's answers; but chiefly it is stimulating. The name 'Mount Ephraim,' ver. 15, which he gave to what had been called less specifically 'the mountain of Israel' (xi. 16, 21), was a pledge to them of success; and all 'the outgoings' of that mountain, ver. 18, its spurs and the rich tracts that stretched beyond there, might all be theirs. The very difficulty of the task marked them out as the men to accomplish it, according to their own account of themselves: and so the closing words of the chapter are most simply rendered, 'For thou shalt dispossess the Canaanites, because they have iron chariots, because they are strong.' These were chariots made of iron, or at least strengthened with it; not chariots with iron scythes, which were an invention of Cyrus about a thousand years later. The large plain or valley of Jezreel, stretching from the Mediterranean up the course of the Kishon, almost to the Jordan, is the only plain of any extent in Palestine, except along the sea-shore; and it has ever been the battlefield of that country, which is otherwise ill adapted for cavalry or chariots of war.

1. *State generally what portion was given to Judah at the first.*
2. *How did Caleb carry out his purpose expressed in chap. xiv.?*
3. *What other great family received their share of the land after Judah?*
4. *How many tribes did they include?*
5. *Does anything in the geographical arrangement of these tribes appear very peculiar?*
6. *What promise or commandment by Moses did one family in these tribes plead to have implemented, and with what success?*
7. *What complaint did the house of Joseph make to Joshua, and how were they answered?*

CHAPTER XVIII. 1-10. ERECTION OF THE TENT OF MEETING AT SHILOH, AND RENEWED ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE COMPLETE PARTITION OF THE LAND.

Ver. 1. Shiloh is now a ruin on a hill, known as Seilûn, scarcely 20 miles N. from Jerusalem and fully 11 miles S. from Nâblus or Shechem: perhaps it never was of civil importance as a city, but owed everything to its ecclesiastical position; and therefore, after the ark was taken from it, 1 Sam. iv., it might easily pass out of notice. Indeed, had it continued to be of any consequence, we can scarcely doubt that Jeroboam would have pitched upon it as one of the seats of his worship, whereas its decaying condition made it a suitable home for Ahijah the prophet, the ruin of the earthly Israel, 1 Kings xi. 29-39, xiv. 2-16. Josephus says that Joshua selected it for the temporary resting-place of the tabernacle on account of its beauty, while others find the reason in its central position: but these reasons might equally favour other places, such as Shechem, which could urge additional claims of its own. We are thus shut up to believe in a selection by Jehovah Himself, which also seems required by passages like Deut. xii. 11; Jer. vii. 12. And the opinion is surely well founded that it is somehow connected with Shiloh in Gen. xlix. 10, meaning 'peace' or 'peaceful;' the name found already in existence, or now for the first time given to it, as the resting-place of the ark, was expressive of firm faith in the coming of the person who should be the true giver of peace and builder of the temple of Jehovah. This was the solemn act of the congregation assembled for the purpose of setting up the tabernacle of the congregation there, or more literally of placing, or causing to dwell (Gen. iii. 24) there the Tent of Meeting, the place appointed by Jehovah for meeting with His people, Ex. xxv. 22, xxix. 42, 43, xxx. 36. The date of this important act is not ascertainable: only the closing statement, 'And the land was subdued before them,' marks greater progress than the former one, 'And the land rested from war,' xi. 23, xiv. 15. This 'tabernacle of Shiloh' was pitched within the territory of Ephraim: when it had become forsaken, and when Jehovah had chosen Jerusalem as the place where His name was to dwell, the Psalmist observed how the pre-eminence had passed from the tribe of Ephraim to that of Judah, to which the royal house of David belonged, Ps. lxxviii. 9, 60-72.—

Vers. 2-7. Joshua had now divided the land to 2½ tribes, and Moses

CHAP. XVIII. 1-10.—*Renewed Arrangements for the Partition of the Land.*

had previously done as much ; there remained therefore 7 unprovided for (the closing words of ver. 2 ought to be, 'Which had not yet divided their inheritance,' the verb being as in ver. 10, not as ver. 7), besides the Levites. Here are recorded the measures he took to complete the allotment, in the view of difficulties arising from the slackness of the people themselves. The beginning had been made at Gilgal, xiv. 1-5 ; but delays had unavoidably arisen, connected with the erection of the holy tent at Shiloh, and the removal of the camp thither ; and there were other delays, owing to causes which were unjustifiable. The complaints made by the house of Joseph, xvii. 14-18, evince the existence of jealousies and dissatisfaction such as must have tended to paralyze the action of the commission for dividing the land. It also brought to light a slothfulness or easiness of disposition, perhaps generated by the roaming life in the desert for 40 years—a disposition which neither cared to face the task of utterly destroying the Canaanites, nor looked with favour on the prospect of the great camp being broken up and the tribes being settled each in its own separate locality. This settlement of the tribes had been most alluring so long as it was merely a prospect ; yet the actual experience of it showed that hard labour, a commonplace and unromantic mode of life, and a certain amount of danger, were inseparable from it : for thus it came to be seen that Joshua had not given them the promised rest by dividing the land to them (Heb. iv. 8). If the powerful houses of Judah and Joseph showed these tendencies, there was greater risk of them among the other less distinguished tribes : if these difficulties were serious already, they were likely to grow more serious by delay. A body of men, 3 representing each of the 7 tribes, might go through the land, as Joshua and the other spies had done formerly, and might bring back a description of the territory with a view to the fairest possible allotment. This might possibly include a regular survey with measurements, for the art of land-surveying was necessarily familiar to the Egyptians, and could not have been wholly unknown to the Israelites : but the language in vers. 6 and 9 does not suggest anything so minute. Anyhow, it would prevent complaints and suspicions for the future, when every measure of precaution had been taken by man, and when at the same time the Divine lot continued to be used in order to determine the position of the tribes. The lot had already fixed the position of the two great houses of Judah and Joseph towards the S. and towards the N. (or centre at

 CHAP. XVIII. 11-28.—*The Portion of Benjamin.*

least) respectively : while any error in assigning too large a portion to them could be corrected in this future distribution, as a considerable deduction certainly came to be made from the portion given to Judah (xix. 9). And the ready submission of Judah to this somewhat trying procedure must have assured the weaker tribes that full justice would be done to them.—**Vers. 8-10.** All this was carried out in the camp (so 'host' in ver. 9 might better be translated) at Shiloh, which we may suppose would surround the tabernacle, just as it used to do in the familiar arrangements during the wandering for 40 years: and thus, at the same time, the lot was cast with the utmost formality before Jehovah, at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, or Tent of Meeting, as is said in xix. 51, where Eleazar is expressly mentioned as continuing to act along with Joshua, a fact left in this narrative to be understood by the reader. The whole partition took place with immediate reference to their genealogical divisions, ver. 10, see on xi. 23. We have no means of determining what length of time elapsed between the beginning of the allotment in Gilgal and the completion of it in Shiloh: according to Rabbinical tradition, it was seven years; Josephus says the men came back to Joshua in the seventh month.

CHAPTER XVIII. 11-XIX. 51.—THE PORTIONS ALLOTTED TO THE SEVEN REMAINING TRIBES.

(A.) THE PORTION OF BENJAMIN, XVIII. 11-28.

Ver. 11. First came out the lot of Benjamin, 'little Benjamin' (Num. i. 37; Ps. lxxviii. 27), between the two great tribes of Ephraim and Judah, to whose respective fortunes it was successively attached. Any unpleasant feelings among the tribes were likely to be allayed when this little tribe received its inheritance first, and the weak tribe of Simeon (Num. i. 23, and xxvi. 14) second, by the Divine lot. The expression, 'the lot came up,' here and at xix. 10, represents the process of drawing up out of the urn; in xvi. 1 it was, 'the lot fell,' literally 'the lot came forth,' as at xix. 1, 17, etc.—**Vers. 12-20.** The boundaries have been already noticed; the northern one dividing Benjamin from Ephraim, xvi. 1-3, and the southern one from Judah, xv. 6-9 (the places being named in reverse order): the western and eastern boundaries require no explanation. In translation it may be noticed that literally 'the side of Jericho' and 'the side of Luz,'

CHAP. XVIII. 11-28.—*The Portion of Benjamin.*

'the side of Jebusi' and 'the side of Beth-hoglah,' vers. 12 and 13, and 16 and 19, is 'the shoulder,' as of a hill or mountain (for it is rather a 'mountain' than a 'hill' in vers. 13 and 14); that 'the corner of the sea,' ver. 14, ought to be 'the west quarter;' that 'well,' in ver. 15, ought to be 'fountain' or 'fountain-head,' the same as in xv. 9; and that, as in xv. 8, 'the valley of giants,' ver. 16, might have been left untranslated, 'the valley of Rephaim.'—Vers. 21-24. The cities of Benjamin are arranged in two groups, of twelve and fourteen cities; the former lay in the eastern part of the territory, and the latter in the western part. *Jericho*, see at ii. 1, etc.; *Beth-hoglah* and *Beth-arabah*, see at xv. 6. *The valley of Kezis* is said by some to be a name preserved in the Wâdy el Kaziz, east of Bethany, on the way from Jerusalem to Jericho; this being a town had better have been left untranslated, Emek-Kezis. *Zemaraim*, a ruin, Sumrah, indeed two ruins, as the dual form of the Hebrew indicates, nearly 4 miles N. of Eriha (Jericho). *Bethel*, now Beitân, 10 good miles N. of Jerusalem; see vii. 2. It is strange that a place so prominent in the history of the patriarchs, afterwards one of the two chief seats of worship for the Ten Tribes, sank entirely out of sight, so that its position was long a matter of dispute to modern geographers. *Avim* is unknown, unless possibly it be another way of writing Ai or Aiah, the neighbouring city to Bethel; see at vii. 2. *Parah* may be a ruin, Fârah, in the Wâdy Fârah, 6 miles N.E. from Jerusalem. *Ophrah* has been by some confounded with the preceding; by others it has been identified with Ephron, 2 Chron. xiii. 19 (recognised by some moderns, like Conder and Ganneau, in Taiyibeh, 4 miles N.E. of Bethel), which is otherwise read Ephraim or Ephraim, John xi. 54. *Ophni* is not again mentioned in Scripture, but is supposed to be the same as Gophna, a place of considerable importance in the classical age, 15 Roman miles from Jerusalem, on the road to Neapolis or Shechem; the name is recognised in the modern village Jufna, almost 3 miles N.W. of Bethel; but this seems beyond the limits of Benjamin. *Geba*, which, like Gibeah (with which it has often been identified), means 'a hill,' may have been a common name for towns; hence it is distinguished as Geba of Benjamin in 1 Sam. xiii. 16 (wrongly 'Gibeah' in the A. V.) and 1 Kings xv. 22, which latter text marks it as being near Ramah: it is spoken of as the northern frontier town of the kingdom of Judah, 'from Geba to Beer-sheba,' 2 Kings xxiii. 8. It is now a half-ruinous village Jeb'a, less

 CHAP. XVIII. 11-28.—*The Portion of Benjamin.*

than 2 miles E. from er Râm, and $5\frac{1}{2}$ miles N. from Jerusalem. It is perhaps not necessary to discuss here the question still keenly agitated by geographers, whether Geba is or is not the same as Gibeah. If not, then Saul's city (1 Sam. xi. 4, etc.) does not occur in this list. The difference of forms is not surprising, the one being masculine and the other feminine; of which there are examples in this very context, Mizpeh and Mizpah. The chief difficulty in the way of identifying them is that both are named in Isa. x. 29. Those who make them different generally find Gibeah at a remarkable hill, Tell el Fûl, $2\frac{3}{4}$ miles N. of Jerusalem; at which place their opponents deny that any ancient site can be found. Two additional cities are mentioned in xxi. 18, as being given to the priests.—**Vers. 25-28.** The western group. *Gibeon*, now El Jîb, $5\frac{1}{2}$ miles N.N.W. of Jerusalem; see at ix. 3. Here we find the tabernacle in David's reign, and till the temple was built, 1 Kings iii. 4, etc. *Ramah*, probably the Ramah where Samuel was born and died (though this is a point still by no means beyond controversy), is now er Râm, on a height (the meaning of its name), with ruins, between Gibeon and Geba, yet nearer the latter: see above; it is 5 miles N. from Jerusalem. *Beeroth*, commonly identified with el Bîreh, nearly 9 miles N. of Jerusalem, on the road to Nâblus: yet this is questioned by others, since the site is remote from the other three Hivite cities combined in ix. 17. *Mizpeh*, also written Mizpah in the Hebrew, mentioned repeatedly in the books of Judges and Samuel and elsewhere, is now recognised almost universally in Neby Samwîl (the prophet Samuel, whose tomb tradition places here), fully $4\frac{1}{2}$ miles N.W. of Jerusalem, and fully 1 mile S. of Gibeon. It stands on the highest point (2935 feet high) near Jerusalem, and commands such a view as to justify its name, 'the watch-tower.' *Chephirah*, another of the Gibeonite cities, ix. 17, now a ruin, Kefîreh, almost half-way from Neby Samwîl to Yâlô (Ajalon). *Mozah*, from notices in the Talmud, is identified with Kulônîeh, 4 miles W.N.W. of Jerusalem. *Irpeel* is recognised by Conder as probably Râ-fât, $1\frac{1}{2}$ miles N. of El Jîb (Gibeon). *Eleph* is the village Lifta, $2\frac{1}{4}$ miles W.N.W. of Jerusalem. *Jebusi*, or Jerusalem: see at x. 1, xv. 8, 63. *Gibeath*, so far as the form goes, might be the same as Gibeah, and so possibly the Gibeah of Saul above referred to. But that ought to be found among the twelve eastern cities, not among these fourteen western; Conder therefore looks for it at the ruin Jebâ, 5 miles W of El Jîb (Gibeon). *Kirjath* (which means city)

 CHAP. XIX. 1-9, 10-16.—*The Portions of Simeon and of Zebulun.*

is recognised by Conder in Kuryeh, or more fully Kuryet el 'Enab (the city of grapes), scarcely $7\frac{1}{2}$ miles W.N.W. of Jerusalem, commonly said to be Kirjath-jearim.

(B.) THE PORTION OF SIMEON, XIX. 1-9.

The circumstances in which Judah had to give up part of its territory have been suggested in the note on xviii. 3-7; and the lot for this portion fell to Simeon, who thus experienced the effect of Jacob's curse, Gen. xlix. 7; but whether the Simeonites were to some extent scattered in detached cities and adjacent patches of territory, as the Levites were, is unknown, though it is less probable. There is a probability that the main part of their portion, a group of thirteen cities, vers. 2-6 (though the detailed list amounts to fourteen, see on xv. 20), was a continuous territory, since all the fourteen occur in xv. 26-32, together with the first two of the second group of four cities given here in ver. 7, and in the same order, except that Beersheba stands after the first three named here: nevertheless there are five more cities in the original list of the cities of Judah, interspersed among these, which, not being given to Simeon, may have broken the continuity of the Simeonite territory; and while all these were in the Negeb or South Country, probably in the western half of it, the last two in ver. 7 are mentioned in xv. 42 as in the Shephelah or Low Land, and apparently at a considerable distance, though possibly not. Besides, the sites are very imperfectly known: what can be told, with remarks on a few differences of name in the two lists, as also in a third list, given 1 Chron. iv. 28-33, may be seen by referring to the notes on ch. xv.¹ *Baalath-beer*, ver. 8, is called Baal in Chronicles, and has been supposed to be Bealoth, an unknown city of Judah, xv. 24: Ramath of the South (called South Ramoth, 1 Sam. xxx. 27) may be only another name for it.

(C.) THE PORTION OF ZEBULUN, XIX. 10-16.

The third lot came out for Zebulun in the north. Josephus makes the territory extend to the sea and to the Lake of Gennesaret, agreeing well enough with the predictions, Gen. xlix. 13 and Deut. xxxiii. 18, 19: recent writers shut it out from both; 'toward the sea,' in ver.

¹ 'In "Beth-marcaboth," the *house of chariots*, and "Hazar-susim," the *village of horses*, we recognise the depôts and stations for the horses and chariots, such as those which in Solomon's time went to and fro between Egypt and Palestine.'—Stanley's *Sinai and Palestine*, p. 160.

CHAP. XIX. 10-16.—*The Portion of Zebulun.*

11, does not decide, and indeed may be fully better rendered, 'toward the west,' in accordance with an alteration already made at xvi. 6, xviii. 14. It reached to the territory of Asher on the N.W., ver. 27, and to that of Naphtali on the N.E., ver. 34: and those who have visited this part of Palestine praise its fruitfulness and its beauty, occupying as it does a position between the great plain of Jezreel on the S. and Mount Naphtali on the N., including the plain el Buttauf to the N. of Nazareth, a town or village which belonged to this tribe, though it is not mentioned in the Old Testament. But the geographical details cannot be followed accurately. It is agreed that *Sarid* is the central point of the southern boundary, which is traced from it, first westwards in ver. 11, the places being unknown to us, except *Jokneam*, which is very probably at Tell Keimûn, in a good position for a frontier town, see at xii. 22: then, secondly, eastward, with places less obscure to us. The identification of Sarid would therefore be of great value to the geographer. Conder says: 'It is to be sought near the northern boundary of the great plain, and between Chisloth (Iksâl) and Jokneam (Tell Keimûn). This is the position of the large ruin, $4\frac{1}{2}$ miles S.W. of Nazareth, Tell Shadûd.' It is possible we should read *d* for *r*, as the Vatican Sept. does, Seddûk, but the Syriac reads Asdod; these letters being often mistaken. He formerly identified *Maralah* with Merla of the Crusaders, now el Mczr'ah; and *Dabbesheth* with ed-Duweibeh, a ruin on the southern boundary of Carmel, 2 miles N.W. of Tell Keimûn: but now he says Maralah is possibly the present village of M'alûl, $3\frac{1}{2}$ miles W. of Nazareth, and he pronounces Dabbasheth to be unknown. *Chisloth-tabor*, ver. 12, according to an old and good interpretation, 'the flanks of Tabor,' is recognised in the classical Xaloth or Chasalus, now Iksâl or Ksâl, a village $3\frac{1}{2}$ miles from the summit of Tabor westwards. On account of the close connection in Hebrew, many identify it with a town Chesulloth, ver. 18, to which there is an objection that it seems there to be given to Issachar: yet it is not a fatal objection, for this is certainly the case in xxi. 28, where Dabareh ought to be *Daberath*, the next named town of Zebulun here, now a village Debûrieh, lying on the side of a ledge of rocks directly at the foot of Tabor westward. *Japhia* has been of late identified by many (including Conder) with Yâfa, a mile and a half S.W. of Nazareth: though this has been doubted, since the situation is not what we should expect. In ver. 13, *Gittah-hepher* and *Ittah-kezin* are mis-

CHAP. XIX. 10-16.—*The Portion of Zebulun.*

translations for 'towards Gath-hepher and Eth-kazin.' The latter is unknown: the former, the birth-place of the prophet Jonah, in agreement with what Jerome tells of its position, is Meshhed, a village 3 miles N.N.E. from Nazareth, where an old tradition places the tomb of the prophet. It matters little, if, as some think, this village has grown up around the tomb, and the real old town was a mile farther N.E., at Kefr Kenna, which was in the fourth and fifth centuries supposed to be Cana of Galilee (John ii. 1, iv. 46). *Remmon-methoar* by universal consent is a mistranslation: *Methoar* is rightly in the margin, 'which is drawn,' or 'is marked off,' or 'stretches along,' a word used of boundaries already, xv. 9, 11, xviii. 14, 17. Remmon would have been more accurately spelt Rimmon, both here and at ver. 7: it is the village Rummâneh, 6 miles N. of Nazareth. Ver. 14 is thought by good authorities to describe the boundary as it turned to the N.W.; but it is very obscure in consequence of our ignorance of the sites. *Hannathon*, which would then be an important point on the N., is perhaps Kefr 'Anân, fully 5 miles S.W. of the sacred Jewish city Safed in Mount Naphtali. *Jiptah-el* is possibly Jefât, 9 miles N. of Nazareth, a place tenaciously defended against the Romans by Josephus, who calls it Jotapata. The valley of Jiptah-el on this supposition being the Wâdy 'Abellîn, with its great Roman road, running on the N.W. between the tribes of Asher and Zebulun (see ver. 27). Conder makes it the gorge (which the Hebrew denotes) Wâdy esh Shâghûr, leading to the maritime plain from the plain of Râmeh in Naphtali. *Nahallal* (more accurately, Nahalal) was afterwards called Mahlûl, and probably is 'Ain Mâhil, 3½ miles N.E. of Nazareth. *Shimron* is in the Talmud Simûnieh, 5 miles W. of Nazareth: in which case one would be tempted to take M'âlûl, which lies between them, for the preceding town. *Idalah* suggests Dâliet el Kurmul, a village high up on Carmel; but the Talmud makes it Hiriah, or Hirii, possibly Huwârah, less than a mile S. of Bethlehem. The western border down to Jokneam might naturally have been given here: but instead we have only the names of these cities, as to which there is much uncertainty, except the last, *Bethlehem*, now a wretched village, Beit-Lahm, nearly 7 miles W.N.W. of Nazareth. It is therefore a common opinion that something has dropped out of the text in the 14th and 15th verses (as already has been supposed between xv. 59 and 60), which would account for ver. 15 beginning with 'and,' and for only five out of twelve

 CHAP. XIX. 17-23.—*The Portion of Issachar.*

cities being named. Another opinion is, that the supposed missing seven cities are those named in tracing the boundaries; with the exception, however, of Chisloth Tabor and Daberath which belonged to Issachar, and Jokneam which was also outside the tribe of Zebulun.

(D.) THE PORTION OF ISSACHAR, XIX. 17-23.

This embraced a very rich agricultural district, the plain of Jezreel. As it lay enclosed by Ephraim, Manasseh, and Zebulun, the boundaries are not given except on the N.E. and E., ver. 22. The cities named are the following:—*Jezreel*, ver. 18, the classical Esdraclon, now Zer'in, N.W. of Mount Gilboa; a city which was frequently a residence of the kings of the Ten Tribes. *Chesulloth*, see above, Chisloth-Tabor, ver. 12. *Shunem*, named in connection with the last battle of Saul, and in the history of Elisha, etc., is now Sôlam, a village at the south-west base of Mount Duh, the so-called Little Hermon, $3\frac{1}{2}$ miles N. of Zer'in. *Hapharaim*, ver. 19 (the A. V. has dropped a vowel), has been recognised by Jerome's account (6 miles N. of Legio) in Afûleh, a village fully $2\frac{1}{2}$ miles W. of Sôlam, and nearly 7 miles E.N.E. of Lejjûn (usually taken for Megiddo): but Conder finds it in el-Farrîyeh, fully 5 miles N.W. of Lejjûn. *Anaharath* is well represented in the modern name en-Na'ûrah, a village $3\frac{3}{4}$ miles E. of Sôlam. *Rabbith*, ver. 20, is thought to be Râba, 7 miles S.E. of Jenîn, the ancient En-gannim (ver. 21); if so, *Remeth*, ver. 21, might be Râmeah, 13 miles to the W. of it; yet Râmeah is only $3\frac{1}{2}$ miles S.S.W. of 'Arrâbeh, which Tyrwhitt Drake proposed for Rabbith. *Abez* is thought to be the ruin el Beida, scarce 2 miles S.W. of Bethlehem, at the north end of the plain of Jezreel. *Kishion* has been thought the same as Kadesh in 1 Chron. vi. 72; but it is quite unknown, unless possibly it be Tell Abu Kudeis, fully 2 miles S.E. of Lejjûn. *En-gannim*, the classical Ginæa, 7 miles S. by W. of Jezreel, is now Jenîn: besides the confirmation from the resemblance of name, the meaning of that name, 'fountain of gardens,' exactly describes the site, on the S. side of the great valley of Jezreel, among gardens and plantations richly watered from a fountain. In 1 Chron. vi. 73 it seems to be called Anem, unless this be Anîn, $8\frac{1}{2}$ miles W.N.W., in hills. *En-haddah* is supposed to be the ruin Kefr Adân, 3 miles W.N.W. of Jenîn. In ver. 22, where the north-eastern border is given, *Tabor* is supposed to be the city, of which abundant ruins still exist, on Mount Tabor; else the number, sixteen cities, is

CHAP. XIX. 24-31.—*The Portion of Asher.*

not made out: a Tabor is indeed mentioned as a Levitical city in Zebulun and not in Issachar, 1 Chron. vi. 77, but it is perhaps Chisloth Tabor, ver. 12. *Beth-shemesh*, that is, 'the house of the sun,' is possibly recognisable in 'Ain esh Shemsîyeh, 'the fountain of the sun,' a ruined site in the Jordan valley, 7½ miles s. of Beisân.

(E.) THE PORTION OF ASHER, XIX. 24-31.

This was the N.W. of Palestine, partly mountainous and partly sloping down to the sea, but on the whole a fertile soil, rich especially in the olive (Gen. xlix. 20; Deut. xxxiii. 24). Once more, as at xvi. 6, xix. 10, the boundary begins at a middle point on one of the sides, near the famous seaport Acre or Akka, then called Accho: that is, if *Helkath*, ver. 25, be the modern Yerka, 8½ miles E.N.E. from Acre, a high-lying Druse village with ancient ruins; which is doubtful. *Hali* is looked for in the same neighbourhood, perhaps a ruin, 'Alia, close on the s. of M'alia, a village 9 miles from the coast at Es Zîb, and 13 miles N.E. of Acre. 8 Roman miles E. of Acre, *Beten* is placed by Eusebius, therefore is recognised in el B'aneh, though its distance is a half more. *Achshaph*: see at xi. 1; it may be Kefr Yâsîf, 6 miles N.E. of Acre. *Amad*, ver. 26, may be the ruin el-Amûd, 2 miles E. of Es-Zîb. *Misheal* may be the ruin M'aîsleh, in the Wâdy of the same name, 8½ miles N.E. of Acre. *Carmel* well deserves its name 'a fruitful field,' on account of the luxuriance of its brushwood, etc. It is often referred to in Scripture; and all travellers are arrested by its physical appearance, a mountain range which bounds the great valley of Jezreel on the s.w., and terminates in a bold promontory, the southern limit of the Bay of Acre. *Shihor-libnath* is by good authorities rendered 'the dark river of baked [sand],' and they think of the early glass-making at the river Belus, now the Namein, immediately south of Acre: but looking to the fact that the boundary of Asher must have been s. of Dor, if Asher is the tribe at xvii. 7, 10, 11, some geographers think of a stream, about 5 miles s. of that city and 3 N. of Cæsarea, the Nahr Zerka, or 'lead-coloured river,' and they translate the Hebrew name 'blackish white.'—Ver. 27. The boundary now turned, or more literally 'returned,' 'turned back,' it may probably be up the course of the river first named, by places not known to us, till it met the western or north-western limit of Zebulun, in the valley of *Jiphthah-el*: see at ver. 14. *Beth-dagon* is perhaps the ruin D'aûk, near this river Namein, 4 miles

CHAP. XIX. 24-31.—*The Portion of Asher.*

above its mouth near Acre. *Neiel*, if that valley be Wâdy esh Shâghûr, is almost certainly the ruin Y'anîn, near its outlet, less than 2 miles N. of Kâbûl, which is named next. The left hand is the N. side, according to the usage of the Hebrew language; and *Cabul* is recognised by means of a description of Josephus, as 40 stadia westward (north-west) from the town he defended against the Romans, Jotapata, now Jefât; it answers, therefore, to the modern village Kâbûl, 9 miles S.E. from Acre. According to the scheme of some geographers, which, however, is very uncertain, the principal or home territory of Asher having been thus described, vers. 28-30 give an account of important outlying places on the Phœnician marches, in connection with the three Phœnician cities of Sidon, Tyre, and Achzib. *Hebron* may be a very easy corruption for the Levitical city Abdon in xxi. 30; probably we find it in the ruin 'Abdeh, $3\frac{1}{2}$ miles E. of ez-Zîb, just N. of Wâdy el Kurn. *Rehob* is unknown; it must be distinguished from another in ver. 30, and both from that northern point reached by the spies, Num. xiii. 21. *Hammon* is supposed to be 'Ain Hâmûl; or, a mile nearer the coast, the large ruin Umm el 'Amûd, 10 miles S. of Tyre. Conder makes it a ruin Hama, S.E. of Tyre. *Kanah* is a place whose old name is still preserved unchanged in Kânâ, $7\frac{1}{2}$ miles S.E. from Tyre on the road to the interior. *Zidon* has the epithet 'great,' as already at xi. 8. In ver. 29, 'the coast turned,' better 'the border turned back,' or 'returned,' to another district, that of *Tyre*, now Sûr, here called the 'strong city,' or 'fenced city,' apparently as yet inferior to Sidon, though at a later period by far the greatest of the Phœnician cities, and very frequently mentioned in Scripture; classical writers distinguish Old Tyre, on the mainland, from New Tyre, on an island now joined to the land. The previously named *Ramah* is conjectured to be a modern village with ancient ruins, Rameh, S.E. of Tyre, just outside the range of the ruins of Old Tyre; and other sites have also been assigned to it. *Hosah* may be el-'Ezzâh, 7 miles S. of Tyre. The closing words of ver. 29 ought probably to be 'from the region towards Achzib,' or 'at the region of Achzib:' *Achzib*, the classical Ecdippa, is ez-Zîb, a pretty large village on the sea-coast, almost 9 miles N. of Acre. In ver. 30, three cities are named, which are to be sought, not in the N.W., like the preceding, but in the N.E., if *Aphék* be Afka, see at xiii. 4: the strong objection is that it would extend the territory of Asher much farther to the N. than

CHAP. XIX. 32-39.—*The Portion of Naphtali.*

we commonly believe it went. Conder says *Ummah* is perhaps the ruin 'Alma, N. of Achzib, that is, the village 'Alma esh Sh'aub, fully 6 miles N.E. of it. The cities named amount to 23 instead of 22 (see at xv. 20), if we include Zidon, Tyre, and Achzib, as Judg. i. 31 apparently justifies us in doing; yet, as it does not name Tyre, perhaps this city should be excluded, or possibly Neiel, ver. 27, if it be the same as Neah, ver. 13. Yet that verse in Judges names other Asherite cities not named here, Accho and Ahlab, if not more; a circumstance which adds to the difficulty of coming to a decision on this point. The Mishna, which is the older part of the Talmud, makes Achzib the boundary of the Holy Land.

(F.) THE PORTION OF NAPHTALI, XIX. 32-39.

This lay E. of Asher and N., and perhaps partly E. of Zebulun, ver. 34, in the most northern part of Palestine W. of the upper Jordan and its lakes: Asher having the sea-coast and the lower hill country, while the more elevated districts were assigned to Naphtali. Mount Naphtali, xx. 7, runs through it from N. to S., yet in a somewhat westerly direction, beginning in Anti-Lebanon and ending in hills and high grounds which form the transition to the great plain of Jezreel. It is, on the whole, a richly wooded and fertile country: comp. Deut. xxxiii. 23.—Ver. 33 is understood to give the western boundary, beginning, however, at some important point in the middle: comp. at ver. 25; then, if this be correct, the northern and the eastern boundaries having been passed over with a mere allusion to the outgoings at Jordan, since these coincided with the boundaries of the land of Canaan as a whole, at ver. 34, 'the border turneth back' westward along the southern boundary. The starting-point, *Heleph*, is the present village Beit Lîf, which is almost half-way on the line from Tyre to Safed. '*Allon to Zaanannim*' ought to be 'the oak,' or perhaps 'oak grove,' in '*Zaanannim*,' mistranslated 'the plain' in Judg. iv. 11, where it is said to be 'by Kadesh,' named here at ver. 37. The form of the word there differs slightly, *Zaanaim*: but in either form it means 'wanderings' or 'moving of tents,' a name commonly associated with Heber's wandering Kenite family. On the whole, however, the probability is that the letter B, which forms the preposition 'in' in Hebrew, here belongs to the name, and that we should translate 'the oak of Bezaanannim,' which is by Conder identified with Bessûm, a ruin situated nearly half-way from

CHAP. XIX. 32-39.—*The Portion of Naphtali.*

Tiberias to Mount Tabor. *Adami* is then naturally identified with Dâmieh, $1\frac{1}{2}$ miles N.W. of Bessûm; and *Nekeb* (through the Talmudic name *Ziadetha*) with Seiyâdeh, nearly 2 miles E. of Bessûm; and *Fabneel* (through the Talmudic name *Caphar Yama*) with Yemma, fully 2 miles S. of Seiyâdeh. Yet Conder now inclines to find *Adami* in Admah, a ruin $5\frac{1}{2}$ miles S. of the Sea of Galilee. 'The outgoings at Jordan' may indicate the well-known boundary on the N.E. and E., that is, including the principal source of the Jordan, the *Ṣahr Hâsbâny*, and perhaps the Lakes *Hûleh* and *Gennesaret* (or Sea of Galilee) through which it flows.—Ver. 34 tells of the border turning back and taking the direction westward to Zebulun and Asher. *Aznoth-tabor*, 'the ears of Tabor,' may have been near that mountain, to which Issachar reached, ver. 22, touching Naphtali, as those think who do not make Zebulun reach the Sea of Galilee. *Hukkok* may probably be recognised in *Yâkûk*, $5\frac{1}{2}$ miles S. of Safed, W. from the northern extremity of the Sea of Galilee. The closing words of ver. 34 have occasioned much controversy, '*Judah upon Jordan toward the sun-rising.*' The most plausible explanation, though not free from difficulty, is that the towns to which Jair gave his name in Eastern Manassah, xiii. 30, etc., may have had the name 'Judah' applied to them, since Jair was a Manassite only on the mother's side, but on the father's side was of the tribe of Judah, 1 Chron. ii. 5 and 21-23. An ingenious suggestion, however, is made by Dr. Thomson (in *The Land and the Book*), that Seiyid Hûda Ibn Ya'kûb, beyond the easternmost branch of the Jordan, $2\frac{1}{2}$ miles below Bâniâs, meaning 'Lord Judah, son of Jacob,' which unquestionably marks some very ancient site, is the place referred to here, whatever may have given rise to the name. Of the fenced cities we now probably can recognise the most through Conder's labours. *Ziddim*, ver. 35 (through the Talmudic name *Caphar Hittia*), is *Hattin*, $5\frac{1}{2}$ miles W. of Tiberias. *Hammath* is probably the Levitical city *Hammoth-dor*, xxi. 32, also *Hammon*, 1 Chron. vi. 76: all the forms of the word mean, 'that which is warm'; it is unhesitatingly identified with the village *Emmaus*, fully a mile from Tiberias, which in Josephus' time had warm baths; hot springs are still used for baths at *Hammâm*, a mile S. of that city on the shore of the Sea of Galilee. *Rakkath*, according to Rabbinical tradition, was the ancient town on whose site Tiberias was built by the tetrarch Herod; this agrees with the probable meaning of the name 'beach:' comp. *Rakkon*, ver. 46, in

CHAP. XIX. 40-48.—*The Portion of Dan.*

the tribe of Dan. *Chinnereth* gave its name to the lake, sometimes in the plural form of the word, Chinneroth, corrupted in later times to Genezar and Gennesaret: see at xi. 2. No trace of the city remains, but it must have stood upon the western shore; and if the name is to be explained 'a depression,' it points to a little plain, remarkable for beauty and fertility, just as Josephus describes it, stretching from el Mejdal on the s. to Khân Minia on the n. *Adamah*, ver. 36, is Dâmieh, if Adami (ver. 33) is Admah. *Ramah* is the large and well-built village Râmeḥ, $7\frac{1}{2}$ miles w.s.w. of Safed, with extensive olive plantations and an excellent fountain, built on a mountain slope. *Hazor*: see at xi. 1. *Kedesh*: see at xii. 22. *Edrei* is probably the village Y'ater, fully 11 miles s.e. from Tyre, $1\frac{1}{2}$ n. of Beit Lif (Heleph, ver. 33). *En-hazor* may be the ruin Hazîreh (which some think to be Hazor of xi. 1), beside which there is also a Hazzûr. *Iron*, ver. 38, is the village Yârûn, fully $8\frac{1}{2}$ miles n.n.w. from Safed, fully $2\frac{1}{2}$ s. of Bint Umm Jebeil. *Migdal-el* since Robinson's time is generally taken to be Mujeidal, a village fully 10 miles e. of Tyre. *Horem* may be the ruin el Kûrah, $1\frac{1}{4}$ miles s. of Hazîreh; or better, the ruin Hârah, nearly 6 miles s.e. from Mujeidil. *Beth-anath* is now by Conder identified with Ainîtha, or Ainatha, a village less than 3 miles s. of Horem and fully 5 w. of Kadesh, on his scheme. Since only sixteen cities are named in detail, the number nineteen has been made up by taking some of those named in giving the boundary: yet, since Kartan was certainly another Naphtalite city, xxi. 32, this is really one of those cases of difficulty noticed at xv. 20.

(G.) THE PORTION OF DAN, XIX. 40-48.

The boundaries of this territory are not given (very much as in the case of Issachar), being determined by those of the adjacent tribes Judah, Benjamin, Ephraim, and perhaps Manasseh. This territory, like Simeon's, must have been taken partly from Judah, partly, however, from Ephraim: see on xviii. 2-7, xix. 1-9. The eastern side of it was mountainous, but for the most part it lay in the fertile Shephelah or Low Land, and in the northern continuation of this, the valley or plain of Sharon, if Josephus be correct; but the cities assigned to Dan give no evidence that its territory extended n. of the river 'Auja, or crooked river, the mouth of the scriptural river Kanah (see on xvi. 8), supposing this to be the same as Mc-jarkon, 'the Yellow waters.' The list of towns follows the prevailing order, proceeding

from E. to W. *Zorah*, *Eshtaol*, came from the tribe of Judah, see at xv. 33. *Ir-shemesh* (city of the sun) has been identified with Bethshemesh (house of the sun), xv. 10, which may be 'Ain Shems (fountain of the sun), $1\frac{3}{4}$ miles S. of Zorah. *Shaalabbin*, ver. 42, is called Shaalbin in the account of Solomon's officers, 1 Kings iv. 9; it may be the modern Selbit, $6\frac{1}{2}$ miles N. of Zorah, and 3 miles N.W. of the next city, *Ajalon*, now a village Yâlô: see at x. 12. *Fethlah* may be Beit Tûl, a ruin fully 3 miles E.S.E. of Ajalon; though Tyrwhitt Drake took it to be Shilta, fully 4 miles W.N.W. of the lower Beth-horon, by the Roman road. *Elon*, ver. 43, might be Elon-beth-hanan, conjoined with Shaalbim and Bethshemesh in 1 Kings iv. 9; but the present inclination is to keep them separate, and to find Elon in Beit Ello, nearly $6\frac{1}{2}$ miles N. of the upper Beth-horon. *Thimnathah*, or Timnah, and *Ekron*: see at xv. 10, 11; but again the inclination is to recognise in this Thimnathah, a northern Tibneh, a ruin fully 2 miles N. by W. of Beit Ello. *Eltekeh*, ver. 44, is probably Beit Likia, a village $3\frac{1}{2}$ miles N.E. of Yâlô (Ajalon), 2 miles S. by W. of the lower Beth-horon. *Gibbethon* is said probably to be the village Kibbiah, $6\frac{1}{2}$ miles E.N.E. of Ludd (Lydda in the New Testament, later Diospolis). *Baalath*, a city named along with Gezer and Beth-horon as fortified by Solomon, 1 Kings ix. 18; it may be connected with Mount Baalah in xv. 11, like several already named on the border of Judah; but again present inclination looks for it in Bela'in, a modern village $2\frac{1}{2}$ miles N.N.W. of the lower Beth-horon. *Fehud*, ver. 45, now a village Yehûdîyeh, 8 miles E. of Jaffa, and fully 5 miles N. of Ludd (Diospolis), in the fertile and well-cultivated plain. *Bene-berak* is Ibn Ibrâk, between Yehûdîyeh and Yaffa, $3\frac{1}{2}$ miles from the latter; though Jerome speaks of it as near Ashdod. *Gathrimmon*, mentioned as a Levitical city, xxi. 24 (of course not the same as that in xxi. 25), is held by Conder and others to be the same as the famous city of the Philistines, Gath: if it is not so, we are surprised at there being no mention of this city in the book of Joshua, except once incidentally, xi. 22. Its situation is strangely perplexing. Conder inclines to place it, as Porter does, at Tell es Sâfi, $10\frac{1}{2}$ miles S. by E. of 'Akir (Ekron), and $11\frac{1}{2}$ E.S.E. from Esdûd (Ashdod). Even this seems too far S. for the tribe of Dan: and much more so some other sites recently proposed. *Mejarkon*, ver. 46, is now thought to be the river 'Auja, the northern boundary of the tribe; though it might also be the name of a city built on it. *Rakkon* would then naturally be identified with Tell er Rekkeit, on the

 CHAP. XIX. 49-51.—*Conclusion of the Work of dividing the Land.*

shore, 5½ miles N. of Jaffa. *Japho* appears in the New Testament under the Greek form *Joppa*, now *Jaffa* or *Yâfa*, the only port of southern Palestine, and consequently a place of considerable importance. The language need not be understood so as to exclude the town from the possession of the Danites; though it is recorded that they were very unfortunate in their struggle with the Amorites, Judg. i. 34, 35. This may account for their territory being found *too little for them*, ver. 47, if this be the correct rendering; others prefer to translate that their border 'went out from them' in the sense of becoming extended beyond what the Divine lot had assigned to them; though this must be understood of their seeking a new territory altogether, for the lot merely fixed the position, not the magnitude. Their expedition against *Leshem* is narrated with many details in Judg. xviii., where the town is called *Laish*. Under its new name of *Dan* it is often coupled with *Beersheba* as the northern and southern extremities of the land of Israel. It is now *Tell el Kâdy* (*Kâdy* in the Arabic is 'a judge,' as *Dan* is in Hebrew), at the middle source of the *Jordan*, fully 2 miles w. of *Bâniâs* (*Cæsarea Philippi*), at the eastern source; and the patriarch's name may be traced in *Leddân*, the modern name of the stream.¹

CHAPTER XIX. 49-51.—CONCLUSION OF THE WORK OF DIVIDING THE LAND.

Vers. 49-51. It would have been a natural mark of their affection for *Joshua*, and of their confidence in him amid all the labours now completed, had the children of Israel asked him to choose an estate to be his own; yet the expression is so nearly identical with that used in *Caleb's* case, xv. 13, that, in addition to this, we are led to think of a Divine promise to the two faithful spies: see at xiv. 9. *Timnath-serah* has its geographical position marked more precisely when the account is given of *Joshua's* death, xxiv. 30; as also at Judg. ii. 9, where it receives perhaps its original name, *Timnath-heres*, 'portion of the sun,' which *Joshua* might alter to 'portion of redundance.' It is by some recognised in the ruins and foundation walls of a great city, situated upon two hills, at *Tibneh*, the northern *Thimnathah*, which was noticed at ver. 43; this seems to have been *Jerome's* view, and it has been strongly supported lately by *M. Guérin*, who found in the tomb a number of flint knives, in accordance with the tradition

¹ On the characteristics of the tribes, and of the territory allotted to each, cp. *Smith's Bible Dict.*

 CHAP. XX.—*Appointment of the Cities of Refuge.*

noticed at v. 2. But the Jews and the Samaritans agree in their tradition, to which probably the greater weight ought to be attached, that the place is the village Kefr Hâris (representing Heres), $7\frac{1}{2}$ miles farther N., nearly 10 miles S.W. from Shechem. Ver. 51 tells how the work of dividing the land was completed by the men who began it, xiv. 1, in the place where the task had been resumed, xviii. 1-10.

1. *What was now done for the settlement of public worship?*
2. *What do we know of Shiloh, then and afterwards?*
3. *What had this step to do with the division of the land among the tribes still unprovided for?*
4. *What circumstances may have led to the delay in their case?*
5. *What means did Joshua adopt for carrying out the division of the land with promptitude and thoroughness?*
6. *What position did Benjamin occupy in relation to other tribes?*
7. *What was the peculiarity in the portion of Simeon?*
8. *What may be said generally of the geographical descriptions of the four northern tribes?*
9. *What was singular in the territorial arrangements of Dan?*
10. *How did the people act toward Joshua after he had completed the division of the land?*

 CHAPTER XX.—APPOINTMENT OF THE CITIES OF REFUGE.

Vers. 1-6. *Summary of the directions given in the Law of Moses, Num. xxxv.; Deut. xix. 1-13.* The reference to the known law is clearer in the Hebrew of ver. 2, 'Assign you *the* cities of refuge.' In the former passage it is further said that they were to be Levitical cities, a fact which comes out here (vers. 6-8), and in the next chapter. By this arrangement the manslayer, who specially needed the mercy of God to protect, console, instruct, or humble him, was placed in the most favourable circumstances for his spiritual welfare. The city of refuge was in a sense an asylum, yet without the abuses by which such places have been disgraced and polluted. There appears to have been a preliminary judgment of the case by the elders of the city of refuge, then another before the congregation. But even after being cleared both times from the charge of murder, the manslayer must remain in a sort of exile till the death of the high priest: the death of this anointed one (Num. xxxv. 25) was a condition which apparently had a typical reference to justification through Christ's death 'from all things, from which ye could not be justified by the

CHAP. XXI. 1-42.—*Appointment of the Levitical Cities.*

Law of Moses' (Acts xiii. 39), since murder is the greatest crime against a fellow-man.—**Vers. 7-9.** *The cities appointed.* They were six: distributed somewhat equally over the country, three on each side of Jordan. On the w. of it, Joshua appointed (literally, sanctified) *Kedesh* in the N., see at xii. 22 and xix. 37; *Shechem* in the centre, see at xvii. 7 with xvi. 6; and *Hebron* in the S., see at x. 3 and xiv. 13. *Galilee* is mentioned for the first time in ver. 7, again in xxi. 32. The word means 'a circuit,' 'a district,' but we cannot determine how far it extended; see I Kings ix. 11; Isa. ix. 1, where it is called 'Galilee of the nations,' no doubt on account of the many heathen in it. Joshua had been called to take up the work of Moses, who had already separated three cities on the eastern side of Jordan (Deut. iv. 41-43), of which the names are now repeated; compare in chap. xiii. the repetition of the conquests of Moses. *Bezer*, from the tribe of Reuben, in the S., and *Golan*, from the half tribe of Manasseh, in the N., have not been identified, though the latter was a large city which gave its name in the classical age to a province Gaulanitis, N.E. of the Sea of Galilee. *Ramoth in Gilead*, from the intermediate tribe of Gad, is generally believed to be the same as Ramath-mizpeh, see at xiii. 26: the place es Szalt seems to suit well enough with the description in the Onomasticon, 15 Roman miles from Philadelphia, that is, Rabbath of the children of Ammon.

CHAPTER XXI. 1-42. APPOINTMENT OF THE LEVITICAL CITIES.

Vers. 1-3. *The claim by the Levites.*—Some think there had been undue delay in assigning these cities, else the Levites would not have needed to come forward as they did; others, with greater reason, deny this, holding that the Levites came forward at the right moment, according to Num. xxxv. 1-8, now that the cities of refuge had been consecrated. Be this as it may, the claim was at once acknowledged; indeed, it had been always kept in view, xiii. 14, 33, xiv. 3, 4. In regard to these forty-eight cities given to them, it is to be observed—(1) It was the fulfilment of Jacob's prediction, 'I will divide them in Jacob, and scatter them in Israel' (Gen. xlix. 7), though this discipline had been blessed to Levi and became a spiritual benefit to the whole people. (2) It was no excessive share, considering that the tribe of Levi had no lands or territorial influence. (3) It is probable that some of the towns never actually were possessed by Israel, and therefore could not be actually given to the Levites. (4)

 CHAP. XXI. 1-42.—*Appointment of the Levitical Cities.*

The want of conscientiousness in giving them tithes (Mal. iii. 8-10) may probably have had a parallel in neglect to assign them cities. (5) The Levitical cities were not absolutely handed over to the Levites to be inhabited by them exclusively; for if so, it might well seem unreasonable to assign thirteen cities to the priests in Joshua's time, even with a view to their future multiplication. There is no proof that the Levites had more than the right to the houses they required; the cities truly belonged to the tribes in whose territory they lay, so that a man purchasing a house from the Levites was said to 'redeem it' (Lev. xxv. 33 in the original); and the Levites were politically reckoned to the tribe in which they lived (Judg. xvii. 7; 1 Sam. i. 1). Nor is it unlikely that all Levites were considered 'sojourners' even in what are called their own cities (see Deut. xviii. 6). (6) In 1 Chron. vi. 54-81 there is a list of these cities, in which only forty-two of the forty-eight are named, and some of the names are different. This may be connected with corruptions in the text, or changes of names in course of time, or possibly with exchanges of one city for another. In the meantime we have not any geographical antiquities connected with these Levitical cities, except M. Clermont-Ganneau's discovery of two stones with an inscription both in Hebrew and in Greek, which marks the boundary of the Levitical city of Gezer (*Palestine Exploration Statement* for October 1874). He infers that 'the sacred boundary' was a square, having its four angles at the four cardinal points' (p. 280).—**Vers. 4-42.** *The particulars of the division.* The application had been made to those who divided the whole land, compare ver. 1 with xiv. 1-5, xviii. 1-10, xix. 51. And whereas the ordinary rule had been laid down in the Law, that most cities were to be given by the tribes to whom the largest territory had been assigned (Num. xxxv. 8 with xxvi. 52-56); nevertheless, as in the case of the twelve tribes, the lot came in to settle the geographical position of the Levitical families, so that we read of the lot coming out for them all, and of the children of Aaron having the first lot, ver. 10. Levi had three sons, Kohath, Gershon, and Merari, whose respective descendants formed the three great families, each with their own duties about the holy tent (Num. iii. and iv.); the Merarites having the lowest and coarsest, and the Kohathites having the highest, while the Gershonites occupied an intermediate rank: and their places of honour as they encamped around the holy tent of God corresponded to their office and work. But above them all were the priests, the children of

CHAP. XXI. 1-42.—*Appointment of the Levitical Cities.*

Aaron, who genealogically belonged to the Kohathites. The details in this chapter will be seen by glancing at the following table, in which the occurrence of a city of refuge is indicated by the letter (R) :—

		[Name of Tribe.	Number of Cities.
I. Kohathites,	1. The priests (vers. 4, 19),	(R) Judah and Simeon (vers. 9-16),	9
		Benjamin (vers. 17, 18),	4
	2. The rest (vers. 5, 26),	(R) Ephraim (vers. 21, 22),	4
		Dan (vers. 23, 24),	4
II. Gershonites (vers. 6, 33),		Half Manasseh, W. (ver. 25),	2
		Issachar (vers. 28, 29),	4
		Asher (vers. 30, 31),	4
		(R) Naphtali (ver. 32),	3
III. Merarites (vers. 7, 40),		(R) Half Manasseh, E. (ver. 27),	2
		(R) Reuben (vers. 36, 37),	4
		(R) Gad (vers. 38, 39),	4
		Zebulun (vers. 34, 35),	4
			48
			48

To a small extent, the tribes are named in different order in the summary and in the detail. Simeon is not distinguished from Judah in the list of cities given, no doubt in consequence of the peculiarity of Simeon's territory (xix. 1, 9). Each of the three families of the Levites had two cities of refuge assigned to it, the priests having one, and the other Kohathites having a second. It will be observed that in the providence of God the priests' lot fell in those territories which afterwards became the kingdom of Judah, and were nearest to Jerusalem, the chosen city of God; and that the other portions of the Kohathites occupied territories next to theirs, just as the feeble half tribe of Manasseh was placed next to Ephraim. For the most part, the cities have been already mentioned in the accounts of the several tribes: it is therefore necessary to refer to only a few of them. With the list given here may be compared the other in 1 Chron. vi. 54-81, where, however, only forty-two of the forty-eight cities are named, and several of the names are altered, as has been already observed. *Ain*, ver. 16, may be an error for *Ashan*, xix. 7, as it is written in 1 Chron. vi. 59. *Anathoth* and *Almon*, ver. 18, were not named in Benjamin's lists, ch. xviii. The former, the birthplace of the prophet Jeremiah, and the place where the deposed high priest Abiathar ended his days, is now a village 'Anâta, 2½ miles N.N.E.

 CHAP. XXI. 43-45.—*The Summing up of the Conquest and Partition.*

from Jerusalem: the latter, called Alemeth in 1 Chron. vi. 60, is recognised in a ruin a mile farther off, called 'Almîth. *Gezer*, ver. 21, was not named in Ephraim's list, ch. xvi.; but see at x. 33, xii. 12; nor was *Kibzaim*, called Jokmeam in 1 Chron. vi. 68, not yet discovered, though a site has been suggested, Tell el Kabûs, near Beitân (Bethel); nor *Bethhoron*, but see at x. 10, 11. Indeed it was noticed in ch. xvi. that the lists of Ephraimite towns are not given. *Gath-rimmon*, ver. 25, is almost certainly an error of a scribe, misled by this name occurring in ver. 24; in 1 Chron. vi. 70 the name is Bileam, equivalent to Ibleam in xvii. 11. *Beeshterah*, ver. 27, is a contraction for Beth-eshterah, 'the house of Ashtaroth,' as 1 Chron. vi. 71 names it Ashtaroth, and we may assume that it was common to dedicate cities to this goddess. In consequence, there are several claimants for the site: see as to this at xii. 4. *Kishon*, ver. 28, apparently an error in writing by our translators for Kishion, as in xix. 20. *Farmuth*, ver. 29, a form of Remeth, xix. 21. *Mishal*, ver. 30, a mere variation in spelling Misheal, xix. 26, in a case where our alphabet cannot exactly reproduce the Hebrew. *Abdon*, see at Hebron, xix. 28. *Rehob*, ver. 31, see at xix. 28, 30. *Hammoth-dor*, ver. 32, probably Hammath in xix. 35. *Kartan*, ver. 32, apparently a contraction of Kirjathaim, 1 Chron. vi. 76; it is unknown; so is *Kartah*, ver. 34. *Dimnah*, ver. 35, is almost certainly an error in copying (very easily made in the Hebrew) from what is called Remmon in xix. 13, as it is Rimmon (more exactly, Rimmono) in 1 Chron. vi. 77. Vers. 36 and 37 in the A. V. are pronounced spurious in the Massoretic or authorised text of the Jewish synagogue; but many manuscripts and all the ancient versions have them, so that the case is very different from that of the Septuagint insertion after xv. 59. Indeed, they are indispensable to make the numbers of the cities and the contributions of the several tribes complete. Some suspicion of another hand may have arisen from the fact that 'a city of refuge for the slayer' is not attached to Bezer as to the other five.

 CHAPTER XXI. 43-45.—THE SUMMING UP OF THE HISTORY OF
 THE CONQUEST AND PARTITION.

The whole of the task assigned to Joshua, ch. i. 2-6, had now been accomplished: the promises to the patriarchs and to Israel, so far as related to the occupation of Canaan, had been fulfilled, and the people had entered into the promised rest, Deut. xii. 9, 10. No

 CHAP. XXII.—*Return of the Eastern Tribes to their own Home.*

doubt there were many Canaanites left in the land, but this was distinctly foretold from the first, Ex. xxiii. 30, Deut. vii. 22, where it is said that these nations were to be driven out by little and little, not all at once. The first generation of Israelite inhabitants of Canaan had received everything according to promise: if the scattered, broken, dispirited Canaanites should become a curse to later generations, it must be through their own guilty carelessness or self-will, not without warnings already given by Moses, and still to be repeated by Joshua. The possibility of the ruin of the fair hopes of Israel no more derogated from the completeness of God's goodness, than did the possibility of Adam's fall when he had been placed in Eden. There was, indeed, a necessity for the second Adam to save us; and in like manner, the history of Israel in Canaan proved that the anti-type of Joshua was needed to bring the people into the true and everlasting rest, Heb. iv. 7-9.

1. *What was the nature and purpose of the cities of refuge?*
2. *Upon what conditions might the manslayer remain in them, and how long was he to stay?*
3. *How many of these did Joshua appoint, and how many were there altogether?*
4. *How were they situated for general convenience?*
5. *What had Jacob predicted of Levi, and how were his words fulfilled?*
6. *What difference appears in the position of the Levites from that of the other occupants of the land?*
7. *How were the Levites arranged in the distribution of their cities?*
8. *What connection had they with the cities of refuge?*
9. *How far were the promises to Israel fulfilled before the death of Joshua?*

CHAPTER XXII.—THE RETURN OF THE EASTERN TRIBES TO THEIR OWN HOME, THEIR DANGER OF CIVIL WAR, AND THEIR ESCAPE FROM IT.

Vers. 1-8. *The dismissal by Joshua.* He sent them home with the highest possible praise for their obedience to the Law of Moses, and to his own commands (as they had promised, i. 16-18), for their faithfulness to their brethren and to their God. 'Then,' in ver. 1, leads us to think it was at or about the time when the partition of the land and the arrangements for the Levites had been completed. And this

 CHAP. XXII.—*Return of the Eastern Tribes to their own Home.*

may be inferred from their point of departure, ver. 9, which was not Gilgal but Shiloh. In ver. 4, 'hath given rest' refers back to xxi. 44, and the mention of their 'tents' reminds us of their pastoral tastes and habits, see Num. xxxii. 1, though perhaps this is not to be pressed. The fulness of expression in the admonition, ver. 5, and the place assigned to love even in the Law, remind us of the style of Deuteronomy, and vindicate the Law from the exaggerated notions of severity often attached to it. Joshua blessed them, ver. 6, as he had blessed Caleb, ch. xiv. 13. That blessing to Caleb and this to the eastern tribes had a special resemblance, inasmuch as both related to inheritances assigned by Moses himself, which Joshua had merely to record and in some sense confirm, as is noticed, ver. 7; where the repetition of the statement that he blessed them may have an emphasis in connection with the praise he bestowed upon them, since otherwise the grant of territory made to them was to have been reversed, and instead of receiving a blessing their sin would have found them out, Num. xxxii. 23, 29, 30. As it was, they were to share with their brethren in all the great spoil taken from the Canaanites; or perhaps rather, these soldiers were to share what they carried away with their brethren whom they would find on returning home, according to the principle laid down in Num. xxxi. 27, which was extended by David, 1 Sam. xxx. 24, 25.—Vers. 9–12. *Their return home, and their memorial altar.* The 'borders' of Jordan, in vers. 10, 11, literally 'circuits' or 'districts:' see at xiii. 2, also at xx. 7. The altar was built 'great to see to,' or, great to look upon; their purpose in constructing it being to make a large object which could not fail to be seen, and not for sacrifice, the natural use of an altar, ver. 23. It was probably not even in their own country on the E. of Jordan, which is called the land of Gilead, vers. 9, 13, 15, 32, whilst Canaan is here taken in its narrow and original sense, as the land W. of Jordan: nor is this interpretation irreconcilable with the words 'over against the land of Canaan,' ver. 11, for (not to say that the expression is repeatedly rendered 'in,' or 'upon the front of,' Ex. xxviii. 9, xxviii. 37, Lev. viii. 9; and 'toward,' Ex. xviii. 19, xxviii. 27, xxxix. 20, 1 Sam. xvii. 30; 'before,' Ex. xxxiv. 3) the Jordan valley was sometimes regarded as distinguishable from the land of Canaan, Gen. xiii. 12, as if a border territory in some sense outside of it. 'At the passage of the children of Israel,' ver. 11, had better be rendered 'at the other side of' them. The position of this altar, however, cannot be given. Conder was very

 CHAP. XXII.—*Return of the Eastern Tribes to their own Home.*

confident at one time, that it was on the remarkable conical hill, 1244 feet high (and used by the later Jews as a beacon station, where a fire was lighted on the new moon appearing), Kurn Surtubeh, a little N. of E. from Shiloh, straight in the direction of the great Dâmieh ford of Jordan, 4 miles W. of it; but there are serious difficulties in the way of this identification. A proceeding so novel, and at least having so alarming an appearance of defection from the Law of God, recalled the whole congregation of Israel to Shiloh, the rightful place of the altar of God, from which they had by this time departed to go to their several homes.—**Vers. 13-20.** *The remonstrance of the other tribes.* The congregation had gathered (or better, **had assembled**, in the orderly assembly which held the reins of government) to make war against the apostates, Deut. xiii. 12-18, should their apprehensions be confirmed: but the Law required them first to make investigation. To do so wisely, kindly, and firmly, ten princes were sent, each representing a tribe, and headed by Phinehas, the heir-apparent to the high-priesthood, who had already distinguished himself by his zeal against the idolatry of Peor, Num. xxv. 7-13. In his speech to the eastern tribes, he referred to that sad time of sinning, and consequent suffering, and to one still later, Achan's trespass: and he left them to infer how much more serious this act of public authoritative apostasy must be, beginning in trespass (vers. 16, 20, 31, better rendered 'transgression,' ver. 22, or 'unfaithfulness'), and ending in rebellion. Any apparent sharpness in this remonstrance was effectually counter-balanced by the generous offer to receive the eastern tribes into the land of Canaan, and to redistribute the territory, so that they might be no losers, if the land of Gilead was dangerous on account of distance from the appointed centre of worship, or on account of idolatrous pollutions natural to it: a supposition which was sadly verified in the history of these eastern tribes, 1 Chron. v. 25. And its justification was to be found in the rapidity with which corruption spreads, and the swiftness with which the wrath of God may follow, ver. 18; as also in the conviction, that the evil leaven had not been fully purged out of the congregation, ver. 17.—**Vers. 21-29.** *The reply of the eastern tribes.* They repudiate all intentions of building an altar for any kind of sacrifice (burnt-offering, the oldest, commonest, and most comprehensive, or peace-offerings, or indefinitely any kind of animal sacrifice whatever, or even the meat or vegetable offering, vers. 27, 28, 29), as if they would break off from the unity of service at the one altar of the

 CHAP. XXIII.—*A Solemn Warning by Joshua.*

God of Israel. Their motive, to translate ver. 24 more literally, had been 'from anxiety, for a reason,' instead of 'for fear of this thing;' and their aim had been to secure themselves and their posterity against any risk of being treated as aliens on account of the geographical separation: so long as this huge altar should stand, after the pattern (ver. 28, as Ex. xxv. 40) of that at the tabernacle, they should have a monumental witness, ver. 27, like other stone memorials mentioned in this book; especially we may think of the twelve stones set up at Gilgal not very far from this spot, iv. 20, for an altar had already been associated with twelve stone pillars for the twelve tribes in a memorable passage of their sacred history, Ex. xxiv. 4. The solemn statement with which they begin perhaps uses three Divine names in a climax, 'The Mighty One, God, Jehovah,' ver. 22. The same words occur again in Ps. l. 1.—Vers. 30-34. *The happy issue of the conference.* The explanation was received with that frankness with which it was offered. The deputies returned to Shiloh, and they gave a report so satisfactory that there was no further thought of war with their brethren. And the eastern tribes named the altar Ed, which means 'a witness,' as if it were endued with life to be a witness between them: compare Jacob's 'heap of witness,' Galeed, Gen. xxxi. 47, 48.

1. *When were the eastern tribes sent back to their own homes?*
2. *What step did they take with the view of preserving oneness of interest and of religion with their brethren west of Jordan?*
3. *On which side of the river is the altar supposed to have been built?*
4. *How did the other tribes act, and why?*
5. *What was the proposal of Phinehas to them?*
6. *What circumstances may have led to the choice of him to be spokesman?*
7. *How did the interview end?*

 CHAPTER XXIII.—A SOLEMN WARNING BY JOSHUA.

Vers. 1, 2. *The people called together to hear.* Before his death, Joshua made use of such means as he found within reach for impressing upon the people their duty to God, though he himself was little able to take the oversight of them, and must soon be removed by death: compare 2 Pet. i. 12-15. Of this we have two instances in the addresses recorded in this and the following chapter. His audience on the two occasions seems very much, if not entirely, the same; namely, all Israel, as re-

CHAP. XXIII.—*A Solemn Warning by Joshua.*

presented by their elders, their heads, their judges, and their officers. But the second address is marked out as the more formal, since Joshua 'called for all Israel' the first time, but the second time 'gathered all the tribes of Israel:' and again, as the more solemn and public by its being held at Shechem, a sacred spot with very peculiar historical associations, where they 'presented themselves before God;' whereas the place at which the first address was given is left unmentioned, as if it were unimportant. Perhaps it was at Shiloh, the seat of solemn public worship, and of the regular meeting of all the males in Israel, Ex. xxiii. 17; compare here xxii. 12, perhaps at his own house, to which he retired when his public work had been accomplished, xix. 50. Certainly the first was more an address from himself personally, confined very much to the immediate duty of warning and exhorting the people, in view of all the mercies they had been receiving under his administration, to cleave to the Lord, and to complete the work of destroying the Canaanites; whereas the second address surveyed their whole history from the call of Abraham, took a comprehensive view of their duties and responsibilities, and led them on to a renewal of the covenant with God, in whose name the entire address is given, so that the personality of His servant Joshua is thrown into the background. How long this was after the partition of the land we cannot even guess: 'a long time,' literally 'many days,' ver. 1, is used of the forty years in the wilderness, xxiv. 7, of the seven years' war in Canaan, xi. 18, xxii. 3, and of shorter periods; and the description of Joshua's age is the same as that when he was commanded to begin to divide the land, xiii. 1. It was after the people had entered on the rest given to them by Jehovah, xxi. 44, xxii. 4; and probably after such a lapse of time as to make it manifest that Phinehas was right in his apprehension of seeds of evil lying ready to spring up and bear bitter fruit, xxii. 17-20.—Vers. 3-13. *The encouragement and warning.* He appeals to what their own eyes had seen, and to their personal experience of mercies. He charged them to be strong and very courageous in obeying the written Law of Moses (the charge which had been addressed to himself, i. 6-8), and to keep jealously apart from the cursed nations and their gods. He bore testimony to the faithfulness with which they had kept close to the Lord hitherto, obviously speaking of them as a whole, and not taking individual cases into account. He held out the blessed promises of continued complete success. He urged upon them, that obedience and success could be

 CHAP. XXIV.—*Last Address by Joshua.*

achieved only by love to the Lord (compare Rev. ii. 4). And he set before them the ensnaring and fatal consequences of familiarity and intermarriage with the Canaanites. All this was expressed in language full of references to the Law of Moses.—Vers. 14–16. *His pathetic appeal.* Moses had spoken to the Israelites as a dying man; Joshua now did the same. He appealed to their experience of the fulfilment of all the promises, see xxi. 43–45; and thus he brought home to their consciences the assurance of the corresponding curse if they became backsliders. Compare the blessings and the curses brought together in viii. 34, and by Moses in Lev. xxvi. and Deut. xxviii.

1. *What special means did Joshua take to produce an impression upon the people before he died?*
2. *What differences appear between his address recorded in this chapter and that in the next chapter?*
3. *What was the substance of his appeal here?*

 CHAPTER XXIV.—LAST ADDRESS BY JOSHUA; HIS RENEWAL OF THE COVENANT; HIS DEATH, ETC.

Ver. 1. He gathered all the tribes of Israel by calling for their representatives, as at xxiii. 2. And they 'presented themselves before God' in Shechem; it is this description, no doubt, that has led to the error in some of the Greek copies, which make the place of meeting Shiloh, where the ark was with the holy tent. This reading would indeed have been more plausible if the expression had been 'before the LORD,' that is, before Jehovah, as at xviii. 6, xix. 51; though even so, there would have been no adequate ground for thinking Shechem a copyist's error for Shiloh, or for assuming that the ark had been moved to Shechem, and that sacrifices had been offered there: because wherever the people of God were convened in an orderly and solemn manner, there they presented themselves before God. But Shechem was the place where Abraham had built his first altar in the land of Canaan, and there Jehovah had appeared to him and promised to give the land to his seed, Gen. xii. 6, 7: and there Jacob, on his return to Canaan, had fixed his abode, and had been directed by God to renew the covenant, which he accordingly did in a very earnest manner, Gen. xxxiii. 18, 19, xxxv. 1–4. And Moses had instructed Israel to renew the covenant there when they came into the land; and this

CHAP. XXIV.—*Last Address by Joshua.*

Joshua had done, see at viii. 30-35. And now at the close of his life, Joshua wished once more to gather the people and rehearse Jehovah's dealings with them, and yet again to renew the covenant, as his master Moses did when he was about to die.—*Vers. 2-15. Joshua's second address.* Speaking in the name of God, he went over the distinguishing mercies which had been bestowed upon their race: the call of Abraham, who is in no way distinguished from his idolatrous family 'on the other side of the flood,' or river Euphrates, though later Jewish tradition has many fables of his early distinguishing goodness; the gift to him of Isaac; the election of grace continued in the line of Jacob (comp. Mal. i. 2, 3); the mission of Moses and Aaron; the Exodus and the passage of the Red Sea; the lengthened stay in the wilderness; the successful wars with the eastern Amorites, and the prevention of a curse from Balaam; and the victories over the seven nations of Canaan, the earnest and the pledge of the others being the taking of Jericho. On all this there is little need for remark, unless to notice that Balak is said to have warred, or fought against Israel, though nothing of this is recorded by Moses, and the contrary is asserted in Judg. xi. 25. The explanation must be, that, though he himself did not actually fight, yet his sending for Balaam to curse them was virtually a declaration of war, from which he drew back ignobly, leaving the brunt of the battle to be borne by his allies the Midianites. The whole seven nations of Canaan are enumerated in ver. 11, no doubt to give emphasis to the completeness of the conquest; see at iii. 10. The hornet mentioned in ver. 12, as in Ex. xxiii. 28 and Deut. vii. 20, where the promise was given whose fulfilment is now recorded, may have been literally one of those stinging flies which are the scourges of some climates: but the prevalent opinion is that it is metaphorical, referring to the piercing agony of terror, magnified by flying reports as the Israelites advanced, which drove out the enemy without the sword or bow being actually employed, as is hinted at xxiii. 10. Observe a somewhat similar comparison of enemies to bees, Deut. i. 44; Ps. cxviii. 12. Possessed of vineyards and oliveyards taken from the enemy, the people would be exposed to those temptations against which Moses had warned them, Deut. vi. 10-12, viii. 7-20: and therefore Joshua repeats the warning, and in view of this series of distinguishing mercies, calls on them to make their choice between fearing and serving Jehovah in the only possible way, namely in sincerity and in truth (as in the New

 CHAP. XXIV.—*Renewal of God's Covenant by Joshua.*

Testament, John iv. 24 ; 2 Cor. i. 12), and going back to the false gods whom their ancestors worshipped beyond the Euphrates, or more recently in Egypt, or perhaps stooping so low as to worship the gods of the conquered Canaanites. It has been already noticed at xxiii. 1, 2, that Joshua had well-founded suspicions of an evil leaven being at work, to which suspicion he gives frank expression this day at ver. 23 ; and his outspoken earnest appeal to them to make the right choice between the only two courses open to them (as Moses had appealed in Deut. xxx. 15–20, and as Elijah afterwards appealed in 1 Kings xviii. 21), was enforced by the announcement in ver. 15 of his own choice for himself and his house.—**Vers. 16–28.** *The renewal of the covenant.* The people earnestly said, ver. 16, 'God forbid,' that is, literally, 'Far be it from us,' as at xxii. 29. They remembered their God in the terms which He had used in the preface to the ten commandments, and felt all the more sure that they would remember Him in consequence of those mercies of which Joshua had spoken, vers. 17, 18. Joshua replied, vers. 19, 20, telling them of the holiness and zeal of Jehovah, which made it impossible for them to serve Him as they spoke of doing ; adding, sin would be fatal to them, as he had said in xxiii. 15, 16. But when they repeated their resolution, Joshua could do nothing else than call them deliberately to be witnesses against themselves if they made the covenant and then broke it. So, when they agreed to be witnesses, he bade them put away the strange gods which were among them, ver. 23, as there might be individuals secretly idolaters in the host. And yet, since there is nothing said of material idols being given up by them (contrast the case of Jacob's household in Gen. xxxv. 2–4), it may be safer to adhere to the precise meaning, and to render, 'put away the strange gods which are within you,' referring to spiritual idolatry, 'and incline your heart unto the Lord God of Israel.' And upon their promising service and obedience, as in Ex. xix. 8, xxiv. 3, 7, Joshua made a covenant with them, and set them a statute and an ordinance, as in Ex. xv. 25 : the Hebrew expression in ver. 25 literally being, 'he made a covenant for them,' since the people are always represented not as equal parties in a covenant with God, but servants on whom subjection was binding, though God condescended to give His law to them in the form of a covenant, 2 Kings xi. 4 ; Ps. lxxxix. 3, etc. How much Joshua wrote in the book of the Law of God, ver. 26, as an appendix to the Pentateuch, is uncertain : it might be the answer of the people, or the

CHAP. XXIV.—*The Death of Joshua.*

whole proceedings of that day, or possibly the entire book which bears his name. But as Moses had not been content with writing a matter in the book, but in addition to this erected a memorial on occasion of Joshua's earliest service, Ex. xvii. 14-16, Joshua now connected his latest effort, of which he wrote an account in the book of the Law, with a great memorial stone which he set up, and which he declared to be a witness of the transaction, as the eastern tribes had declared their altar to be, xxii. 34. This great stone he set up there 'under an oak that was by the sanctuary of the Lord;' more correctly, '**under the oak that was in the sanctuary,**' etc. For it was no sanctuary built of stone and lime: such a thing did not yet exist; nor was it the court of the moveable tabernacle, in which an oak could not have been planted: but it was that holy place which was consecrated by so many remarkable religious services, as already explained at ver. 1, where there was a venerable oak, Gen. xii. 6 (there mistranslated 'plain'), xxxv. 4, which oak was still revered in the time of Abimelech, who was made king there, Judg. ix. 6 (margin). And so Joshua sent away the people to their own homes, for he could do nothing more.—**Vers. 29-33.** *The close of the book of Joshua.* Joshua, at his death receiving the title 'the servant of the Lord' (see at ch. i. 1), died ten years younger than his master Moses, and was buried in the city which the Israelites had given to him, ch. xix. 50: see at v. 2 a notice of the legend in the Septuagint translation about his grave. Mount Gaash has not been identified. The noble and thorough work of Joshua had the most convincing testimony borne to it by the faithful adherence of the people to their God, until all the elders were dead who had been Joshua's companions; with whom may be classed his associate the high priest Eleazar. His place of burial is also named, though it is not yet identified: for 'a hill that pertained to Phinehas' had better have been rendered 'Gibeah of Phinehas,' like Gibeah of Saul. Some think it a village Geba or Gebena, 5 Roman miles north of Guphna, towards Shechem, 8½ miles w.s.w. of Shiloh, now called Jibia or Khurbet Jibia, which would be conveniently situated for the high priest, being near Shiloh. This was indeed outside the tribes of Judah and Benjamin, among whom the priests had their cities, but it would be reckoned a private possession given to him for his services to the people. Or it might be the priestly city Geba (which is a name interchangeable with Gibeah) in Benjamin, ch. xxi. 17. But, more probable than either, Conder thinks that we may accept the Jewish and

CHAP. XXIV.—*The Death of Joshua.*

the Samaritan traditions when they agree, as they do here, in fixing on Kefr Ghuweirah, now called 'Awertah, fully 7 miles N. of Shiloh, as the place where both Eleazar and Phinehas were buried. Between these two burials is mentioned another, that of the bones of Joseph; see Gen. l. 25, 26; Ex. xiii. 19: the place selected was near Shechem, the same which Jacob made his dwelling-place on his return to his own country, Gen. xxxiii. 19, not improbably at or near the sanctuary of Jehovah' mentioned already at ver. 26. The time of the fulfilment of their promise to Joseph to bury his bones in Canaan was probably long before the death of Joshua, though it is not mentioned till the end of the book, so as not to interrupt the main course of the history; see on viii. 30-35.

1. *What difficulty has arisen about the place of meeting here?*
2. *What is the general character of this address by Joshua?*
3. *What feelings were awakened in the minds of the people, and how did he deal with them?*
4. *What were the most notable circumstances connected with this renewal of the covenant?*
5. *What burials are mentioned in the closing verses?*
6. *What testimony to the thoroughness of Joshua's work for the Lord comes out in the notice of the people after his death?*

THE END.

PUBLICATIONS OF
T. AND T. CLARK,
38 GEORGE STREET, EDINBURGH.

Just published, in post 8vo, price 7s. 6d.,

AMERICAN PRESBYTERIANISM:
ITS ORIGIN AND EARLY HISTORY.

Together with an Appendix of Letters and Documents, many of
which have recently been discovered.

By CHARLES AUGUSTUS BRIGGS, D.D.,
DAVENPORT PROFESSOR OF HEBREW AND THE COGNATE LANGUAGES IN THE
UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, NEW YORK CITY.

With Maps.

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

Just published, Second Edition, in post 8vo, price 7s. 6d.,

BIBLICAL STUDY:
ITS PRINCIPLES, METHODS, AND HISTORY.

By PROFESSOR C. A. BRIGGS, D.D.

With Introduction by Professor A. B. BRUCE, D.D.

'We are sure that no student will regret sending for this book.'—*Academy.*

'Dr. Briggs' book is a model of masterly condensation and conciseness.'—*Freeman.*

'We have great pleasure in recommending Dr. Briggs' book to the notice of all Biblical students.'—*Nonconformist.*

'Written by one who has made himself a master of the subject, and who is able to write upon it, both with the learning of the scholar and the earnestness of sincere conviction.'—*Scotsman.*

'The work shows mental robustness, and scholarship both extensive and accurate; and the rich tone of spiritual religion which pervades it is signally fitted to help and elevate the readers.'—*United Presbyterian Magazine.*

'This book is one of much value.'—*Spectator.*

'The book will be helpful to all those who wish to pursue deeply the greatest of all studies.'—*Methodist Recorder.*

BY THE REV. JAMES STALKER, M.A.

Just published, in crown 8vo, price 8s. 6d., a New Edition, in larger Type, and handsomely bound,

THE LIFE OF JESUS CHRIST.

'No work since "Ecce Homo" has at all approached this in succinct, clear-cut, and incisive criticism on Christ as He appeared to those who believed on Him.'—*Literary World*.

'We are glad to welcome a new edition of this now celebrated work. . . . We trust, and confidently predict, that equal success will attend it in its new shape. . . . Mr. Stalker has produced a book without which no private library is complete.'—*Methodist Recorder*.

'Even with all our modern works on the exhaustless theme, from Neander to Farrar and Geikie, there is none which occupies the ground of Mr. Stalker's. . . . We question whether any one popular work so impressively and adequately represents Jesus to the mind. . . . It may be despised because it is small, but its light must shine.'—*Christian*.

Uniform with the above in size and price,

THE LIFE OF ST. PAUL.

'Even to those who know by heart the details of the great Apostle's life, this glowing sketch will be a revelation. Written with a fine sympathy for the more tender and personal aspects of his theme, Mr. Stalker has portrayed the outer and the inner life of Paul with a mingled power and beauty which is as rare as it is needed in evangelical writing.'—*Christian*.

'It is no matter of surprise that a new edition has so soon been called for. . . . It is a work of singular freshness.'—*Churchman*.

'A gem of sacred biography, which we have already commended to our readers. . . . Well does it deserve the new and handsome dress in which it now appears.'—*Christian Leader*.

Just published, in crown 8vo, price 8s. 6d.,

SCENES FROM THE LIFE OF JESUS. Lectures

BY PASTOR E. LEHMANN.

'No one can read these lectures without gathering from them many holy and devotional thoughts.'—*Ecclesiastical Gazette*.

'We have seldom read lectures more deeply spiritual or more full of sober and thoughtful Scripture teaching.'—*Dublin Express*.

'There is in these lectures a tender sympathy, and a spiritual devoutness and simplicity, which gives to them a real charm.'—*Literary World*.

Just published, in demy 8vo, price 10s. 6d.,

THE KINGDOM OF GOD BIBLICALLY AND HISTORICALLY CONSIDERED.

BY JAS. S. CANDLISH, D.D.

'A charming book, written with unaffected, easy, and perfect lucidity, and therefore to be read with delight. Perhaps a magic pen belongs to the house of Candlish. . . . The book is positively good, and ought to be thoroughly popular with the larger religious public.'—*Monthly Interpreter*.

'As to the ability of this volume there can be no question; it is of profound interest.'—*Evangelical Magazine*.

Just published, in Two Volumes, 8vo (1600 pages), price 28s.,

THE DOCTRINE OF SACRED SCRIPTURE:

A CRITICAL, HISTORICAL, AND DOGMATIC INQUIRY INTO THE
ORIGIN AND NATURE OF THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENTS.

BY GEORGE T. LADD, D.D.,

PROFESSOR OF MENTAL AND MORAL PHILOSOPHY, YALE COLLEGE.

'This important work is pre-eminently adapted for students, and treats in an exhaustive manner nearly every important subject of Biblical criticism which is agitating the religious mind at the present day.'—*Contemporary Review*.

Just published, in crown 8vo, price 6s.,

STUDIES IN THE CHRISTIAN EVIDENCES.

BY ALEXANDER MAIR, D.D.

'This book ought to be immensely popular. . . . Speaking from our own experience of works of this character, we have no hesitation in saying that, for readers in general, we know of no work which is so distinctly suited for all who can understand a complete subject, made remarkably easy and clear. . . . That one chapter on the "Unique Personality of Christ" is a masterpiece of eloquent writing, though it is scarcely fair to mention one portion where every part is excellent. The beauties of the volume are everywhere apparent, and therefore will again attract the mind that has been once delighted with the literary feast.'—*Rock*.

'Dr. Mair has made an honest study of Strauss, Renan, Keim, and "Supernatural Religion," and his book is an excellent one to put into the hands of doubters and inquirers.'—*English Churchman*.

Just published, in crown 8vo, price 6s.,

**CHRISTIAN CHARITY IN THE ANCIENT
CHURCH.**

BY G. UHLHORN, D.D.

'The historical knowledge this work displays is immense, and the whole subject is wrought out with great care and skill; it is a most readable, delightful, and instructive volume.'—*Evangelical Christendom*.

Just published, in demy 8vo, price 10s. 6d.,

THE LORD'S PRAYER:

A Practical Meditation.

BY REV. NEWMAN HALL, LL.B.

'Short, crisp sentences, absolute in form and lucid in thought, convey the author's meaning and carry on his exposition. . . . He is impatient of dim lights; his thoughts are sharply cut and are like crystals in their clearness.'—*British Quarterly Review*.

'Well deserves a place in the minister's library.'—*Literary World*.

T. and T. Clark's Publications.

In Three Volumes, 8vo, price 31s. 6d.,

THE LIFE OF CHRIST.

BY DR. BERNHARD WEISS,
PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY, BERLIN.

'This book seems destined to hold a very distinguished, if not absolutely unique place in the criticism of the New Testament. Its fearless search after truth, its independence of spirit, its extent of research, its thoughtful and discriminating tone, must secure for it a very high reputation.'—*Congregationalist*.

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

In Two Volumes, 8vo, price 21s.,

BIBLICAL THEOLOGY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

'The work which this volume completes is one of no ordinary strength and acumen. It is an exposition of the books of the New Testament arranged scientifically, that is, according to the authorship and development. It is the ripe fruit of many years of New Testament exegesis and theological study. . . . The book is in every way a notable one.'—*British Quarterly Review*.

In Four Volumes, 8vo, price £2, 2s.,

A SYSTEM OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE.

BY DR. I. A. DORNER,
PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY, BERLIN.

'The work has many and great excellences, and is really indispensable to all who would obtain a thorough acquaintance with the great problems of theology. It is a great benefit to English students that it should be made accessible to them in their own language, and in a form so elegant and convenient.'—*Literary Churchman*.

In Three Volumes, 8vo, price 31s. 6d.,

CHRISTIAN ETHICS.

BY DR. H. MARTENSEN,
BISHOP OF SERLAND.

Translated from the Author's German Edition.

VOLUME I.—GENERAL ETHICS.

„ II.—INDIVIDUAL ETHICS.

„ III.—SOCIAL ETHICS.

'It is no ordinary book, and we commend it to the study of all who are interested in Christian Ethics, as one of the most able treatises on the subject which has ever yet appeared.'—*Watchman*.

'Dr. Martensen's work on Christian Dogmatics reveals the strength of thought as well as the fine literary grace of its author. . . . His chief ethical writings comprise a system of Christian Ethics, general and special, in three volumes. Each of these volumes has great and singular excellence, and it might be generally felt that in them the author has surpassed his own work on "Christian Dogmatics."'—Rev. Principal CAIRNS.

T. and T. Clark's Publications.

In demy 8vo, Third Edition, price 10s. 6d.,

THE TRAINING OF THE TWELVE;

OR,

EXPOSITION OF PASSAGES IN THE GOSPELS EXHIBITING
THE TWELVE DISCIPLES OF JESUS UNDER
DISCIPLINE FOR THE APOSTLESHIP.

BY A. B. BRUCE, D.D.,

PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY, FREE CHURCH COLLEGE, GLASGOW.

'Here we have a really great book on an important, large, and attractive subject—a book full of loving, wholesome, profound thoughts about the fundamentals of Christian faith and practice.'—*British and Foreign Evangelical Review*.

'It is some five or six years since this work first made its appearance, and now that a second edition has been called for, the author has taken the opportunity to make some alterations which are likely to render it still more acceptable. Substantially, however, the book remains the same, and the hearty commendation with which we noted its first issue applies to it at least as much now.'—*Rock*.

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

In demy 8vo, Second Edition, price 10s. 6d.,

THE HUMILIATION OF CHRIST,

IN ITS PHYSICAL, ETHICAL, AND OFFICIAL ASPECTS.

SIXTH SERIES OF CUNNINGHAM LECTURES.

'These lectures are able and deep-reaching to a degree not often found in the religious literature of the day; withal, they are fresh and suggestive. . . . The learning and the deep and sweet spirituality of this discussion will commend it to many faithful students of the truth as it is in Jesus.'—*Congregationalist*.

'We have not for a long time met with a work so fresh and suggestive as this of Professor Bruce. . . . We do not know where to look at our English Universities for a treatise so calm, logical, and scholarly.'—*English Independent*.

KEIL AND DELITZSCH'S

**INTRODUCTION TO AND COMMENTARIES
ON THE OLD TESTAMENT.**

In 27 Volumes, demy 8vo.

Messrs. CLARK have resolved to offer complete sets of this work at the Original Subscription Price of £7, 2s. Single volumes may be had, price 10s. 6d.

'This series is one of great importance to the Biblical scholar; and as regards its general execution, it leaves little or nothing to be desired.'—*Edinburgh Review*.

T. and T. Clark's Publications.

Just published, in crown 8vo, price 6s.,

OLD AND NEW THEOLOGY: A CONSTRUCTIVE CRITIQUE.

BY REV. J. B. HEARD, M.A.

'We can promise all real students of Holy Scripture who have found their way out of some of the worst of the scholastic byelanes and ruts, and are striving to reach the broad and firm high road that leads to the Eternal City, a real treat from the perusal of these pages. Progressive theologians, who desire to find "the old in the new, and the new in the old," will be deeply grateful to Mr. Heard for this courageous and able work.'—*Christian World*.

'Among the many excellent theological works, whether English or German, published by Messrs. Clark, there are few that deserve more careful study than this book. . . . It cannot fail to charm by its grace of style, and to supply food for solid thought.'—*Dublin Express*.

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

Fifth Edition, in crown 8vo, price 6s.,

THE TRIPARTITE NATURE OF MAN: SPIRIT, SOUL, AND BODY,

Applied to Illustrate and Explain the Doctrines of Original Sin, the New Birth, the Disembodied State, and the Spiritual Body.

'The author has got a striking and consistent theory. Whether agreeing or disagreeing with that theory, it is a book which any student of the Bible may read with pleasure.'—*Guardian*.

'An elaborate, ingenious, and very able book.'—*London Quarterly Review*.

Just published, in demy 8vo, price 9s.,

THE DOCTRINE OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.

(The Ninth Series of the Cunningham Lectures.)

BY GEORGE SMEATON, D.D.,

Professor of Exegetical Theology, New College, Edinburgh.

'The theological student will be benefited by a careful perusal of this survey, and that not for the moment, but through all his future life.'—*Watchman*.

'Very cordially do we commend these able and timely lectures to the notice of our readers. Every theological student should master them.'—*Baptist Magazine*.

'It is a pleasure to meet with a work like this. . . . Our brief account, we trust, will induce the desire to study this work.'—*Dickinson's Theological Quarterly*.