

# CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY

---

Representative Universalism and  
the Conquest of Canaan  
A. J. MATTILL

God's Tabernacles Among Men  
WALTER R. ROEHRS

Homiletics

Theological Observer

Book Review

VOL. XXXV

*January 1964*

No. 1

# Representative Universalism and the Conquest of Canaan

By A. J. MATTILL, JR.

EDITORIAL NOTE: In a letter Dr. Mattill, professor of Bible, Livingstone College, Salisbury, N. C., states that the terms Deuteronomist (D) and Yahwist (J) are used in his article to identify the passages in the Books of Joshua and Judges which are regarded by many as representing variant accounts by different authors. The use of these terms does not endorse the adoption of the source hypothesis. His article should "help to eliminate the need for such sources in Joshua and Judges."

The problem of the nature of the conquest of Canaan has long puzzled biblical scholars.<sup>1</sup> The Book of Joshua opens with the Lord promising Joshua "every place" that the sole of his foot shall tread upon, "from the wilderness, and this Leb-

<sup>1</sup> See L. W. Batten, "The Conquest of Northern Canaan: Joshua 11:1-9; Judges 4—5," *JBL*, XXIV (1905), 31—40; Lewis B. Paton, "Israel's Conquest of Canaan," *JBL*, XXXII (1913), 1—53 (contains bibliography); Harold M. Wiener, "The Exodus and the Conquest of the Negeb," *Bibliotheca Sacra*, LXXVI (1919), 468—74; Beatrice L. Goff, "The Lost Jahwistic Account of the Conquest of Canaan," *JBL*, LIII (1934), 241—49; Fleming James, "A Brief Summary of Some Recent Views as to the Date and Manner of the Conquest of Canaan," *Personalities of the O.T.* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1939), pp. 579—83; J. Alberto Soggin, "Ancient Biblical Traditions and Modern Archaeological Discoveries," *BA*, XXIII (1960), 95—100; George E. Mendenhall, "The Hebrew Conquest of Palestine," *BA*, XXV (1962), 66—87. See also Walter R. Roehrs, "The Conquest of Canaan According to Joshua and Judges," *CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY*, XXXI (1960), 746—760. This paper was read before Hood Theological Seminary, Salisbury, N. C., and before the Southern Section of the Society of Biblical Literature at Black Mountain, N. C. Scriptural quotations are from the ASV, "Lord" being substituted for "Jehovah."

anon, even unto the great river, the river Euphrates, all the land of the Hittites, and unto the great sea. . . . There shall not any man be able to stand before thee all the days of thy life" (1:1-5). Rahab tells the spies that she knows the Lord has given them the land (2:9), and the spies report to Joshua, "The Lord is delivering the whole land into our power" (2:24). After Joshua's campaign in south-central Canaan it is said that Joshua "smote all the land, the hill-country, and the South, and the lowland, and the slopes, and all their kings: he left none remaining, but he utterly destroyed all that breathed, as the Lord . . . commanded. And Joshua smote them from Kadesh-barnea even unto Gaza, and all the country of Goshen, even unto Gibeon. And all these kings and their land did Joshua take at one time because the Lord . . . fought for Israel" (10:40-42). And following his crowning victories in the north, we read, "Joshua took all that land, the hill-country, and all the South, and all the land of Goshen, and the lowland, and the Arabah, and the hill-country of Israel, and the lowland of the same; from Mount Halak, that goeth up to Seir, even unto Baal-gad in the valley of Lebanon under mount Hermon: and all their kings he took, and smote them, and put them to death. . . . So Joshua took the whole land, according to all that the Lord spake unto Moses . . ." (11:16, 17, 23). During the course of the conquest, Israel smote some 33 kings (12:1-24). After

the allocation of the land, the whole conquest is summarized by saying that "the Lord gave unto Israel all the land which he swore to give unto their fathers; and they possessed it and dwelt therein. And the Lord gave them rest round about . . . and there stood not a man of all their enemies before them; the Lord delivered all their enemies into their hand. There failed not aught of any good thing which the Lord had spoken unto the house of Israel; all came to pass" (21:43-45). In his farewell address Joshua tells the Israelites that "the Lord hath driven out from before you great nations and strong; but as for you, no man hath stood before you unto this day" (23:9).<sup>2</sup>

After reading these sweeping passages about Joshua's conquest of "all that land," one is quite perplexed to hear the Lord saying to Joshua, "Thou art old and well stricken in years, and there remaineth yet very much land to be possessed" (Joshua 13:1). 13:1-7 goes on to state that the land which remains to be conquered includes "all the regions of the Philistines," Phoenicia, and "all Lebanon." 13:13 informs us that Geshur and Maacah, two regions in Bashan, had not been taken. 15:13-19 describes the capture of Hebron and Debir by Caleb and Othniel. 15:63 admits that the inhabitants of Jerusalem could not be evicted. In 16:10 we learn that the inhabitants of Gezer had not been driven out. 17:11-18 reveals that the inhabitants could not be expelled from Dor on the coast and from a string of fortresses in the Valley of Jezreel—Bethshan, Ibleam, Taanach, Megiddo, and Endor. The disclosure in 18:3 that Israel was "slack"

to take possession of the land suggests that the conquest was not so complete and triumphant after all. And according to 19:47, Leshem also remained to be taken by the tribe of Dan.

As if this were not disconcerting enough, what a contrast to Joshua 1—12 is Israel's opening query in the Book of Judges: "Who shall go up for us first against the Canaanites, to fight against them?" (1:1). Judges 1 then goes on to picture individual tribes seeking, with varying success, to conquer a good part of their respective territories. Judah and Simeon defeated 10,000 Canaanites and Perizzites at Bezek (1:1-7) and took Hormah (1:17). Judah captured Jerusalem, Hebron, Debir, Gaza, Ashkelon, Ekron, and the highlands (1:8-15, 18, 19). Joseph took Bethel (1:22-26), but Manasseh, Ephraim, Zebulun, Asher, Naphtali, and Dan were unable to evict the inhabitants of many sites in their allotted portions (1:27-36). Judges 3:1-4 states that there remained "the five lords of the Philistines, and all the Canaanites, and the Sidonians, and the Hivites that dwelt in mount Lebanon, from mount Baal-hermon unto the entrance of Hamath."

No wonder that the virtually unanimous view of critical scholars has been that here are two mutually exclusive accounts of the conquest: according to the one, chiefly in Joshua, and usually attributed to the Deuteronomist (D), the entire land of Canaan was conquered by the united Hebrew army under Joshua; according to the other, in certain passages in Joshua and in Judges, usually attributed to the Yahwist (J), the settlement in Canaan was made gradually over many generations and not completed until the time of David; the subjugation

<sup>2</sup> A similar view of the conquest is also found in Deut. 1:7, 8; 11:22-25; 31:1-8.

of the land was the work of single tribes acting independently. Hence the J version is regarded as the one authentic account. Judges 1, in fact, is the "lost J account of the conquest," "one of the most precious monuments of early Hebrew history," which contravenes the Deuteronomic representation in Joshua 1—12 "at all essential points." D's version in Joshua 1—12 is scrapped as heroic sagas and local, separate, etiological tales of little historical value. It has been schematized, idealized, generalized, and nationalized according to later fanciful conceptions of a swift and complete conquest which ascribed to one man, one army, one nation, one generation, and one stroke of arms what was in fact the result of a long development—one which included the peaceful penetration and settlement of seminomadic groups. The Deuteronomist, wishing to show how the promise to the patriarchs was marvelously fulfilled under Joshua, was simply carried away with religious enthusiasm.<sup>3</sup>

Attempts have been made to reconcile these two pictures of a swiftly completed conquest and a slowly completed conquest by such conjectures as this one: Viewed in relation to the purpose and effect, the land was conquered and appropriated and the power of the Canaanites was broken. But through various causes, chiefly the

<sup>3</sup> See, for example, Lindsay B. Longacre, "Joshua," *Abingdon Bible Commentary* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1929), pp. 346, 353; George Foot Moore, *Judges* ("International Critical Commentary"; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1895), pp. 6—10; Robert H. Pfeiffer, *Introduction to the O. T.* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1941), pp. 296—301; H. H. Rowley, *The Growth of the O. T.* (New York: Hutchinson's University Library, 1950), pp. 53, 57, 58; for a bibliography of Alt and Noth, see Soggin, *op. cit.*

people's own fault, the work was not literally completed.<sup>4</sup>

A newer critical view has it that there is truth in both pictures. It is unfair to say that Joshua 1—12 represents the conquest as complete after a few campaigns. A closer study of the Deuteronomic passages 10:40, 41 and 11:16-22 reveals that even here D does not claim such regions as the Coastal Plain, the Plain of Jezreel, Jerusalem (taken by David), and Gezer (acquired by Solomon). Other Deuteronomic passages—Deut. 7:22, Joshua 23:4, 5, 11-13, and Judges 2:20—3:6—do not assert that the whole land was subjugated. According to D's theory, as well as according to J's view, the completion of the conquest was a long, drawn-out affair. In spite of his overstatements, D knows full well that the conquest under Joshua was incomplete. Moreover, Judges 1 is not the earliest and most reliable account of the conquest, not even a unified document, but a collection of fragments of differing worth, sometimes inferior in fact to parallels in Joshua 1—12. Archeological evidence indicates that such cities as Bethel, Lachish, Debir, Eglon, Hazor, and possibly Jericho were destroyed in Joshua's time, and that a number of towns had to be retaken, as indicated in Judges 1. Recent findings at Gibeon in tombs of the Late Bronze period make it probable that Gibeon was occupied in Joshua's time. And geographically speaking, Joshua 10 describes the precise way one would expect a conqueror to lead a campaign in the region later occupied by Judah. Likewise, studies of the amphictyony, which

<sup>4</sup> John McClintock and James Strong, "Joshua," *Cyclopedia of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1891), IV, 1028.

suggest that tribes would act together, support the picture of a unified assault which broke unified resistance but left much to be done by tribal action after Joshua's death. There is, then, no real contradiction between the various narratives of the conquest. Joshua 1—12 "schematizes" the story, but does not say that there was no work left to be done.<sup>5</sup>

To me this position seems much nearer to the truth than either the older critical view of two mutually exclusive accounts or the attempt at reconciliations by means of harmonization. But even this newer critical view remains mystified and embarrassed by those passages which insist that Joshua captured "the whole land" (11:23), for D knew as well as we that all the land was not taken, but only the key centers were destroyed. Such statements are therefore called "simplifications," "exaggerations," "telescoping," "foreshortenings," "overschematizations," "overstatements," "idealizations," "interpretations," and "hyperboles." Even the conservative scholar Yehezkel Kaufmann refers to the "terminological extravagance" of Joshua 10 and 11.<sup>6</sup>

Is there any way out of this dilemma

<sup>5</sup> W. F. Albright, "The Israelite Conquest of Canaan in the Light of Archaeology," *BASOR*, No. 74 (1939), 11—23; B. W. Anderson, *Understanding the O. T.* (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1957), pp. 80—84; John Bright, "Joshua," *The Interpreter's Bible* (Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1953), II, 547, 548, 609—13; James B. Pritchard, "A Bronze Age Necropolis at Gibeon," *BA*, XXIV (1961), 19—24; G. Ernest Wright, "Epic of Conquest," *BA*, III (1940), 25—40, and "The Literary and Historical Problem of Joshua 10 and Judges 1," *JNES*, V (1946), 105—14. For additional bibliography, see Soggin, op. cit.

<sup>6</sup> Yehezkel Kaufmann, *The Biblical Account of the Conquest of Palestine*, trans. M. Dagut (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1953), p. 85.

without resorting to forced harmonizations, irreconcilable conflicts, or uncomfortable statements about "overschematizations"? Fortunately, in N. T. studies a concept is now being used which should help us to understand D's passages of swift, universal conquest. This concept is that of "representative universalism." So far as I know, it has never before been applied to the problems of the conquest.

In Romans 15:19-24, Paul states that since he has "fully preached" the Gospel from Jerusalem around about even unto Illyricum and has no more room for work in those regions, he hopes now to fulfill his longing to come to Rome on his way to Spain. But how can even the indefatigable Paul have no more room to work in 300,000 square miles of territory? Must we take this passage with a grain of salt, as many critics do, and as many take the sweeping statements of Joshua? The Danish scholar Johannes Munck has given us the answer:

His (Paul's) line of thought must be that he has never imagined that every single person should hear the Gospel and come to a decision about it, but that all the Gentile nations should do so, and that by the fact that people in, e. g., Corinth, Ephesus, or Philippi came to a decision about the Gospel, the nation in that region had to decide for or against Christ. For the whole of the east, therefore, there has been a representative acceptance of the Gospel by the various nations, and that is why the apostle has no longer any room in that sphere of activity and is to go on to the Spaniards, Gauls, and Britons.

This Pauline train of thought, which we may describe as representative universalism, is Semitic. It assumes that a part takes the place of the whole. It does not anxiously ask whether all have now

had the opportunity of giving their answer to the Gospel; it asks what answer that part that has been approached has given. That answer is regarded as the answer of the whole to the offer of salvation.<sup>7</sup>

Instead, then, of "anxiously asking" whether each and every village and each and every individual in Canaan had been conquered, may we not ask whether representative parts had been taken? In light of the Semitic idea that the part stands for the whole, can we say with Joshua 1—12 that since Joshua had taken the key centers he had conquered the whole land?

To answer these questions we shall indicate on a chart the chief geographical

<sup>7</sup> Johannes Munck, *Paul and the Salvation of Mankind*, trans. Frank Clarke (Richmond, Va.: John Knox Press, 1959), pp. 53, 277, 278.

divisions of Canaan, divisions which are explicitly or implicitly recognized by D himself. These divisions cover Canaan from Mount Hermon to Mount Halak in the Negeb of Judah (11:17; cf. "from Dan to Beersheba"), and from the Arabian Desert to the Mediterranean Sea (1:4). Then we shall indicate what, if any, representative parts of these divisions D claims in Joshua 1—12, either through conquest or slaying of kings. We shall also point out sites D does not claim. To help clarify the relation between Joshua 1—12, on the one hand, and those passages indicating a slowly completed conquest (Joshua 13:1-7, 13; 15:13-19, 63; 16:10; 17:11-18; 18:3; 19:47; Judges 1), on the other hand, all of the sites in these passages which have been identified with some probability will be included on the chart.

### THE CONQUEST OF CANAAN

<i>Geographical Divisions</i>	<i>Representative Parts Claimed in Joshua 1-12</i>
I. THE COASTAL PLAIN	
A. Plain of Tyre	Joshua pursued the northern coalition (drawn from all of northern Palestine, from Jordan River to Great Sea) as far as Sidon and Misrephothmaim (11:8). The capture of the Phoenician cities of Sidon, Misrephothmaim, Tyre, and Ahlab not claimed.
B. Plain of Acre	Joshua captured Achshaph and slew its king (11:1, 12; 12:20). Capture of Aphek, Achzib, Acre, Nahalol, Rehob not claimed.
C. Plain of Sharon	Joshua captured Naphoth-Dor and killed its king (11:2, 12; 12:22), and killed king of Aphek in Sharon (12:18).
D. Plain of Philistia	Joshua conquered them from Kadesh-barnea as far as Gaza (10:41), perhaps gaining a foothold in Gaza (10:41; 11:22; 15:47). Capture of the five Philistine cities not claimed.
II. THE SHEPHELAH (שֵׁפְהֵלַיִם — 12:8)	
A. Northern Shephelah (foothills of Galilean mountains — 11:16)	Joshua captured Shimron and smote its king (11:1, 12; 12:20), as well as all the cities in the Shephelah, smiting their kings (11:2, 12).
B. Southern Shephelah (foothills of Judean mountains — 10:40; 11:16)	Joshua captured Makkedah, Libnah, Lachish, Eglon, Debir and slew their kings (10:23-32, 34, 35, 38, 39; 12:11-13, 15, 16). Joshua slew the kings of Jarmuth (10:3, 5; 10:22-27; 12:11), Gezer, Geder, Hormah (Hormah annihilated? — Num. 21:3), and Adullam (10:33; 12:12-15), but it is not said these places were taken. Aijalon, Bezek, Beth-shemesh (= Harheres?), and Shaalbim not said to have been captured.

<p>III. THE CENTRAL PLATEAU (הָהָר — 12:8)</p> <p>A. Galilee (the northern hill country — 11:2)</p> <p>1. Upper Galilee</p> <p>2. Lower Galilee</p> <p>B. Valley of Jezreel</p> <p>C. Highlands of Israel (Ephraim) (הַר - יִשְׂרָאֵל — 11:16)</p> <p>D. Highlands of Judah (הָהָר 10:40; 11:16)</p> <p>E. Negeb (הַנֶּגֶב — 10:40; 11:16; 12:8)</p>	<p>Joshua captured the Jebusites in the highlands and all the cities of those kings, slaying the kings (11:2, 3, 12). Capture of Lebanon not claimed.</p> <p>Hazor captured, burned, and its king slain (11:10, 11; 12:19), and king of Kedesh killed (12:22). Joshua burned none of the other fortified cities (11:13).</p> <p>Madon taken and its king slain (11:1, 12; 12:19).</p> <p>Shimron captured and its king killed (11:1, 12; 12:20). Kings of Taanach, Megiddo, Jokneam, and Harosheth-ha-goim (?12:23) slain (12:20-23), an indication of fighting in this historic battlefield, but the capture of these places and of Bethshan, Ibleam, Jezreel, and Endor not claimed.</p> <p>Shechem, the capital of this region, and Shiloh occupied (8:30-35; 24:1; 18:1). Perhaps north-central Canaan was settled a century before Joshua by Habiru, so that Joshua did not have to fight for this section but extended the covenant to include these kindred people. Some fighting here may be indicated, however, by the slaying of the kings of Tappuah, Hopher, Aphek, and Tirzah (12:17, 18, 24; cf. Num. 27:1, which mentions Hopher and Tirzah as Israelite clans).</p> <p>Ai (Bethel? — cf. 12:16; 7—8; 12:9) and Hebron (10:23-27; 10:36, 37; 12:10) taken and their kings killed. Treaty made with Gibeon (9). King of Jerusalem killed (10:23-27; 12:10), but capture of Jerusalem not claimed.</p> <p>Joshua conquered from Kadesh-barnea as far as Gaza (10:41). He also killed the king of Arad (12:14) (and destroyed Arad? Num. 21:1-3).</p>
<p>IV. THE JORDAN VALLEY (הַעֲרֵבָה — 11:16; 12:8)</p> <p>A. Arabah west of Jordan</p> <p>B. Arabah east of Jordan</p>	<p>Gilgal possessed (5:1-12), Jericho captured and its king slain (6; 12:9). Joshua also took all the cities of those kings in Arabah south of the Chinnereth and slew their kings (11:2, 12). By taking Jericho itself, Joshua possessed himself of Jordan Valley and established communication with Gilead and Bashan.</p> <p>Territory of Sihon taken from Sea of Chinnereth to Salt Sea (12:3).</p>
<p>V. THE TRANSJORDAN PLATEAU (Land beyond Jordan to the east, from river Arnon to Mount Hermon — 12:1)</p> <p>A. From Arnon to Jabbok</p> <p>B. From Jabbok to Mount Hermon</p>	<p>Israel slew Sihon and took his land (12:2, 3).</p> <p>Israel slew Og and captured his land (12:4-6). Joshua pursued the Hivites as far as the Valley of Mizpeh at foot of Hermon, evidently capturing their settlements and killing their kinglets (11:3, 8, 12). Not said that Geshur, Maachah, or Lesham (Dan) were captured.</p>

Now we can see how thoroughly D followed through with his conception of representative universalism. The chart reveals that according to Joshua 1—12 Israel under Moses and Joshua did lay claim to representative portions of each of these geographical divisions. According to D, "all the land" in a representative sense was indeed conquered in one fell swoop!

The chart also shows that D's claims in Joshua 1—12 to sites actually captured are not so sweeping as commonly supposed. Joshua 1—12 does not say that Israel under Joshua captured any of the cities mentioned in Judges 1 and fragments in Joshua (13:1-7, 13; 15:13-19, 63; 16:10; 17:11-18; 18:3; 19:47) except Dor, Hebron, and Debir. So far as Dor is concerned (Joshua 11:2, 12; 12:22; 17:11-18; Judges 1:27), Joshua's capture of it was probably a temporary one.

At present there seems to be no satisfactory way to solve the problems connected with the various accounts of the capture of Hebron (Joshua 10:23-26; 10:36, 37; 11:21, 22; 12:10; 14:12-15; 15:13, 14; Judges 1:9, 10) and Debir (Joshua 10:38, 39; 11:21, 22; 12:13; 15:15-19; Judges 1:11-15). Excavations, however, indicate that Debir fell late in the 13th century and that the first phase of Israelite occupation lasted only into the first half of the 12th century. Thus there could have been a second conquest of Debir. The same may have been true in Hebron. Since Hebron was not easily defended, and since it was logically the next town in the path of the conquest described in Joshua 10,<sup>8</sup> there is no sufficient reason to doubt that Joshua captured it (Joshua 10:36, 37).

<sup>8</sup> G. Ernest Wright, "The Literary and Historical Problem of Joshua 10 and Judges 1," p. 111.

In general it may be said that some of the expeditions of the Hebrews were what the Arabs call "razzias" (swift forays for momentary rather than for permanent conquest), and that after the raids had passed, the original inhabitants again reclaimed their sites. Joshua did not leave occupation forces in the cities captured but returned with his forces to Gilgal. Thus the great campaigns of Joshua had to be followed by a series of mopping-up operations.<sup>9</sup> "Every town thus far excavated was destroyed from one to four times during these centuries" (13th, 12th, 11th centuries).<sup>10</sup> But whether we are to think of razzias for momentary subjugation or campaigns for immediate settlement and permanent conquest, representative parts, and thus the whole, could be claimed by D.

At any rate, if D had been inventing and etiologizing with wild abandon, his narrative of the conquest would be much less reserved than it is. He undoubtedly would have pictured Joshua as taking many of the towns which Judges 1 and the fragments in Joshua say were captured later. Had D been carried away with his desire to show that the divine promises (Joshua 1:4) were fulfilled under Joshua, he would have had Joshua securely encamped far to the north and east on the banks of the Euphrates, to say nothing of having subjugated Lebanon and Phoenicia.

This concept of representative univer-

<sup>9</sup> F. R. Fay, *Joshua*, trans. George R. Bliss ("Lange's Commentary"; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1877), pp. 15, 16; Kaufmann, p. 86. Kaufmann finds Judges 1 to be "the perfect continuation of Joshua."

<sup>10</sup> George Ernest Wright and Floyd Vivian Filson, *The Westminster Historical Atlas of the Bible*, rev. ed. (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1956), p. 39.



salism as applied to the conquest also helps us to understand D's sweeping statements that Joshua "utterly destroyed all that breathed" (Joshua 10:40). Some scholars have concluded that D's picture is that Joshua captured the whole land and distributed it, empty of inhabitants, among the tribes. But D was perfectly aware that a remnant remained alive and breathing in the land (23:12). He was saying that since a representative part of the inhabitants had been slaughtered, the whole had been put under the ban.

Moreover, this theory gives us the key to D's emphasis on Joshua's smiting of the kings ("kinglets") of Canaan. "Representative kingship" was a related and ancient Near East conception. Like such other outstanding figures as the patriarchs, the king represented the whole of the people. In Israel, with its strong corporate sense, the king represented the whole people to Jahweh. The king was the people's representative, who spoke for the nation. The king as a representative individual was the true embodiment of the whole, the representative of the many, the incarnation of the group. Hebrew thought refers with equal facility to the representative king or to the nation he represents. When D, then, reports that Joshua has slain a king, he is not simply saying that one more individual has been killed. Rather, he has slain a representative figure who stands for the whole of his people. The scope of D's claim is thus clearly seen in Joshua 12, where he refers to 33 kings killed by Israel. When it is recalled that each of the 31 cities mentioned in vv. 9 ff. is each king's capital, and that his realm comprised other towns and villages several square miles in extent, then it is patent that D is laying

careful claim to significant, representative parts of the whole of Canaan.<sup>11</sup>

Again, on the view that D and J have given us two incompatible accounts of the conquest, there is no satisfying explanation as to why Joshua should allot the land to the tribes when so much remained to be conquered. Thus it is said that "there is a visionary character to this stage of the Deuteronomist's history which must not be forgotten. His dream, set down during the dark days of the Babylonian overlordship, is the full possession of the whole land, and he expresses Israel's claim to the land by his ordering of the materials regarding Joshua's conquest."<sup>12</sup> Our thesis, however, is that D presents Joshua as parceling out land not belonging to Israel, not because D was a starry-eyed dreamer and visionary, but because D was using representative universalism, according to which Joshua would allot the entire land because representative parts of it had been taken. This conception especially helps to explain 13:1-7, where Joshua knows that much land remains to be taken, yet he is to allot the land anyway.

There are also other considerations which support our contention that D was using the old Semitic concept of representative universalism. First, the concept of representative universalism is applied geographically in parts of the Bible other

<sup>11</sup> For a fuller discussion of representative kingship, though not in relation to the conquest, see *The Cambridge Ancient History*, ed. J. B. Bury et al (Cambridge: Univ. Press, 1929), III, 492, 493; H. Wheeler Robinson, "The Hebrew Concept of Corporate Personality," *BZAW*, LXVI (1936), 49—62; A. S. Tritton, "King (Semitic)," *Enc. Rel. & Ethics*, ed. J. Hastings (Edinburgh: Clark, 1914), VII, 726, 727.

<sup>12</sup> E. M. Good, "Joshua, Book of," *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1962), II, 992.

than Joshua and Romans. "Ephraim" came to refer not only to the territory assigned to one tribe but to all the territory of the ten northern tribes. Likewise "Judah" is representative of the tribes of the Southern Kingdom. So too "Samaria" became synonymous with the Northern Kingdom (1 Kings 13:32; Jer. 31:5). "Zion," originally referring to a fortified hill in Jerusalem (2 Sam. 5:6-10), comes to stand for the entire city and then for the heavenly Jerusalem (Rev. 14:1), which in turn embraces the entire new and perfect world (Rev. 22:1).

Second, D himself has used the concept of representative universalism in at least one other instance—in Deuteronomy 26:5b-10a, where he incorporates an ancient tabernacle confession. The worshiper is instructed to bring the first of the fruit of the ground to the sanctuary to symbolize that the consecration of a part of the crop consecrates the whole. Likewise Paul not only used the idea of representative universalism in connection with his "conquest" of the East (Rom. 15:23, 24), but also in connection with the firstfruits: "If the firstfruit is holy, so is the lump" (Rom. 11:16).

Third, D knew and used the related Semitic idea of the solidarity of the group: Yahweh visits the iniquities of the fathers upon the children (Deut. 5:9, 10); the Levirate marriage law points to a unitary group conception (Deut. 25:5-10); Achan's entire household is destroyed for Achan's crime (Joshua 7); the supposed rebellion of the Transjordanic tribes threatens to bring disaster upon all Israel (Joshua 22:19, 20); the doom of the Northern Kingdom is already sealed by the apostasy of Jeroboam I (1 Kings 14:16). This

conception of social solidarity is closely related to that of representative universalism, for both look at things not as isolated units but as solid wholes.

Fourth, it is increasingly recognized today that D was not a "scissors and paste" editor, patching together traditions of which he had no understanding, but that he was a competent historian. His "great work is not the outcome of a literary 'process of redaction,'" but "merits without qualification the rare and exalted title of historical writing."<sup>13</sup> Joshua 1—12 is "predominantly a re-writing of old material on the part of the Deuteronomist."<sup>14</sup> How, then, could such a historian have combined two mutually exclusive accounts of the conquest or even have been guilty of so many "overstatements" and "terminological extravagances"? We cannot claim that D simply respected his documents, "with no thought of the repetitions, or even the contradictions, that this might entail."<sup>15</sup> Such unawareness would be inconsistent not only with D's rank as a historian but also with the fact that D obviously knew both pictures of the conquest well. The slow conquest is found not only in the J materials, which he edited, but also in his own D materials. D was neither unaware of the facts, nor did he seek to conceal them. Nor can we find refuge in the fact that the Hebraic mind was not strictly logical at all times. Although the Hebraic

<sup>13</sup> Gerhard von Rad, *Studies in Deuteronomy*, trans. David Stalker ("Studies in Biblical Theology, No. 9"; London: S. C. M., 1953), p. 74.

<sup>14</sup> G. Ernest Wright, "The Literary and Historical Problem of Joshua 10 and Judges 1," p. 114, note 37.

<sup>15</sup> L. H. Grollenberg, *Atlas of the Bible*, trans. and ed. Joyce M. H. Reid & H. H. Rowley (New York: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1956), pp. 56, 57.

mind was not so addicted to logical consistency as the modern Western mind, there nevertheless must have been limits of contradiction beyond which even the Hebraic mind could not pass. The very fact that a Deuteronomic editor included material in Joshua parallel to that in Judges 1 is "enough to refute the charge that he wished to present a theory of the Conquest incompatible with it."<sup>16</sup> The answer to the problem is found in our contention that D knew and used the Semitic conception of representative universalism.

But may we not go still further to suggest that D did not impose this concept of representative universalism on his materials, but that it goes back to Joshua himself? If, as we are contending, Joshua in fact was the leader of a major onslaught against Canaan which involved the conquest of key centers, the slaying of kings, and the exterminating of people, is it unreasonable to suppose that Joshua himself charted the strategy of conquest according to the concept of representative universalism?<sup>17</sup>

<sup>16</sup> Bright, p. 547.

<sup>17</sup> This line of thought, if true, has implications in respect to the authorship of the Book of Joshua.

In sum, with the aid of this ancient concept of representative universalism, in which a part stands for the whole, we no longer need to speak of "overschematizations" and "overstatements" in respect to the sweeping statements in Joshua. Much less do we need to think in terms of outright contradictions. Nor need we engage in forced harmonizations. Rather, we can say forthrightly, in the sense of representative universalism, that "the Lord gave unto Israel all the land which he swore to give unto their fathers . . . and there stood not a man of all their enemies before them . . ." (Joshua 21:43, 44). And, like D, we may go on to say, with no sense of contradiction, that the war was still going on in full swing: "Which of us is to be the first to go up against the Canaanites to attack them?" (Judges 1:1)<sup>18</sup>

Salisbury, N. C.

<sup>18</sup> A study of the titles of the Old Babylonian kings might produce additional evidence for our thesis. These kings received such titles as "king of the universe" (*šar kiššati*) or "king of the four quarters" (IUGAL.AN.UB.DA.LIMMU.BA). Such titles may have been based upon the control of representative cities. Moreover, it may be that such kings as Sargon II claimed conquest of vast regions on the basis of the conquest of representative parts.