This paper continues the outline-appreciation of the Old Testament books and data in the objective context of the Ancient Near Eastern world in which they were first written; like its predecessors, this treatment is perforce restricted to compressed outlines only.

CONQUEST AND SETTLEMENT

1. Structure of Joshua

This book is basically a straight narrative (1-11; 22-24), incorporating in its latter half a list of vanquished kings (12) and especially the allotments of tribal territory (13-19), including cities of refuge and for priests and Levites (20-21). There is no over-arch ing formal framework to the book — simply a narrative incorporating lists.

2. Formation and role of Joshua

a. Formation, i. Within the narratives themselves, there is at first sight very little that is self-evidently later than the period following on the passing of 'the elders who outlived Joshua' (Jos. 24: 31; Jdg. 2: 7; cf. 10). Thus, it is not unnatural to suppose that records of the events and lists — written, oral, or both — were directly utilized by the unnamed author of Joshua. The existence of written data at this juncture is evidenced in the use of writing by Joshua and his aides noted in the book itself. On the altar erected on Mt Ebal, Joshua obediently inscribed the text of the then recently renewed covenant (Jos. 8: 30-32; cf. Dt. 27: 1-8). Later, to draw up tribal land-allocations, Joshua ordered seven scouts to traverse the land and 'write it up' in seven divisions (Jos. 18: 4, 6, 8, 9) — this they did in a 'book', or better, 'document', spr. Those surveys may be considered to underlie the basic contents of Jos. 18-19. Finally, before his demise, Joshua again renewed the covenant, giving commandments to Israel (Jos. 24, especially verse 25), and 'wrote these words' in the book of God's law. Thus, at the earliest, Joshua may have been composed from prior documents (and people's personal memories?) as early as (say) some 20 years after Joshua's death, when the elders surviving him would have passed from life into history.

ii. However, such a chronologically 'maximal' view cannot be accepted without first examining traces of the author in the book and possible indications of later date. The author of Joshua obtrudes his own standpoint remarkably little; his chief mark is the phrase 'to this day'. It is used of landmarks of the author's time that serve him as reminders of Joshua's high deeds: so, at Gilgal (5: 9), Achor (7: 26), Ai (8: 28-29) and Makkedah (10: 27). Alt and Noth in particular have argued that the phrase marks such narratives as 'aetiologies' — legends
concocted to 'explain' the features visible 'to this day'; thereby, much of Joshua's history could be neatly turned into fiction. Unfortunately for Alt and Noth, such a theory of origins is *demonstrably* invalid when tested in historical epochs where the facts can be checked, as was well shown by Bright. Hence, their theory must be discarded. One should further note that most occurrences of the phrase in Joshua are *not* features to which such 'explanations' could be attached. Thus, Joshua's stones in the Jordan stream bed (4: 9) would be permanently lost to view and require no aetiology. Rahab of Jericho dwelt in Israel 'to this day' (6: 25) — but not as a silent monolith draped in fairy-tales! The same applies to the Gibeonites (9: 27), the heirs of Caleb (14: 14), and especially to the unexpelled Canaanite peoples (13: 13; 15: 63; 16: 10), the 'monument' to Israel's real (not imaginary) failure.

iii. One possible indication for later date has been seen in a reference to the 'book of Yashar' (10: 13); another is that some places in the lists were not settled until long after Joshua's time. 'Yashar' is known otherwise only from 2 Samuel 1: 18, thus it at least once contained a poetic reference to the sun and moon at Aijalon (Joshua) and David's lament for Saul and Jonathan. If 'Yashar' were a work first composed under the monarchy, then of course the author of Joshua could not quote it earlier — unless the mention in 10: 13 were simply an added gloss. However, it is possible that 'Yashar' was simply a collection of heroic poems which began with the wanderings or conquest, to which new pieces were added until at least the United Monarchy. So little is known of it that it must remain indecisive for Joshua's date as a book.
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iv. More important is the geographical factor, namely the suggestion for archaeological dating of the 'wilderness' section of the towns list of Judah (Jos, 15: 61-62, *cf.* boundary, 15: 6-7). After a survey and trial excavations, Cross, Wright and Milik identified the 'Vale of Achor' with the modern Buqe'ah, south-east of Jerusalem, and three sites there of Iron Age II (c. 9th-7th centuries BC) with three names in Joshua; these may reflect activities of Jehoshaphat (2 Ch. 17: 12) and possibly Uzziah (2 Ch. 26: 10). From the archaeological data, these writers suggested a date for the Judean place-lists in the reign of Jehoshaphat (c. 860 BC). While the topographical identifications are attractive, the deductions drawn from them are much too sweeping on too narrow a basis, merely five or six places out of about 110 names in Joshua 15. And the real history of the lists is probably very much simpler than envisaged by a Noth, or even Cross and Wright. Thus, one may suggest initial surveys by Joshua's scouts (Jos. 18: 2-9; *cf.* earlier, Nu. 13), listing districts in Canaan (a) by 'natural' boundaries place to place, and (b) by settlements within each district. Subsequently, the author of Joshua drew upon such documents in giving (selectively) boundaries and districts much as they are now found in Joshua 15: 61-62, if the findings of Cross and Milik are correct. Hence, one may attribute the basic book of Joshua to the beginning of the judges' period, with the possibility of some small supplements in the 9th century BC at least.

*b. Role.* The narratives of the book repeatedly ram home the importance of faithful obedience to God for success in fulfilling His purpose for Israel. So, in 1: 7ff., Joshua must heed the 'book of the law'; in 5, the circumstances of circumcision. In 7, failure stems from Achan's disobedience, while misalliance with Gibeon came from failure to seek first divine guidance (9: 14). Mosaic commands were fulfilled at Ebal (8: 30ff.) and in assigning cities of refuge and for clergy (20-21). The east-bank tribes were commended for faithfulness (22: 1-6), but
their altar was at first misconstrued as the opposite (22: 16ff.). Finally the aged Joshua enjoined covenant-obedience upon leaders and people after God's faithfulness to them (23-24). In the uncertain days following the passing of Joshua and the elders 'who had known all the work which the Lord did for Israel' (24: 31b; Jdg. 2: 7), such a book as Joshua would be a timely and eloquent reminder of the blessings of past obedience and unity (and examples of the converse) to impress on Israel the continuing need for unity of action and especially for sustained obedience to their divine Sovereign to enter fully upon their designated heritage.

3. Structure of Judges

By contrast with Joshua, the book of Judges has a very characteristic framework and formulation as setting for its principal narratives — whereas Joshua is simply a straight narrative with lists, having no such formal framework.

   - I. Caleb, Othniel. II. Ehud, Shamgar.
   - III. Deborah, Barak. IV. Gideon, plus Others.
   - V. Jephthah, plus Others. VI. Samson.

2. Declensions and Deliverers, 3: 7-16: 31
   - 2. Declensions and Deliverers, 3: 7-16: 31
     - I. Othniel. II. Ehud, Shamgar.
     - III. Deborah, Barak. IV. Gideon, plus Others.
     - V. Jephthah, plus Others. VI. Samson.
   - 3. Without a King in Israel, 17-21.

The foregoing outline indicates the basic threefold structure of Judges: an introduction that links up with Joshua's day and sets the pattern of disobedience, oppression, repentance, deliverance, in general terms; then six main sections (varying length) which exemplify this historical-theological pattern (I-VI, above) and include other data; and finally a 'tailpiece' of two narratives that illustrates the low tone of life in Israel soon after Joshua's time and before kings reigned.

4. Formation and role of Judges

The first and last sections of the book thus analysed link it with Joshua and just after. Judges 1: 10-15 (cf. 20) are practically identical with Joshua 15: 14-19 and allude to the same events (but with Caleb instead of the wider 'Judah'). The exploits of Caleb and Othniel fall within Joshua's lifetime. On the other hand, the phrase 'after the death of Joshua' (Jdg. 1: 1) does indicate a later date for the deeds of Judah and Simeon in Judges 1: 1-9.16 The other brief tribal records in 1: 21-36 are, strictly, undated, but may record events after Joshua's time. In 2-3: 6, decline into unfaithfulness is contrasted with Joshua (2: 6-10), and the pattern of repeated failure to meet the challenge of Canaan is expressed. At the end of the book, both narratives in 17-21 date by contents very early in the judges' period: the Danite migration is contemporary with a grandson of Moses (18: 30), while during the Benjamin incident the officiating high priest is Aaron's grandson Phinehas (20: 28).

However, in the closing chapters 17-21, one may also note the modest but insistent references (four) that suddenly appear: 'in those days, there was no king in Israel' (17: 6; 18: 1; 19: 1; 21: 25), with twice added 'every man did what was right in his own eyes' (17: 6 and 21: 25). The latter phrase refers to the poor ethos in Israel shown up by these two narratives; the former phrase implies that, under a just king, it would not be so. This bears on both date and purpose of Judges. The fourfold reference to kingship suggests a date after establishment of the monarchy — but to a time when that monarchy might be looked to as realistically an
instrument for bringing Israel back to ways closer to the divine will for her way of life. Saul's reign hardly fits this too well\(^\text{17}\) — nor does the later part of Solomon's reign (1 Ki. 11), and still less the Divided Monarchy with its repeated declensions in faith and practice. Only under David or the early years of Solomon would such an outlook seem credible. And more narrowly, one might suggest the early days of David when his good character had been known under Saul and his own rule seemed full of promise. Thus, one might place Judges in David's early years,\(^\text{18}\) possibly even in the decade prior to his capturing Jerusalem.\(^\text{19}\)

In its turn Judges would thus serve to teach from the history of Israel's failures\(^\text{20}\) the lesson of needful obedience and unity taught by the book of Joshua and not heeded; the evils of disobedience and disunity were likewise fully exemplified. Without a king as agent of God's just rule, people had pleased themselves and sank morally very low; *ergo*, a strong, just, obedient king could be the focus for renewed national obedience to Israel's covenant God, with a standard of life to match.

### 5. Other documents until the monarchy

#### a. *Ruth*

*Ruth* is a graphic, unadorned narrative of a family's fortunes under the judges, ending with the birth of David's grandfather (1 - 4: 17); the closing genealogy (4: 18-22) ties it firmly into the family traditions of Judah and David. There is no adequate reason to date this little gem any later than David's reign;\(^\text{21}\) it gives a glimpse of his family background and exemplifies God's dealings with His people in ordinary life.

#### b. *Samuel*

*Samuel* covers the end of the judges epoch with Samuel himself (1-8), plus the reigns of Saul (1 Sa. 8-31) and David (2 Sa.). This book is, like Joshua, straight narrative with no formal framework as visible in Judges or Kings. At the earliest, it could have been penned in the last years of David, or (better) in the beginning of Solomon's reign. Its sources were probably the writings of Samuel, Nathan and Gad (1 Ch. 29: 29), besides sundry court records and personal information obtained from others by its unknown author.\(^\text{22}\) This book may have served to show, first, the failure of the old order of the 'judges' and of Saul's self-sufficient kingship, before presenting David — strengths and weaknesses alike — as the ruler after God's own heart. It may have fulfilled a dynastic role for the young Solomon,\(^\text{23}\) as at once supporting the legitimacy of his rule as David's promised son and also serving in true prophetic vein to exemplify the standards (positive and negative) by which the new ruler should govern.\(^\text{24}\)

#### c. Other records

During the period down to the monarchy, various other documents evidently accumulated. Some, like the genealogies and related traditions in 1 Chronicles 1-10, eventually found a place in the present canonical writings, while others passed into oblivion and are barely known to have existed (*e.g.* the 'book of Yashar' or 'the upright'; *cf.* above).

### 6. Near Eastern background

#### a. *Conquest*

The narratives of Joshua indicate a succession of rapid campaigns that temporarily disabled a series of Canaanite city-states: east-central (Jericho and Ai), south, and north. This gave scope for an occupation-in-depth — which was a different undertaking that should have been pressed home following on the initial 'conquests'.\(^\text{25}\) This was begun in part
under Joshua and the elders, but he and his successors yet left 'much land to be possessed' (Jos. 13: 1-6; cf. Jdg. 3: 1-5), as illustrated (e.g.) by Judges 1. This fact rules out the obsolete theory of a supposed contradiction between an alleged 'complete' conquest by Joshua (unhistorical) and slow entry by tribes (Jdg. 1; historical). Various sites show evidence of destruction in the late 13th century BC: 

27 Hazor (Tell el-Qedah), Debir (probably Tell Beit Mirsim), Lachish (Tell ed-Duweir) Beitin (Bethel ??), etc. While some destruction-levels might plausibly be assignable to other agents (e.g. Philistines at Lachish), yet the Israelites remain the only obvious major cause of others (e.g. destruction of Hazor). The lower level of material culture that replaced that of Late Bronze Age Canaan at some sites would seem to reflect the presence of new inhabitants — the incoming Hebrews.

Much speculation has been devoted to the supposed literary development of the place-name lists in Joshua 13-19, but very little attention has been paid to the relevant background material. Yet, both boundary-descriptions and town-lists are well attested in the biblical Near East, not least for the 14th/13th centuries BC. Just as in Joshua, they can include a variety of phrases linking geographical features and are not just restricted to bare name-lists; multiple MSS can show minor variations as in Joshua. Town-lists with totals of places are also attested.

Lists of cities, as for priests and Levites (Jos. 21), again are comparable with the city-lists from Ugarit in North Syria. Villages, territories, etc. assigned to temples and their priests are known from contemporary documents.

b. Other background. The use of spies and scouts (Jos. 2: 1ff.; 18: 4ff.; cf. Nu. 13) is known in the Near East as early as the patriarchs, and in the 13th century BC, equally old was the stratagem of an ambush (Jos. 8; Jdg. 20). Rahab of Jericho may have been an innkeeper rather than a harlot. The 50 shekels of gold, 200 shekels of silver and fine Babylonian garment were enough to tempt Achan fatally (Jos. 7: 21), but are modest indeed if compared (e.g.) with over 1,700 shekels goldware, 1,070 shekels silverware, Human garments, and other wealth that went into a trousseau for a princess from Amor marrying a king of Ugarit.

In Near Eastern history, the period c. 1200-1000 BC is a 'dark age' for modern observers, with the great powers in eclipse and inadequate documentation. However, it is possible to trace the expansion of the power of the Philistines and to see new states arising in North Syria. Culturally, Judges 5 is a triumph-hymn like Exodus 15 — a genre well attested in Egypt during the 15th-12th centuries BC. Writing is not absent from the period of the judges, either in the Old Testament (e.g. Jdg. 8: 14) or in 12th-century Palestine as attested by inscribed arrowheads. Other archaeological work can give background to incidents in Judges.

THE UNITED MONARCHY

7. Saul and the beginnings

a. Institution of the kingship, 1 Samuel 8. The corrupt conduct of Samuel's sons led Israel's elders to demand an earthly king from Samuel, for whom God was the true king; he was directed to comply. But in doing so, he warned the people of the cost of the new institution (1 Sa. 8: 10-18) — a passage often misinterpreted by Old Testament scholars as an embittered
and distorted view of the kingship expressed at a much later date. However, it is nothing of the kind; Samuel is simply stating the practical cost of a human monarchy as known to that time — as shown by a point-by-point comparison of 1 Samuel 8 with the records of the kingdoms of Alalakh and Ugarit made by Mendelsohn long since.

b. The reign of Saul must have been of some length, as he was elected king while a young man (1 Sa. 9: 2, 16; 10: 1, 23-24), but soon after Saul's death his younger son Ishbosheth became king at 40 years old (2 Sa. 2: 8). His residence, Gibeah of Saul, was probably at Tell el-Ful just north of Jerusalem; traces of a fort have been excavated.

8. David

a. Historical. Once sole king, David soon took over Jerusalem to become his personal capital ('city of David', 2 Sa. 5: 6-9) and received technical help from Hiram I of Tyre (2 Sa. 5: 11). From wars with hostile neighbours (2 Sa. 8, 10; 1 Ch. 18, 19), he emerged as ruler from the Euphrates to the marches of Philistia and Sinai, a realm at first maintained by Solomon (1 Ki. 4: 21; 2 Ch. 9: 26). That realm was threefold in constitution: (i) 'home territory' of Judah and Israel, (ii) conquered territories to east (Edom, Moab, Ammon) and north (Aram), and (iii) subject-allies, notably Toi of Hamath, further north. It is known that Hamath's domain reached to the Euphrates — hence, as ally and overlord to Hamath, David held sway that far. Doubts sometimes expressed on the extent of David and Solomon's kingdom are therefore unjustified. From his early days of adversity under Saul, a group of 'heroes' grew up around David (2 Sa. 23: 8ff.; 1 Ch. 11, 12). From these came army leaders of forces (Joab) and bodyguard (Benaiah); besides the chief priests, the administration counted a recorder and secretary (2 Sa. 8: 15-18; 1 Ch. 18: 14ff.). While 2 Samuel deals more with David's personal character and family affairs (11-24), Chronicles adds further useful data on the organization of the kingdom. Thus, for each month of the year, one of twelve commanders with a division under him was on active service (doubtless in the capital and border-forts, etc.), while the other eleven were in reserve in ordinary life until their turn came (cf. 1 Ch. 27: 1-15); the commanders, not unfittingly, were in several cases drawn from the 'thirty' heroes. This form of organization is not fictional but can be seen also in other Syrian kingdoms, where (in Ugarit and Alalakh) lists of cities occur, noting the charioteers and warriors (marīyannu, etc.) resident in them. In 1 Chronicles 27: 25-31, appear the king's treasurers for realia, including vineyards, olives and livestock — economic sectors that also concerned kings in Ugarit, Alalakh and elsewhere.

b. Religious. Since Joshua, the ark and tabernacle had been mainly at Shiloh (Jos. 18: 1; Jdg. 18: 31; 1 Sa. 1-4), then at Nob (cf. 1 Sa. 21; 22: 19), finally at Gibeon. David erected a new tent for the ark in Jerusalem, installing the latter at the second attempt (2 Sa. 6; 1 Ch. 13; 15-16), the tabernacle remaining at Gibeon (1 Ch. 16: 39; 21: 29) until Solomon (1 Ki. 8: 4). 1 Chronicles 16 indicates that David instituted a regular daily cult, led by levitical musicians with harp, lyre and cymbals and psalmic praises. At Gibeon similar arrangements accompanied the regular sacrificial cult at the altar and tabernacle (1 Ch. 16: 39-42, especially 41-42). Furthermore, the Chronicler indicates that David did much 'forward planning' for the building of the future temple (1 Ch. 22; cf. 28-29) and the organization of its personnel (1 Ch. 23-26; cf. 6: 31).
i. Personnel. The priests were to share the temple services in twenty-four 'watches' in rotation, i.e. for half a month each group (1 Ch. 24: 1-19). Likewise the Levites for varied duties in the temple (1 Ch. 23: 4, 26ff.) and in the land (1 Ch. 23: 4b), especially for the temple music (1 Ch. 25). There is nothing very revolutionary or new about such arrangements as late as the 10th century BC: Egypt had very similar arrangements for temple-staffing for almost 2,000 years before, where priests in four sa or phyles served a month at a time. Duties were carefully prescribed, and inventories of temple furnishings handed to incoming priests by their colleagues going off service—such documents are known as early as c. 2400 BC and down to c. 320 BC. From Syria itself, there are the temple-inventories of Qatna, c. 15th century BC. Thus, the kind of arrangements ascribed to David by the Chronicler are not mere fancies, but in a millennia-long tradition.

ii. Music, both instrumental and as hymns or psalms in worship, is no novelty in the 10th century BC either. Thus in Mesopotamia from at least the Old Babylonian era, c. 19th-16th centuries BC (and doubtless much earlier), there is ample evidence for both kinds of music in the temple rituals, both Sumerian and Akkadian (Assyro-Babylonian) languages being used. Catalogues of 'psalms' are well known, also rituals which explicitly direct that this or that piece is to be sung at a given juncture.

c. Literary. This brings up the possible relation of the psalter to David. His repute for psalmody cannot be ignored or fictionalized. Besides 1 Chronicles 16 (above), so early a work as Samuel has as explicitly Davidic his lament over Saul and Jonathan (2 Sa. 2), his song of deliverance (2 Sa. 22) and 'last words' as 'sweet psalmist of Israel' (ib. 23). Equally inescapable are the reports of David's early musical flair (1 Sa. 16: 16-23, a youth under Saul) and quite separately the passing reference by Amos (6: 5). As is well known, some seventy-three psalms in the psalter bear in or as the title l-dwd, 'pertaining to David'—a phrase variously interpreted. Generally, it has long been fashionable in Old Testament studies to dismiss the psalm-titles as entirely worthless for both authorship and 'biographical' allusions, they being as late liturgical/musical insertions. However, this attitude rests on no particle of respectable evidence and has much against it. Elsewhere in the Old Testament, Habakkuk 3: 1 is clearly intended to attribute authorship of that psalm to the prophet Habakkuk; likewise, Isaiah 38: 9 equally claims authorship of Hezekiah for the prayer that follows it. There can be no question of the intention of 2 Samuel 22: 1 to indicate David as author of 22: 2-51, and the Sitz im Leben as David's attainment of political peace over his foes. As the selfsame psalm and its title-details recur as Psalm 18 with very closely similar title, there is no objective ground for rejecting either the authorship or the occasion as given in the title to Psalm 18. Nor is there any objective warrant to reject the authorship or the 'biographical' Sitz im Leben given similarly for a dozen other psalms (Pss. 3, 7, 30, 34, 51, 52, 54, 56, 57, 59, 60, 63, 142). Thus, the phrase l-dwd can clearly indicate authorship as well as other relationships; theoretically, the other sixty psalms l-dwd could all be by David, or all merely relate to David ('Davidic collection' or the like), or be partly his, partly a collection or the like — his possible authorship should not be dismissed out of hand. Some thirty-nine 'Davidic' psalms carry also the phrase l-mnsh, 'pertaining to the (musical) director'; as he and David cannot both be the author of a given psalm each time, these entries probably do denote a 'director's collection', which included also most of the dozen psalms of Asaph and that (88) of Heman (but not Ethan, 89), all (younger?)
contemporaries of David. The musical notices could date — with those of the 'director' — to any period from David to the post-exilic age; explicit evidence is lacking.66

The role of psalmody in the cult is illustrated by 1 Chronicles 16 (David), by 2 Chronicles 5: 12-13; 7: 6; 8: 14 (daily praises), and 9: 11 (also 1 Ki. 10: 12, new harps, etc). A vast amount of scholarly speculation has been expended in rash attempts to force nearly all psalms into various cultic straitjackets — New Year or enthronement festivals, covenant festivals, etc. — all theoretical, with hardly a trace of explicit evidence from the Old Testament writings themselves.67 Furthermore, the really relevant comparable data from the Near East has been mainly ignored by Old Testament scholars. First, individual 'psalms' of various kinds did exist in the biblical Near East, outside of and alongside formal worship and ritual.68 Second, a psalm or hymn can have more than one 'Sitz im Leben' or cultural setting:69 'the same song could be sung … on different occasions' in Sumer, especially at later periods;70 as a hymn can be appropriated for personal use, so a personal psalm could pass into formal cult.71 Third, the content of a psalm need have no direct relevance to its role in the cult — this fact has been noted for Sumerian psalms in rituals in Mesopotamia,72 and should serve as a warning against over-interpretation of supposed allusions to this, that or the other imaginary feast in the psalter. Fourth, the use of titles (Egypt) and colophons (Near East) with technical classifications (like Hebrew maskil, miktam, etc.) and musical terms is not a late phenomenon in the biblical Near East — such notations are appended to psalms in Mesopotamia from the Old Babylonian period onward,73 and so with the Hittite data a little later. Fifth, named authors are by no means foreign to psalm literature, either — as shown by 2nd-millennium Egyptian examples, and in Mesopotamia from the late 3rd millennium BC.74 In this vast and multifaceted context, there is nothing unthinkable about allowing David into the psalter.75

9. Solomon

a. Historical. Solomon's most famed enterprise was the temple. Many details would lend themselves to comment; suffice it to note here that the lavish use of gold is consistent with the practice of other monarchs adorning fanes throughout the Near East.76

Much of the organization of Solomon's kingdom as seen in Kings and Chronicles finds realistic analogies in Near Eastern data.77 Solomon's prayer of dedication for the temple is no Deuteronomistic midrash, but (in its context) is the kind of dedication one might expect.78 Some light is available on the relations of Egypt and Israel in Solomon's day;79 marriage to an Egyptian princess was not allowed beyond the Egyptian court in earlier days, but became possible even for commoners in the 10th-9th centuries BC.80

b. Literary. Proverbs is associated with Solomon, but not as a single unit. Proverbs 1-24 forms one complete Solomonic 'book', while 25-29 is a further collection of his, edited under Hezekiah; 30-31 belong to Agur and Lemuel, otherwise unknown. Here, again, the Near East gives the essential background to the literary form of Proverbs' constituent parts. The Hezekiah collection of Solomon (25-29), Agur and Lemuel have simply each a title and main text — a common over-all literary form from the 3rd millennium BC downwards.81 More interesting is the main work of Solomon, Proverbs 1-24. It shows a title, introductory portion (1-9), then sub-title (10: 1) and main text (10-24). This schema is neither artificial, late, nor accidental — but corresponds strikingly to a fuller literary form also current from the 3rd millennium BC onwards.82 It is illegitimate to divide off 1-9 from what follows, in the light of
this fixed and well-attested literary form. And in dating 1-9, neither sentence-length, nor vocabulary, nor concepts (e.g. personification) can be termed late — all the significant comparative data are early, and even millennially earlier. After 2,000 years of tradition, Solomon was not precocious.

The Song of Songs has also a rich background. In Mesopotamia, religious lyric poetry is known from the IIIrd Dynasty of Ur (2100 BC) and after. Much closer in style are a series of lyric love-poems from Egypt of the 13th/12th centuries BC and occasionally later. The early and very international (and intercultural) character of lyric poetry is well exemplified by the text of the 'signs' of Ludingirra for his mother — composed in Sumerian by c. 1700 BC, it passed westward from Mesopotamia to the Hittites and by the 13th century BC became part of the literary repertoire among educated scribes at Ugarit in North Canaan: a copy found there was inscribed in four parallel columns in three languages: (two forms of Sumerian; Akkadian; Hittite)! The 'signs' show the same very ornate style as the Song of Songs and the Egyptian poems. The date and authorship of Song of Songs is a matter of debate. Its range of reference, its early poetic content, etc., may favour the reign of Solomon. More specifically his are Psalms 72 and 127, if not other pieces.

10. Heritage of the United Monarchy

There is no reason to doubt that this period was an age of considerable achievement. On the literary plane, a rich heritage had accumulated from the past: accounts of national origins, the national covenant, early journeyings and covenant renewal (Gn.-Dt.), clustering round the name of Moses. Joshua was pendant to these. Other documents included tribal genealogies, Ps. 90, collections like Yashar, etc., and poems (cf. Jdg. 5). Under the monarchy itself, a further flowering occurred. 'Prophetic' tradition produced Judges and Samuel in relation to the early years of David and Solomon respectively; plus Ruth on David's background. Under David, psalmody and music received a major impetus, especially for the cult, its daily, periodic and festal services. With Solomon, 'wisdom' in turn came to fruition, only partly preserved (cf. 1 Ki. 4: 31-33). As in the rest of the Near East, literature did not just 'appear' evenly and mechanically through time, but in flowerings when the human spirit was impelled to noble endeavour.

Notes

1 See TSFB 59 (Spring 1971), pp. 2-10; TSFB 60 (Summer 1971), pp. 3-11.
2 Two suggested later items are discussed below, §§ iii-iv.
3 Who may even have been an eye-witness, if he wrote in old age of events seen in his youth. I make no apology for dismissing the conventional literary-critical analyses of Joshua-Judges and Samuel, as they are based on the same hopelessly fallacious 'criteria' as are commonly used on the Pentateuch; they have been repeatedly refuted on internal grounds and fail also on external grounds—especially for the latter, see AO/OT, pp. 112-146, and Kitchen, Pentateuchal Criticism and Interpretation (TSF, 1965), with references.
4 In English versions, often translated 'describe'; but in Hebrew, it is katab, 'write', plus direct object.
5 For spr, cf. TSFB 59, p. 10 and n. 59, and ibid. 60, p. 4 and n. 6.
6 I.e. presumably at the end of a scroll of (proto-) Deuteronomy.
7 Excluding here Jos. 22: 3, 16 and 23: 8, 9, which all occur in reported speech by Joshua and others.

9 Unless this reference be held to refer to her descendants, this verse would suggest that the time that elapsed from the fall of Jericho to the basic composition of the book of Joshua fell within the lifespan of one woman—which would favour a quite early date of composition. On Rahab, cf. also Kaufmann, *op. cit.*, pp. 73-74.

10 Verses 17-18 run basically: 'David lamented (with) this lament over Saul and over Jonathan his son. And he spoke (i.e. commanded) to teach the sons of Judah "the Bow"—behold, what is written (or: (it is) written) in the book of Yashar (the upright); the lament then follows directly. 'The Bow' is probably nothing more than a short title by which the lament came to be known in David's time, deriving from the allusion to the 'bow of Jonathan' in the climactic middle verse 22. I do not concur with Harrison's view, *Introduction to the Old Testament* (Tyndale Press, 1970), p. 670, which is more ingenious than convincing; training songs for archers remain to be discovered, 'heroic age' or not; but with Harrison, one may certainly dismiss the supposed reference to Yashar in the LXX of 1 Ki. 8: 53 as secondary and spurious.


12 The twelfold division of Judah's districts could be of *any* date, and from the conquest period itself; it could well (e.g.) be based on groupings of the old Canaanite city-states.

13 As the greatest detail is given for Judah, this might reflect his tribal affiliation—or merely the incompleteness of occupation by other tribes by the time he wrote, for example.

14 There are sometimes other possibilities to be reckoned with: e.g., a name being at one site in the Late Bronze Age, but a shift in the site and name in the Iron Age to another spot nearby (cf. Aharoni, *op. cit.*, pp. 112-113).

15 Besides the possible evidence of Rahab (n. 9 above), one may note that the partial migration of Dan northwards mentioned in Jos. 19: 47 and more fully in Jdg. 18 is there dated to a period quite close to the initial 'conquest' as the Levite (18: 30) is a grandson of Moses.

16 Jdg. 1:10-15 would then be (for verses 1-9) an appended retrospect on Judah's earlier efforts; 16-19 may also belong therewith?

17 Witness Samuel's initial opposition to the monarchy (1 Sa. 8), and the progressive failure of Saul (1 Sa. 13: 13 ff.; 15: 17 ff.; 16: 1 ff.; 22: 17-22; 28: 6-20; 31).

18 In the entire book, the sole datum that looks as if it might be later is the allusion in Jdg. 18: 30 to their Levites serving Dan 'until the day of the captivity of the land' (the northern territory of Dan). As part of Israel, Dan here would at latest fall to Assyria in 722 BC, but before that, that area had been swallowed up by Tiglath-pileser III c. 733 BC (cf. his raid, 2 Ki. 15: 29; Abel-beth-maacah belongs with N. Dan), cf. Y. Aharoni and M. Avi-Yonah, *Macmillan Bible Atlas*, 1968, p. 95 and maps 147-8. Still earlier, N. Dan was taken by Ben-Hadad I of Aram-Damascus (1 Ki. 15: 20; 2 Ch. 16: 4), c. 890 BC. Any of these might date the verse 18: 30 as a later gloss from after one of these invasions. However, as pointed out by A. E. Cundall, *Judges* (Tyndale Press, 1968), p. 192, this verse is in the context of verse 31 that Mical's image was in N. Dan 'as long as the house of God was in Shiloh'—*i.e.* not until some incursion under the Divided Monarchy, but only until the Philistine destruction of Shiloh (cf. Ps. 78: 60; Je. 7: 12, 14; 26: 6), following on the capture of the ark (1 Sa. 4), perhaps c. 1070 (?) BC (my date). Also, David would hardly have tolerated such a cult in N. Dan in his time (Cundall, *loc. cit.*). In this case, of course, Jdg. 18: 30 is no later than the rest of the book.

19 In the light of Jdg. 1: 21, mentioning the Benjaminites' failure to expel the Jebusites from Jerusalem, they dwelling among them there 'to this day'. However, as Cundall, p. 58, notes, Jebusites remained there under David (2 Sa. 24: 16), so 1: 21 is not a certain criterion for dating—unless it be taken to imply Jebusite rule.


22 Who was perhaps a prophet like Nathan and Gad.
23 So with (e.g.) R. N. Whybray, *The Succession Narrative* (SCM Press, 1968), pp. 50-55; his doubts of full historicity (pp. 15-19) are only very slenderly based on the alleged total secrecy of sundry conversations—'secrecy' was no more total then than now; cf. also briefly my review in *The Churchman* 83 (1969), pp. 71-72.

24 Cf. *NPOT*, pp. 11-12.

25 Merely knocking off kings (Jos. 12) and their warrior-elites is not the same as settling into lands (cultivating or stock-keeping) and 'cities'.

26 Propagated by G. F. Moore and others; contrast in good measure G. E. Wright, *JNES* 5 (1946), pp. 105-114, drawing also on archaeological data.

27 For some details and fuller references, see Kitchen, *AO/OT*, pp. 61-69, incl. questions of Jericho and Ai (cf. *NBD*, pp. 215-6, 612-3); on the individual sites, *cf. NBD, passim*, and table, pp. 72 ff.

28 The usual identification, but now challenged on geographical grounds by D. Livingston, *Westminster Theol. Journal* 33 (1970), pp. 20-44. Any such change in locating Bethel automatically affects the location of Ai. Already, scepticism over Et-Tell as site of Ai was expressed in *AO/OT*, pp. 63 ff., especially as its occupational history better suits the known history of Beth-Aven (see J. Grinitz, *Biblica* 42 (1961), pp. 201-216).


31 *Cf.* Virolleaud, *Syria* 21 (1940), pp. 123 ff. (lists for fiscal purposes).


35 See Sasson, *op. cit.*, p. 43 (n. 33 above); the Battle of Qadesh was one big ambush against Ramesses II.


38 Thus, the enigmatic Cushan-rishathaim from Aram-Naharaim (Jdg. 3: 8-10) may have been a usurper in the realm there known as Hanigalbat, c. 1200 BC, on the eve of the final disruption of the old political order in Syria by the 'Sea Peoples'.


40 Largely dealt with in *HHAHT*, forthcoming.


45 See his classic paper in *BASOR* 143 (1956), pp. 17-22; *cf. AO/OT*, p. 158 f.

46 Possibly 1 Sa. 13: 1 may be restored to read that Saul was 30 years old and reigned 32 years; this point and the chronology of the judges' period, I hope to take up elsewhere. *Cf.* also the 40 years of Acts 13: 21.

47 See Mitchell in *NBD*, pp. 466-467 and refs.
A ruler known also from late classical sources; cf. Wiseman, *NBD*, pp. 527-8, and Kitchen, *HHAHT*, Table III.

Reaching the Euphrates, Lu ‘ash is only a province of the kingdom of Hamath, never a separate realm; also, Hittite Hieroglyphic texts from the kingdom of Hamath indicate its power northwards, *HHAHT*, Table V.


weeks, booths) on which pilgrims probably did come up to Jerusalem and its temple—cf. the fears of Jeroboam I (1 Ki. 12: 26-30), and 'psalms of ascent' (120-134); Ps. 92 is a sabbath-song. A covenant-renewal every seventh year (Dt. 31: 10-13) was too infrequent for special notice. This scope of worship is a far cry from the unverifiable extravagancies of a Mowinckel; cf. also AO/OT, pp. 102-106.

68 In Egypt, cf. the 'religion of the poor' psalms from Deir el Medina (Gunn, Journ. Eg. Archaeol. 3 (1916), pp. 81-94; Pritchard (ed.), Anc. Near E. Texts, pp. 380-381; Dalglish, Psalm Fifty-One, pp. 9-12), which are individual pieces, not segments of some official ritual.

69 Cf. already AO/OT, pp. 132-135, especially 134.


71 A word of warning is needful against over-rigid application of 'categories' (Gattungen), especially to only one context. For Sumer, cf. Krecher, p. 33, on fluidity of usage. And note that triumph-hymns, individually the creations of the reigns and deeds of Tuthmosis III and Amenophis III of Egypt, were re-employed in formal triumph-scenes and compositions on Ramesside gates and pylons (Kitchen and Gaballa, Zeitschr. f. Aegypt. Sprache 96 (1969), pp. 23-28, especially 27).

72 Note Krecher, Sumerische Kultlyrik, pp. 26-27.

73 Such are the Sumerian terms balbale, adah, tigi, ershemma, etc.; balag is a song with harp, and ershemma a lament with shem-drum, etc. (cf. Krecher, p. 21, n. 11).


75 Especially in the light of the ever-clearer early N-W Semitic affinities of so much in the Psalter (especially Ugaritic); most massively represented in M. Dahood, Psalms I, II, III (Doubleday, New York, 1966-70), who would put the Psalter in the 11th-6th centuries BC (III, pp. xxxv-xxxvii); the nature of LXX and Qumran evidence speaks against later dates.


77 For some details, see Kitchen, TSFB 41 (1965), pp. 17-20, NBD, pp. 431-432.


79 Cf. TSFB 41 (1965), p. 16.

80 As with priests of Amun in Dynasty XXII, and Libyan chiefs in Egypt in late Dynasty XXI; Kitchen, Third Intermediate Period in Egypt, forthcoming, also Kees, Priestertum, 1953 (cf. n. 56 end, above).

81 'Type I'; in Egypt, such are Hardjedef, Merikare, 'Sehetepibre', Man for His Son, Amenemhat I, and Amenemope.

82 'Type II'; in Egypt, Ptahhotep, Khety son of Duauf (Dua-kheti), High Priest Amenemhat, Amenakht, Anii, Onkh-sheshonqy; Ahiqar in Near East.

83 On concepts and vocabulary, cf. (e.g.) Kitchen, AO'OT, pp. 126-127, 145, with references. The latest treatment of Proverbs (W. McKane, Proverbs, (SCM Press, 1970)) makes some use of the Near Eastern data, but is still too dominated by outmoded approaches to use them fully and properly. A really 'new approach' will be found in Kitchen, Proverbs and the Ancient Near East, if completion and publication are ever permitted. The true relationship of Proverbs and Amenemope (neither borrowed from the other) will be found in J. Ruffle's forthcoming work when issued.


The phrase 'which pertains to Solomon' could indicate authorship—or rather that the poem concerned him (like the Ugaritic headings, *l-Aqht, l-Krt*, pertaining to Aqhat, '… Keret', on tablets containing their stories; *TSFB* 59, p. 10, n. 61), or was dedicated to him by a court poet. The oft-mooted Iranian loanwords (*appiryon, pardes*) could reflect post-exilic editing; or, perhaps they belong to an earlier wave of Indo-Aryan penetration into the Near East?

Contrary to common assumption, Ecclesiastes does not actually claim to be by Solomon—but by a 'son of David, king in Jerusalem'; these epithets could apply to any king of Judah from Solomon down to Zedekiah (*cf.* 'son of David' as epithet of Jesus Christ in the New Testament, Mt. 1: 1, 20, etc., etc.), and not only to Solomon. Hence, this book can be dated within simply the 10th-6th centuries BC, with possible later editing if two Iranian words (*pardes, pitgam*) require it.

Archaeologically, for example, one may see this in the unified architectural planning on several sites from Megiddo in the north and Gezer in the west to Ezion-Geber in the far south—only possible under a strong, united authority commanding appropriate skills (*cf.*, e.g., Y. Yadin, *The Art of Warfare in Biblical Lands* (Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1963), pp. 287-289).

Together with some modest editing (and perhaps orthographic revision) of the older heritage; *e.g.* possibly such phrases as Gn. 36: 31b, if not the king-list that follows it. *Cf.* *TSFB* 59, p. 9, n. 55.

Asaph, Heman and Ethan, being Levitical contemporaries of his, perhaps composed their psalms more specifically for the cult.
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