



This is a peer-reviewed, post-print (final draft post-refereeing) version of the following published document, Published online 17 Oct 2013 and is licensed under All Rights Reserved license:

**Pitkänen, Pekka M A ORCID logoORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0021-7579> (2014) Pentateuch-Joshua: a settler-colonial document of a supplanting society. *Settler Colonial Studies*, 4 (3). pp. 245-276. doi:10.1080/2201473X.2013.842626**

Official URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/2201473X.2013.842626>

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/2201473X.2013.842626>

EPrint URI: <https://eprints.glos.ac.uk/id/eprint/1128>

#### **Disclaimer**

The University of Gloucestershire has obtained warranties from all depositors as to their title in the material deposited and as to their right to deposit such material.

The University of Gloucestershire makes no representation or warranties of commercial utility, title, or fitness for a particular purpose or any other warranty, express or implied in respect of any material deposited.

The University of Gloucestershire makes no representation that the use of the materials will not infringe any patent, copyright, trademark or other property or proprietary rights.

The University of Gloucestershire accepts no liability for any infringement of intellectual property rights in any material deposited but will remove such material from public view pending investigation in the event of an allegation of any such infringement.

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR TEXT.

This is a peer-reviewed, post-print (final draft post-refereeing) version of the following published document:

**Pitkänen, Pekka M A (2014). *Pentateuch–Joshua: a settler-colonial document of a supplanting society.* *Settler Colonial Studies*, 4 (3), 245-276. ISSN 2201-473X**

Published in *Settler Colonial Studies*, and available online at:

<http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/2201473X.2013.842626>

We recommend you cite the published (post-print) version.

The URL for the published version is

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/2201473X.2013.842626>

### **Disclaimer**

The University of Gloucestershire has obtained warranties from all depositors as to their title in the material deposited and as to their right to deposit such material.

The University of Gloucestershire makes no representation or warranties of commercial utility, title, or fitness for a particular purpose or any other warranty, express or implied in respect of any material deposited.

The University of Gloucestershire makes no representation that the use of the materials will not infringe any patent, copyright, trademark or other property or proprietary rights.

The University of Gloucestershire accepts no liability for any infringement of intellectual property rights in any material deposited but will remove such material from public view pending investigation in the event of an allegation of any such infringement.

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR TEXT

# **Pentateuch-Joshua: A Settler-Colonial Document of a Supplanting Society<sup>1</sup>**

Pekka Pitkänen

University of Gloucestershire

Revised version, 30/8/13

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor and Francis in *Settler Colonial Studies* on 17 October 2013, with Version of Record available online at <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/2201473X.2013.842626>.

## **Abstract**

This article examines the ideology of Pentateuch-Joshua in comparison with recent social scientific scholarship on settler-colonialism and supplanting societies. It argues that Pentateuch-Joshua can be seen as a legitimating document for ancient settler-colonialism and supplanting.

## **Introduction**

The bible can be seen as one of the foundational documents of Western civilization. With the expansion of the Christian religion into a truly global religion over the past century or two and the continuing spread of Christianity in at least a number of parts of the world, the bible is likely to continue influencing people and societies at least for the foreseeable future. Thus, questions about its interpretation are likely to be of continuing significance. For Christians, the bible consists of the Old and New Testaments, each a collection of various works that were composed at differing times and with a variety of content. The Jews only consider the pre-Christian Old Testament, or, as they call it, the Hebrew Bible, as a sacred corpus of texts. Within the Hebrew Bible,<sup>2</sup> the most holy collection for the Jews is the *torah* (law/instruction), or, as the Christians call it, the Pentateuch. This unique entity, consisting of the five books of Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers and Deuteronomy tells the story of ancient Israel that starts from the creation of the world, including humans, and describes the origins of culture. After a cataclysmic flood, Yahweh, the god of the Israelites tells a man called Abraham who lives in Mesopotamia to migrate to the land of Canaan and promises this land to him and his descendants. A famine causes Abraham's descendants to move to Egypt, and in the course of time they become slaves to the Egyptians. Yahweh however appears to a man called Moses in a revelation and tells him to lead the Israelites out of Egypt. Helped with plagues that Yahweh sends on Egypt, the Israelites leave Egypt and congregate at Mount Horeb in the wilderness where Yahweh appears to them and gives them laws that are to act as a foundation of their new society that is to be established in the land of Canaan that Yahweh had already promised to their forefather Abraham. In the process, the Israelites are to eradicate the decadent Canaanites, the indigenous peoples of the land. Further laws are given in the wilderness and the people traverse through it, encountering some difficulties along the way. The Pentateuch ends with Moses making a final sermon in the land of Moab at the edge of the promised land, giving further laws for the Israelites to keep in the new land. The book of Joshua continues the story and describes how the Israelites actually conquer and settle the land after the death of Moses.<sup>3</sup>

A person familiar with the concept of settler colonialism may immediately suspect that this foundational story about ancient Israel's origins attests settler colonial features, and basic characteristics of settler colonialism in the narrative have already been pointed out and analysed.<sup>4</sup> However, there has not been a detailed analysis of the narrative with reference to settler colonialism and settler colonial theory. Also, previous analyses have generally considered the narrative as not reflecting actual historical events. In fact, to date there has been only very limited analysis of settler colonialism in the ancient world as a whole.<sup>5</sup> This essay will read the books from Genesis to Joshua as a work that is a product of a settler colonial encounter associated with the ancient highlands of Canaan at the end of the second millennium BCE, and even at least partially a related ideological blueprint. In order to do that, I will first contextualize the study of the texts in terms of past scholarship in biblical studies. I will then present settler colonial theory and propose reasons why settler colonial theory can also be applicable to ancient societies. After this, I will compare the biblical materials with settler colonial theory, focusing on related identifiable processes of conquest. I will conclude the essay with some implications of the study.

### **Pentateuch-Joshua and Biblical Studies**

The beginnings of modern academic study of the Pentateuch (and the Old Testament in general) can be traced to the enlightenment and the latter part of the 18<sup>th</sup> century. In the classical theory that was formulated the 19<sup>th</sup> century, the book was essentially divided into four different sources, J, E,<sup>6</sup> D<sup>7</sup> and P<sup>8</sup>, with each of the sources being seen to date centuries apart and as having been successively redacted in towards the formation of the work as we have it today.<sup>9</sup> The final version of the work has often been seen as dating from the postexilic period, in line with the dating of the P source to that time. A key issue here is that the work was seen as having formed in many ways in an almost chance and haphazard way, with its overall message not being particularly clear, at least not at first sight. While the view described became initially a strong consensus, the extent, dating and provenance of each of the sources has since then been extensively debated and even hotly contested, even though, except for some works that have argued for a more unified appropriation of the work, the basic idea of a source division and the successive combination of sources over a long period of time, together with redactional activity, has persisted.<sup>10</sup> As part of all these considerations, importantly for our purposes here, whether one should actually not be speaking of a Pentateuch, but rather a Hexateuch that includes the book of Joshua has also been a matter of debate. For example, while the Pentateuch can be seen to end with the death of Moses, the great liberator and lawgiver, as already suggested above, the story of promises to the patriarchs, stay and slavery in Egypt, and liberation and stay in the wilderness is logically concluded by the conquest and settlement of the land of Canaan that is described in the book of Joshua,<sup>11</sup> and this is relevant for potential connections with settler colonialism, the focus of this essay.

In this context, I will first suggest that we should rather be speaking about a Hexateuch than a Pentateuch, or, as will be labeled for this essay, about Pentateuch-Joshua.<sup>12</sup> The concept of a Hexateuch is in itself not new. For example, Julius Wellhausen, the most influential scholar of the Old Testament/Hebrew Bible, was in favour of it.<sup>13</sup> And, notably, Gerhard von Rad analysed the composition and theology of the Hexateuch from the perspective that it was ultimately a theology of the Yahwist (J source) to which everything else had been added.<sup>14</sup> The situation was changed,

however, with the publication of Martin Noth's theory of the Deuteronomistic History, according to which Deuteronomy-Kings was a unified historical work by a single author that was written during the Babylonian exile.<sup>15</sup> Noth's work proved paradigm-shifting, in that almost all scholars subsequently followed his views,<sup>16</sup> even when there were modifications to his theory, most notably proposals outlining double and triple redactions of the Deuteronomistic History.<sup>17</sup> The theory of the Deuteronomistic History has however come under increasing criticism recently,<sup>18</sup> and at present a number of scholars have also returned to the idea of a Hexateuch.<sup>19</sup>

In my view, importantly, the concept of a Hexateuch, or Pentateuch-Joshua best accounts for the texts from a thematic-literary perspective.<sup>20</sup> There is an overall chiasmic structure that encompasses Pentateuch-Joshua (see Figure 1 at the end of the essay).<sup>21</sup> Above all, the promises to the Patriarchs find their fulfillment in the book of Joshua. In addition, such literary features as splitting the sea in Exodus and splitting of the Jordan in Joshua,<sup>22</sup> plus other connections of Joshua with what precedes in the Pentateuch are significant.<sup>23</sup>

All in all, the prominence of a source critical approach to the Pentateuch and the prominence of the theory of the Deuteronomistic History have until recently limited synchronic readings of Pentateuch-Joshua.<sup>24</sup> In addition, a concomitant late dating for the work as a whole has generally seen it as primarily addressing the concerns of a late postexilic period, arguably in at least a relatively unclear manner. In this essay, I will propose a new essentially synchronic reading of the material<sup>25</sup> that sees the work as an essentially unified composition that also attests a clear purpose as to why it was written. This reading will also at least potentially imply a different provenance for the work than has generally been advocated thus far.

## **Settler Colonialism and Ancient Colonialisms**

### *Defining Settler Colonialism*

Settler colonialism should be seen as separate from "ordinary" colonialism, even though the two often overlap and help define each other.<sup>26</sup> Many of the developments in the study of settler colonialism are very recent, with the field still in a number of ways at an incipient, even though already fruitful stage.<sup>27</sup> As Wolfe describes it, settler colonialism is a specific complex social formation.<sup>28</sup> One important defining characteristic in settler colonialism is the concept of a settler. Settlers come to stay, whereas colonial sojourners, such as administrators, military personnel, entrepreneurs and adventurers return.<sup>29</sup> There is also a crucial distinction between settlers and migrants. Settlers are *founders* of political orders and carry their sovereignty with them, while migrants are *appellants* who face a political order that is already constituted.<sup>30</sup> In addition, as Veracini describes it, "while settlers see themselves as founders of political orders, they also interpret their collective efforts in terms of an inherent sovereign claim that travels with them and is ultimately, if not immediately, autonomous from the colonising metropole".<sup>31</sup> A further characteristic of settler colonialism is that whereas colonialism is a master-servant relationship where the colonised people are often used for exploitative purposes, in a settler colonial situation, the indigenous person is characterised by their *dispensability*.<sup>32</sup> In other words, indigenous peoples can, and in fact are actively made to "vanish", and this is effected by a varying set of actions called *transfer*.<sup>33</sup> These range from liquidation and

deportation to various ways where indigenous peoples are in effect assimilated to the settler collective, whether culturally, administratively or conceptually.<sup>34</sup> Settler colonialism is a structure rather than an event where an initial invasion gives rise to a prolonged process of eliminating the indigenous population.<sup>35</sup> The dynamics of the settler colonial situation are further defined by a tripartite division between the settler collective and indigenous and exogenous others. The exogenous others are made of immigrants and representatives of metropolis.<sup>36</sup> While indigenous others are a threat to the existence and legitimacy of the settler collective, there can be a selective inclusion of exogenous others as there is the possibility of collaboration.<sup>37</sup> However, there can also be undesirable exogenous others who may be subject to deportation or segregation,<sup>38</sup> and abject others who are permanently excluded from the settler collective and have lost their indigenous or exogenous status.<sup>39</sup> A “successful” settler society, then, “is managing the orderly and progressive emptying of the indigenous and exogenous others segments of the population economy and has permanently separated from the abject others”.<sup>40</sup> In many ways, the whole process involves replacing an old society or societies with a new one(s), in other words, a settler colonial society can also be called a supplanting society.<sup>41</sup> The study of settler colonialism can also help understand some innersocietal assimilation and eliminatory processes, such as the Nazi genocide and the elimination of witches in medieval Europe.<sup>42</sup>

#### *Applying Settler Colonial Study to the Ancient World*

As already indicated, until the present time, the study of settler colonialism has been confined to the modern world. Much of this may be due to the short history of its study thus far. Also, it is fair to say that a number of aspects of settler colonialism can be most easily related to the modern world.<sup>43</sup> For example, as Wolfe suggests, the pace, scale and intensity of certain forms of modern genocide that have tended to accompany settler colonialism require the centralized technological, logistical and administrative capacities of the modern state,<sup>44</sup> and that global markets, communications and chains of command together with state protection existed was also instrumental for the success of settler colonialism.<sup>45</sup> In addition, racism as an ideology characteristic of modernity enabled distinction, consideration of the other as inferior, and then exploitation, violence and even genocide.<sup>46</sup>

One may then ask if settler colonialism is wholly a modern phenomenon, without any attestation or precedent in the ancient world. On a related note, studies of ancient colonialisms have in general paid considerable emphasis on the problem of (dis)continuity between ancient and modern colonialisms.<sup>47</sup> Many of such studies deal with ancient Greek and Roman colonialisms where the Greek and Roman societies were in the past considered as models for European colonialism, but at the same time, the ancient colonialisms were read based on modern imperialistic and colonial agendas, resulting in distorted images.<sup>48</sup> With newer readings, scholars have increasingly detected situations of colonialism where colonizers and colonised coexist without any accompanying domination or violence.<sup>49</sup> Also, emphasis is put on analyzing mutual interaction and mutual cultural influence, and even resulting “unintended” consequences of colonialism.<sup>50</sup> And yet, these studies do also include studies of colonialism by empires, such as the ancient Roman and Inca empires that included coercion and exploitation of the labour of subject peoples as part of their policies.

In order to attempt to analyse settler colonialism in the ancient world, we should then attempt to detect features in it that transcend modernity and can apply to ancient societies.<sup>51</sup> Due regard should also be given to any differences, and one also needs to consider that each colonial situation is likely to have its own unique features.<sup>52</sup> And, of course, one will have to try to avoid such pitfalls as trying to read from modernity into the ancient world and then perhaps also read back from the ancient world into modernity etc., a consideration that applies to much if not most or all study of the ancient world.<sup>53</sup> I will consider some main common issues and features of settler colonialism that transcend modernity in the following, and will make reference to any others as part of the analysis of the biblical text that follows. These include intergroup violence, access to resources (including land), the objectives of colonizers and migrations of peoples.

John Docker's *The Origins of Violence* concentrates on the study of intergroup violence in a historical dimension.<sup>54</sup> Docker's argument is that violence is an intrinsic characteristic of humanity and that the history of humanity is a history of violence.<sup>55</sup> Docker also refers throughout to the work of Raphael Lemkin who first coined the term genocide and also connected genocide with colonialism.<sup>56</sup> Docker includes examples from literary products of the ancient world, such as Herodotus and Thucydides, Cicero's *Republic*, Virgil's *Aenid* and Tacitus's *Agricola* and *Germania*. A consideration of the basic narrative contours of the biblical exodus and conquest are also included, even if, as already indicated, Docker does not see the biblical story as reflecting actual events.<sup>57</sup> Interestingly, Docker points out that the concepts of group identity and group violence are not limited to humans. A recent study of chimpanzees demonstrated that they could develop a strong sense of group identity and could exhibit mass murder and even annexation of the territory of other chimpanzees after completely exterminating them.<sup>58</sup> These examples do help suggest that group identity and group violence are inherent to humans. In terms of the ancient world, this idea is further corroborated by the fact that we do know that there have been wars throughout the 5,000 year human history, and this includes the ancient Near East from where first historical records are attested. In this respect, we do also know that ancient Near Eastern peoples did have group identities, including ethnic ones.<sup>59</sup> And, we do know that while the concept of race was not pervasive, the ancients could exhibit prejudices and feelings of superiority based on cultural differences.<sup>60</sup>

In terms of access to resources, it is probably the concept of land has been of crucial importance already since the ancient times. Wars are generally fought to achieve something, and this is typically about access to resources, often territorial ones, even if indirectly. For example, it was typical in the ancient world for a dominant imperial entity to demand taxes from the subjugated.<sup>61</sup> Of course, just as with individual human interactions, violence does not always need to be involved in group dealings, but peaceful means may be utilised, including trade between representatives of groups.

This then leads to one important factor in the study of ancient and modern colonialisms alike: the objectives of colonizers. As Gasco suggests, the process of colonization is generally set into motion by one party in the encounter: the colonizers. Colonizers who move from their homeland into a territory held by another society do so because they have some objective in mind and generally some idea of how they are

going to accomplish it.<sup>62</sup> These, as already indicated, include access to resources, including land, which itself could be achieved by collaboration with the host society, or by subjugating and exploiting the colonized. With settler colonialism, the level of dominance is taken further, with the idea of elimination of natives, at least partially so, rather than collaboration or “mere” exploitation.<sup>63</sup> Also keeping in mind the considerations above, settler colonialism could thus at least potentially have taken place in the ancient world. And, it seems reasonable to suggest that these differing modes of colonialism could even have coexisted, as with the modern world.<sup>64</sup> But there is an accompanying important question of how well colonizers can implement their objectives in practice. For example, resistance by the colonized can thwart the plans of the colonizers. A society set on conquest and colonisation of another society can simply lose a war that was initiated in order to begin accomplishing planned objectives in terms of the other society. In addition, societies are rarely homogeneous, and the actions of individual players can be significant. In this, societal decisions are often made by the elite, especially so in ancient societies. If so, and the elite is only a small part of the population,<sup>65</sup> the views and objectives of the elite may differ even significantly from those of the general population.<sup>66</sup> One may also naturally think that the objectives of the colonizers can change over time, either in theory or practice. The colonizers can for example even become colonized if power relations change.<sup>67</sup> Moreover, the characteristics and resistance of colonized peoples can vary over geographical localities and over time. And, unexpected reactions and interactions may occur, accounting for what have been called as “unintended consequences” of colonialism.<sup>68</sup> All in all, we can have thus have locality, hybridity,<sup>69</sup> syncretism, etc., as pointed out by previous studies of (ancient) colonialism.<sup>70</sup>

That migrations of peoples have taken place throughout history is also significant for the study of ancient settler colonialism, as settler colonialism usually involves migration.<sup>71</sup> However, as already indicated, the crucial difference is whether the migrants are primarily suppliants who eventually integrate into the host society, or if they become a dominant force in the new society, changing it into their own liking with a sovereignty that derives from them rather than from the host society (in which case they can for classificatory purposes be called settlers). One may imagine that objectives of the migrants and means available to them to accomplish their objectives are crucial in how the situation plays out. Naturally, the issues of locality, hybridity and syncretism etc. are also likely to apply in such cases. A crucial difference in comparison with the study of modern settler colonialism in this respect is that, as far as it is known, ancient migrants generally did not seem to keep a political link to their source of origin,<sup>72</sup> that is, there apparently was no supporting metropolis for them. However, this is not a hindrance to potential study of settler colonialism in the ancient context, as there is no reason to exclude the possibility that ancient migrants could also have ideas of sovereignty that travelled with them or eventually developed at their destination.<sup>73</sup> There is also no reason to think that the migrants could not have distinguished themselves from the indigenes in terms of group identity. In terms of a postulated tripartite division of a settler society, as it seems rare that migration happens very much at one go, it is likely that there will be later migrants, and in any case there can also be other potential exogenous others who will arrive to the scene after a settler society has been established. It is thus likely that a tripartite division would emerge, even though it may at least in some cases be necessary to present evidence or at least plausible considerations for its existence. And yet, it would seem

that the existence of settlers and indigenous others is already sufficient for a settler colonial analysis.<sup>74</sup>

The above common themes are not dependent on modernity or a particular societal formation, and thus we can fairly confidently suggest one cannot claim that the phenomenon of settler colonialism must be restricted to modernity.<sup>75</sup> Accordingly, it is justified to attempt its study for the ancient world from a comparative perspective, highlighting both similarities and differences with the modern world. As part of the study of the ancient world, archaeological considerations are important. This is partly because textual remains from the ancient world are often at least relatively meagre, and for some societies and periods they are nonexistent. Or, extant texts may say nothing that is easily relatable to the study of colonialism. In addition, textual evidence reveals ideologies, some of which are more factual and some more fictional, and textual evidence is always also representational and partial.<sup>76</sup> At the same time, material remains are in themselves “silent” and their study requires an interpretative framework. Material remains also usually reveal a different aspect of societies than texts. They are always incomplete and partial, for example, there will in practice always be a limited number of excavations, and by no means have all material remains from antiquity survived. As texts and material remains reveal different aspects of a society, they should be considered as complementary sources.<sup>77</sup> However, there can also be tension, and at times even at least an apparent contradiction between text and archaeology.<sup>78</sup> So a combination of the two lines of inquiry seems appropriate, reflecting critically on differences of scope and any tensions.<sup>79</sup>

Interestingly, there is a difficulty with detecting violence in the archaeological record across the board.<sup>80</sup> Except for ancient texts, one way to detect violence is destruction layers, but, except for accidents of survival, there can also be cases where people are killed without any significant damage to material remains.<sup>81</sup> Burials, grave goods and skeletal remains could be a further way to detect violence,<sup>82</sup> but there are not always enough extant remains, and those that exist may not necessarily be representative.<sup>83</sup> Thus, it would in fact not seem as entirely surprising that a lot of recent archaeologically oriented discussions about past colonialisms have involved examples where collaboration has been considered as the main mode of colonialism, even though in some cases more direct exploitation has been seen to have been involved, too.<sup>84</sup>

Actual examples where settler colonialism may have been involved in the ancient world include prehistoric Uruk,<sup>85</sup> Aramean infiltrations in northern Mesopotamia towards the end of the second millennium,<sup>86</sup> ancient Moab,<sup>87</sup> Etruria,<sup>88</sup> Greece<sup>89</sup> and Rome.<sup>90</sup> In all these cases, it appears that settler colonialism took place in a small scale and was not necessarily intended as total from an ideological perspective.<sup>91</sup> In addition, Hittite, Assyrian and Inka forced relocations of population groups may also be seen to partially reflect settler colonialism as their purpose was to change the population mix and thus the thinking of the target populations so that they would not rebel politically in the future.<sup>92</sup> However, as the primary objective of the colonizers in these cases was not to eliminate the local populations, even when this did happen on selected occasions, so the processes apparently cannot necessarily be considered as settler colonial as a whole. This said, as I will argue below, ancient Israel presents an example of a macroscale application of ancient settler colonialism.

## **Pentateuch-Joshua as an Ancient Settler-Colonial Document**

I have now presented some pertinent methodological considerations and suggested reasons for why it is at least potentially possible to consider that settler colonialism could also have happened in the ancient world, together with elucidating some differences between the modern and ancient worlds. I will next present reasons for seeing Pentateuch-Joshua as a document that is a product, even at least partially an ideological blueprint for settler colonialism associated with the ancient highlands of Canaan at the end of the second millennium BCE. I will in particular draw on the work of David Day, *Conquest: How Societies Overwhelm Others*.<sup>93</sup> This is because Day's work outlines an overall process of conquest that ties with settler colonialism and, as will be argued below, its suggested framework can be seen to nicely correspond with the literary presentation of the biblical documents (Pentateuch-Joshua) and related broad archaeological evidence. Day's work does not include certain aspects of settler colonial theory,<sup>94</sup> but these have now been outlined above, and any additional considerations will be included as appropriate in the presentation below. I will include both textual and archaeological data in the process, attempting to integrate perspectives from both. I will consider the textual testimony as significant, but will also be reading it as a product of and representing the views of an author or authors that are situated in an ancient society and setting(s).<sup>95</sup>

### *Settler-Colonialism and Supplanting*

In terms of terminology, Day essentially labels settler-colonial societies as supplanting societies, a description which fits well with the idea that one society is "taking over" another and through various processes "erases" the other society from existence.<sup>96</sup> Certainly, this seems to be happening in ancient Israel, in that the Late Bronze Age Canaanite societies seem to subsequently more or less "vanish" from existence, replaced by a new Israelite society, even regardless of what one thinks about the date, provenance and historical reliability of the related biblical documents.

Interestingly, Day suggests, with reference to numerous examples from recent world history, that a "process of supplanting" by a society involves three stages: "Firstly, it must establish a legal or *de jure* claim to the land".<sup>97</sup> Then, "a supplanting society must proceed to the next stage of the process by making a claim of effective or *de facto* proprietorship over the territory that it wants to have as its own".<sup>98</sup> Such a claim "is commonly established by exploring the territory's furthest reaches, naming its geographic and other features, fortifying its borders, tilling its soil, developing its resources, and, most importantly, peopling the invaded lands".<sup>99</sup> Lastly, "the last and most elusive step of the process...involves establishing a claim of moral proprietorship over the territory".<sup>100</sup> For this to succeed, "such a claim must outweigh the claim that any other society, including the previous inhabitants, has the potential to assert".<sup>101</sup> Again, at least at first sight, this seems to be happening in ancient Israel according to the biblical documents. In broad sweep, which we will be refining further below, for the Israelite society, the patriarchal promises reflect the first point, the conquest and settlement the second, and recourse to Yahwism as an exclusive ideology, together with the constitution of the new society (as in e.g. Deuteronomy and the Holiness Code in Leviticus) and its contrast with the practices of the previous inhabitants (e.g. Deuteronomy 7) the moral claim.

Day then goes further by identifying typical processes that accompany these three stages, commenting that these processes are often overlapping (as are the three main stages).<sup>102</sup> These are, staking a legal claim, mapping the territory, claiming by naming, supplanting the savages, claiming by right of conquest, defending the conquered territory, using foundation stories, tilling the soil, recourse to genocide where appropriate and peopling the land. I will take these as pointers and a framework for the following analysis, with some slight modifications as some of the features can be seen as slightly overlapping for our purposes here.<sup>103</sup> I will also add a final section, organising the supplanting society, to reflect on certain issues relating to the moral claim, plus some considerations about theological themes and cognitive dissonance in the presentation of Pentateuch-Joshua.

### *Staking a legal claim*

As indicated above, an important part of the mindset of a settler-colonial or supplanting society is to establish a satisfactory legal claim to the land they wish to make their own. As described by Day, with reference to recent colonial history, such a claim is often marked by a ceremony that the “discoverers” of a new land enact.<sup>104</sup> In this, the English, Spanish, Portuguese, Dutch and the French had slightly differing practices. For example, Columbus erected in “every harbour which his ships entered and on every suitable promontory ‘a very large cross in the most appropriate spot’”.<sup>105</sup> Or, Vasco Balboa, when reaching the Pacific Ocean in the Americas, ordered his escorts to kneel and sing “Te Deum” and then waded in the waters of the sea, claiming in the name of his king all the lands whose shores would be washed by this sea.<sup>106</sup> The Portuguese typically erected a *padrão*, or stone pillar topped with a cross, together with an inscription, to mark their discoveries and accompanying claims, plus provided markers for navigation on sea routes for the future.<sup>107</sup> Tasman, the Dutch explorer, erected a flagpole in the Southern Australian island that came to bear his name, “as a memorial for those who shall come after us, and for the natives of this country”.<sup>108</sup> On the main island of New Zealand, Cook erected a cairn inside which he placed some coins and musket balls.<sup>109</sup> Sometimes there were also rituals with the natives that probably were incomprehensible to them due to differences in language and customs, such as the Spanish practice of *requerimiento* or the French ceremony of dressing the natives in French clothes and making them do (in the French view) obeisance to the French king.<sup>110</sup>

As regards the biblical documents, based on such examples, we may suggest that the stories in Genesis portray the patriarchs as establishing similar claims. Interestingly, the first action that Abraham takes after arriving in the land of Canaan is to traverse the land and then build an altar, and this building of an altar is occasioned by Yahweh promising to give Abraham the land (Genesis 12:6-7). While one may dispute the extent to which Abraham is exploring the land in the narrative, certainly, by analogy with the examples above, the building of the altar can be considered as a claim of the land by Abraham. This claim is here of course linked to claiming it as Yahweh’s land. Interestingly, the place for the first recorded altar is Shechem, and we can now understand much of what is happening when the Israelites are instructed to build an altar on mount Ebal in Deuteronomy 27, itself of course located next to Shechem. The act of building, together with the accompanying ceremony prescribed by Deuteronomy 27:9-26, is described as having taken place in Joshua 8:30-35. What we have here is a ceremony of conquest and supplanting by a new society that harks back

to the patriarchal promises in Genesis.<sup>111</sup> The descriptions also reinforce the interrelatedness of Genesis, Deuteronomy and Joshua, and arguably Pentateuch-Joshua as a whole.

There are further connections that potentially fit this scheme. It would appear that Bethel was an important locality in early Israel (Judges 19-21; 1 Sam 7:16). This fits with the tradition of Abraham having built an altar there (Genesis 12:8; strictly speaking a bit outside of Bethel) and Jacob erecting a pillar in response to a theophany (Genesis 28:10-20). While it is probably correct that a primary purpose of these references is to emphasise the general and possibly cultic importance of these sites and their connection with the patricarchs,<sup>112</sup> I do think that their mention (esp. in Genesis 12:8) can also be linked to early Israel's land claims in the context of Pentateuch-Joshua (and cf. Genesis 35:1-7, even with the explicit explanation in v. 7). Building of an altar in Hebron (Genesis 13:18; cf. v. 17) and a tamarisk tree in Beersheba (Genesis 21:33) would seem to help extend the land claim to the southern part of the land of Canaan.

A further aspect that would have helped early Israel to stake a claim to the land would have been the memory of liberation from slavery in Egypt. A very good parallel to this would seem to be the search for freedom by the Puritans in early American history. It is true that the bible did influence this Puritan narrative, but the similarities could nevertheless have been partly fortuitous, and yet, even if there was a connection, this would seem to fit with the idea that the biblical narrative had a characteristic that the moderns could conveniently draw on. In any case, the early northern American continent was considered a land of opportunity, and this can be compared with for example Exodus 3:8; Deuteronomy 8:7-10.<sup>113</sup>

To some extent the case of Abraham buying a burial ground for his wife Sarah (Genesis 23) can perhaps be also considered here. That Abraham buys the plot rather than taking it as a gift from the Hittites would seem to emphasise his independence of these people. Abraham is a stranger and sojourner, but is not indebted to the peoples of the land, and thus has no obligations towards them (cf. Genesis 14:18-24),<sup>114</sup> and this would serve the later legitimation of the conquest and the "genocidal imperative" (see below) of getting rid of the peoples of the land completely (cf. also Genesis 9:25-26).<sup>115</sup>

Finally, the memorials at Gilgal (Joshua 3-4) and other places<sup>116</sup> serve to establish and shape collective memory and help legitimate the Israelite possession of the land in the eyes of the Israelites. Many of them tie localities with a memory of the great deeds of Yahweh for Israel, thus, importantly for the writers of Pentateuch-Joshua, also tying this collective memory with Yahwism.

### *Mapping the land*

Day describes how maps were used by powers to assert a claim over lands, often such lands as their explorers had supposedly been the first to discover.<sup>117</sup> For example, the late medieval Venetians had a map room in the palace of their doge that laid out in full detail the extent of their empire.<sup>118</sup> The English and other Western colonial powers divided up territories between them, often in a mutually conflicting way, to lay claims to territories they wanted to control.<sup>119</sup> Importantly, territorial claims were

often established in a programmatic sense rather than as reflecting the realities of the day.<sup>120</sup> As Day suggests, “map-making by explorers was part of the process of ‘knowing the land’ and is an essential precondition before a supplanting society can assert a credible claim to that land.”<sup>121</sup> Interestingly, according to Day, “the enduring significance of map-making was not the change of political control, but the imposition from afar of often artificial borders”,<sup>122</sup> and in the case of recent Western colonialism, such borders have persisted to this day.<sup>123</sup> And, also interestingly, according to Day, “knowing the land also included ‘knowing’ its animal and plant life and its mineral resources as well as understanding the lives of its native people. Along with the maps, explorers often brought back physical proof of their discoveries and any territorial claims that they might have made.”<sup>124</sup> Sometimes the reports brought back by the explorers could at least partially portray the places visited as exotic, even including stupendous features.<sup>125</sup>

In the case of ancient Israel, we can see how Abraham traverses the land in Genesis (Genesis 12:6-9), also at Yahweh’s instigation (Genesis 13:17). This then can be seen as part of “knowing the land” and thus asserting a claim over it, even if the activity is rather incipient in the book of Genesis. However, in the books of Numbers and Joshua matters are blown out completely explicitly. According to Numbers 13:1, Yahweh commands Moses to send out men to explore the land of Canaan.<sup>126</sup> The men do this and bring back a description of the land, and we can see in the light of the above considerations how this can be seen as part of the process of laying claim to the land, in a way that humans would behave as part of such processes.<sup>127</sup> Interestingly, the Israelites are asked to describe how the land is like (Numbers 13:17-20) and bring back a sample specimen from the land to be conquered, a cluster of grapes (Numbers 13:20, 23), together with a description of some of the peoples of the land (Numbers 13: 28-29). Things of course then go awry when the explorers start to communicate to the people that the inhabitants of the land are too powerful for the Israelites to be conquered (Numbers 13:31-33). Consequently, the conquest is delayed to a later time (Numbers 14).<sup>128</sup>

The book of Joshua then describes the successful conquest, by the succeeding generation according to the biblical narrative. As part of this conquest, Joshua 2:1 describes how Joshua sends men to look over the land and Jericho. Certainly, the focus is specifically on the conquest of Jericho in this chapter, but the actions nevertheless belong to the wider processes of Israel starting to establish its control over the land. Joshua 18:3-10 then describes a mapping process as part of dividing the land to the Israelite tribes. This mapping process is part of Joshua 13-21 which in a larger sense describe the tribal allotments.<sup>129</sup> Scholars have often debated about which time in Israel’s history the lists of tribal allotments reflect.<sup>130</sup> Based on our considerations here, we can see that the allotments could be even entirely programmatic.<sup>131</sup> While such a programmatic vision could have arisen at any time in Israel’s history, based on comparative parallels from conquests in world history, the vision would fit particularly well in a period of early Israel when these territories are not yet in the control of the Israelites but are desired to be so, also as Joshua 13-21 (esp. Joshua 13:1-7) and other biblical documents (e.g. Judges 1) and archaeological evidence indicate that the Israelite settlement and control started from central, eastern and northern highlands and expanded out from there, to include lowlands in the later course of Israel’s history.<sup>132</sup> In this case, the programmatic vision was eventually fairly successful, even though it appears that the Israelites had at most only partial

control of e.g. the Philistine areas in the Southwestern lowlands. The process also seems entirely conceivable in light of comparable processes of conquests in world history. For example, in case of early America, the whole of the area of the initial thirteen colonies was eventually conquered by the settlers only during the American revolution, after having been claimed by their leaders already in the seventeenth century.<sup>133</sup> The settler-colonial vision was then of course expanded to the whole of the continent by the leaders of the early American republic,<sup>134</sup> and this vision proved to be successful. Interestingly, the Lewis and Clark expedition was instrumental in mapping the land beyond the Mississippi and helping the westward expansion.<sup>135</sup> As for the Japanese with the Ainu people of northern Honshu and in Hokkaido, the Japanese spent considerable effort in mapping the northern territories between the 17<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries in increasing detail, and succeeded to expand northwards little by little and claim the lands of the Ainu for their own.<sup>136</sup> As for the Germans, their political leaders in the 1930s and early 1940s had a territorial vision that pertained to lands lying east of Germany that apparently dated back for centuries in some form.<sup>137</sup> However, these leaders wished to extend Germany all the way to the Ural mountains.<sup>138</sup> They did set out to execute their plan, however, they were beaten back by the combined Russian and Allied war efforts, and the vision failed.<sup>139</sup> So, again, in view of these few examples already, we can suggest that an early Israelite vision did partially succeed, until it of course was then defeated by for example the Assyrians and the Babylonians.<sup>140</sup> Interestingly, the German vision in the 1930s-40s was in effect subject to negotiation. Kakel describes how the agricultural minister Richard Walter Darré and the SS leader Heinrich Himmler had “very different visions of Nazi expansion and colonisation in ‘the East’”.<sup>141</sup> Darré did not support invading Russia. For Darré, settlement projects could largely be confined to German territory, to include the settlement of German farmers in East Prussia but also in the Baltic lands.<sup>142</sup> However, for Himmler, there was to be an armed conquest, SS-dominated expansion, and a conquest of Poland and Russia under the domination of the SS.<sup>143</sup> It was the vision of Himmler that won the day, with results still reverberating in world history. In terms of the Israelite conquest, such a comparison would seem to be able to shed light on the two differing visions of the Israelite territory in Pentateuch-Joshua, the priestly one that is largely confined to the land west of the Jordan (e.g. Numbers 34; Joshua 22:9-34), and the larger vision of a greater Israel that extends all the way<sup>144</sup> to the River Euphrates (Genesis 15:18; Exodus 23:31; Joshua 1:1-4).<sup>145</sup> It would appear that these two visions could coexist in the Israelite documents, with any possible further minor modifications,<sup>146</sup> without one being cut off in favour of the other in this case. This might also emphasise the fluidity of the concept of the land that the Israelites held, in that no single border was considered as entirely fixed.<sup>147</sup>

The above discussion then also suggests that the lists of the levitical towns and cities of refuge (Joshua 20-21) that are part of the tribal allotments could easily have been programmatic.<sup>148</sup> Considering the lack of textual and archaeological evidence from the locations described especially in Joshua 21 (Levitical towns), it seems difficult to make further historical conclusions about the materials.<sup>149</sup>

### *Claiming by Naming*

Day describes how the Western colonial powers in particular used naming localities as part of their claim of making the new land they settled into their own.<sup>150</sup> But, this practice was not confined to Western powers, for example, the Japanese renamed the

Ainu island of Ezochi as Hokkaido.<sup>151</sup> On the other hand, according to Day, in some cases, newcomers may consciously appropriate names from pre-existing inhabitants.<sup>152</sup> This may for example be practical, it may help legitimate claims by those coming later, and it may also help with practical navigation through the territory.<sup>153</sup> Sometimes places renamed by explorers may be turned back into their (ab)original names, especially if the places are hard to find based on their newly proposed names.<sup>154</sup> And, sometimes it is difficult to rename, or keep newly established names, especially if there are many aboriginal people remaining in the territory, or if the control by the invaders is relatively tenuous.<sup>155</sup> In addition, Wolfe suggests that settler societies may wish to both eliminate natives and also recuperate indigeneity for their purposes, depending on the unique particulars of each settler colonial situation.<sup>156</sup>

In case of early Israel, it appears that there are some occasions when the Israelites rename places according to the biblical documents, but these seem relatively few. This is the case with Gilgal (Joshua 14:15), Hill of Foreskins (Joshua 5:2-3), Valley of Achor (Joshua 7:26), Hebron (Joshua 14:15; 15:13; Judges 1:10), Debir (Joshua 15:15), Jerusalem (Judges 19:10), Bethel (Judges 1:23), Dan (Joshua 19:47; Judges 18:29), Havvoth Jair (Numbers 32:31) and Nobah (Numbers 32:42). Also, some of these names may actually already be attested according to their Israelite rather than supposed pre-Israelite names before the arrival of the Israelites, this seems to be the case at least for Jerusalem which is considered to be mentioned as early as the early second millennium BCE in the Egyptian Execration texts and appears in the Amarna letters as *U-ru-sa-lim* (EA 287:25, 46, 61, 63; 289:14, 29; 290:15).<sup>157</sup> The reason for relative few renamings in the Israelite case does not seem immediately clear, but one possibility could be that the Israelites saw themselves as “returning” to a land promised to their forefathers, and therefore they would not need to have seen it necessary to rename extensively.

For comparison and contrast, in the explicitly religious sphere, the Israelites are commanded to erase even the name of the gods of the previous inhabitants (Deuteronomy 12:3). Instead, the name of Yahweh is to be established in the land, and in the “chosen place” in particular (Deuteronomy 12:4-31) which then serves as a central place where all offerings are ideally brought to and where the people go to worship three times in a year.<sup>158</sup> Perhaps we may then tentatively suggest that, at least in the mind of the authors of Pentateuch-Joshua, instead of naming places, dedicating the land to the name of Yahweh is paramount.

### *Foundation stories*

According to Day, “a foundation story can provide a potent means for a supplanting society to establish the legitimacy of its occupation, in both the minds of its people and the minds of others, while linking people in ways that they find meaningful to the particular land that they happen at the time to occupy”.<sup>159</sup> Often the conquerors in reality incorporate symbols and elements from existing peoples to achieve this.<sup>160</sup> For example, the various conquerors of Byzantium in the first and second millennia AD sought to use its relics and historical buildings as part of their claims to legitimise their hold of the place, or the Spanish included the symbols and stories of ancient Mexica, in addition to looking back to Spain, as part of the process of supplanting in Mexico.<sup>161</sup> A supplanting society may also have a pre-existing association with the

land it seeks to occupy, as with the Macedonians in the Balkans or the Modern Israelis.<sup>162</sup>

In terms of ancient Israel, clearly the bible indicates, in the book of Genesis in particular, that the land was promised to the patriarchs, and this theme runs through the whole of Pentateuch-Joshua one way or another (see e.g. Exodus 3:16-17; 4:5; Deuteronomy 1:8; 6:10; 9:5; 29:13; 30:20; cf. e.g. Numbers 13:2; Joshua 1:2, 12). The exodus and liberation provide another powerful foundation story, and the lawgiving at Sinai (Exodus) and in the wilderness (Leviticus-Numbers) and at the edge of the promised land (Deuteronomy) add further strands to the set of foundation stories.<sup>163</sup>

The genealogies (see especially Genesis 10) serve to establish Israel's place among the nations, in the context of creation and the land Israel now occupies.<sup>164</sup> The patriarchal stories define Israel's relations with its close neighbours, including the Arameans (Genesis 24, 28-31), the Edomites (Genesis 26-27, 32-33), the Moabites and the Ammonites (Genesis 19:30-38, in the context of Genesis 12-14, 18-19), the Jebusites (Genesis 14:18-20), and the Philistines (Genesis 20, 26).<sup>165</sup> The book of Deuteronomy also includes reference to such relations (Deuteronomy 4:19-20; 32:8-9).<sup>166</sup> All these can be read to serve the purposes of the writer of Pentateuch-Joshua of legitimating the conquest and possession of the land of Canaan based on an orderly account of Israel's place among nations, and even as Yahweh's people among other peoples who may serve other gods, tying with history and the divine purpose of Yahweh.

It also seems that the Israelites used and adapted old local traditions as part of their foundation stories. Certainly, the Psalms and other Israelite poetic literature in particular incorporate Canaanite motifs.<sup>167</sup> The use of the name El in Genesis seems to incorporate old Canaanite mythologies and the name of the supreme God.<sup>168</sup> However, even the legal materials incorporate older non-Israelite traditions, having parallels for example with Hurro-Hittite traditions of the second millennium BCE,<sup>169</sup> and the possible, even likely, existence of Hurrian names in Pentateuch-Joshua otherwise<sup>170</sup> seems to suggest a possible route of transmission of such traditions to the land prior to the arrival of the Israelites.<sup>171</sup> Also based on historical parallels as outlined above, the Israelites could have incorporated these traditions in their legal materials as part of their foundation story that also describes the occasions of giving the laws to them.<sup>172</sup> All this fits with the general idea in recent scholarship that colonial processes are not unidirectional, but that colonisers are themselves also influenced by the colonised.<sup>173</sup>

### *Supplanting the savages and the genocidal imperative*

Day describes how indigenous inhabitants are generally portrayed as of lower worth by conquerors and supplanters, and this also provides a moral legitimization for conquests.<sup>174</sup> And, it is typical that the indigenes do not fit the settler-colonial vision of the supplanting society, often as their existence simply stands in the way to the bold plans, and this provides much of the backdrop for the so-called "genocidal imperative" which is typical for settler-colonial societies, and supplanting societies in general.<sup>175</sup> Milder alternatives to genocide include expulsion and assimilation, where assimilation is often forced.<sup>176</sup> Interestingly, it is fair to say that assimilation may amount to destruction, especially if it is forced, and can thus be genocidal.<sup>177</sup>

Naturally, expulsion means the destruction of a society and its people from a certain place, and can thus in my view also be considered genocidal. At the very least it is part of a process of supplanting.

In the case of early Israel, the idea of the lower worth of the inhabitants is already grounded in Genesis 9:25 where Canaan is cursed, to my mind based on somewhat dubious grounds, considering that his father who actually saw the nakedness was not cursed, at least not explicitly.<sup>178</sup> As already indicated above, the strand against the Canaanites continues in the book of Genesis, even if in a slightly mooted form (see e.g. Genesis 24:3, 37; 28:1, 6, 46, and possibly e.g. the Sodom and Shechem stories in Genesis 18-19; 34). It then becomes more full-blown from the book of Exodus on (e.g. Exodus 33:2; 34:11), finding its most express and severe form in Deuteronomy (esp. Deuteronomy 7; cf. Deuteronomy 20:17) that falls under the genocidal imperative, and this genocidal imperative is then described as having been partially carried out in the book of Joshua. In agreement with the stories of Genesis and Israel's place among the nations, supplanting and the genocidal imperative really only apply to nations existing in the land promised to Israel, and not to nations around Israel (see especially Deuteronomy 20; cf. Numbers 20:14-21 and Deuteronomy 2:2-9, 19). Equally, again broadly in line with Deuteronomy 20, other nations could start to fall under this imperative if their dealings with Israel (at least in terms of the narratives) were problematic or damaging to the Israelites (e.g. the Amalekites in Exodus 17:8-15; cf. 1 Samuel 15; Midianites in Numbers 25; 31).<sup>179</sup>

Thus, as noted above, the process of supplanting may involve a combination of genocide, expulsion and assimilation. It is then easy to see in this light that texts attesting the genocidal imperative and expulsion should be seen together and not as separate.<sup>180</sup> As for assimilation, the rhetoric of the biblical documents is in essence expressly against it (see e.g. Deuteronomy 7:3, Joshua 23:12-13). Much of the rhetoric directed against assimilation stems from religious motives. The wickedness of the indigenous peoples is ultimately about them following non-Yahwistic practices, and this is the primary expressed reason for destroying the indigenous people and societies (Deuteronomy 7 etc.).<sup>181</sup> In contrast with modern colonialisms, no particular express racism seems to be involved, even if, as already indicated, the Canaanites are seen as being accursed by the biblical documents since the time of their forefather (Genesis 9:20-26). On the other hand, in reality there could be assimilation even according to the biblical documents (e.g. the mixed multitude in Exodus 12:38 and Caleb the Kenizzite in Numbers 32:12; Joshua 14:6, 14; probably Rahab in Joshua 6 and the Gibeonites in Joshua 9).<sup>182</sup> Aliens could also join Israelites if they followed Yahweh under the Israelite societal rubric (e.g. Joshua 8:33; Leviticus 17:8 etc.). All of these aspects would be in line with the ideology of the biblical documents of the Israelite society supplanting previous societies in the land in a Yahwistic religious framework.<sup>183</sup> It would appear that the rhetoric against joining with the existing peoples was above all due to the fear that such peoples would continue with their pre-existing practices and that this would then prevent the supplanting of these societies by Yahwism. One should also remember here that the biblical documents indicate that Yahwism was not taking root strongly during much of the early history of Israel but was probably confined to a small minority, often consisting of the leaders of Israel (e.g. Exodus 32; Joshua 24:31; the book of Judges). So, much of what we see in the biblical documents seems to have remained a programmatic ideology promoted only by select people (cf. also the man Samuel in 1 Samuel 1-16; and cf. the portrayal of

Elijah in 1 Kings 19:10, 14, 18 which describes a later time in Israel). But, as for example Kakel implies, it is to be expected that such an ideology would be driven by political elites, even if helped by popular support, or even partially also driven by it.<sup>184</sup>

### *By right of conquest*

As Day describes, supplanting societies have often legitimated their conquests by virtue of such conquests being successful.<sup>185</sup> However, these often hark back to other legitimations of conquest, and such legitimations may be the more dominant ones. Thus, as Day describes, the British and the Japanese based their legitimation on portraying themselves as providing a civilising force on the natives.<sup>186</sup> Appeal to ancient battles could also provide legitimation.<sup>187</sup>

In early Israel, according to the biblical documents, lands could belong to the Israelites also by virtue of conquest, as with king Sihon,<sup>188</sup> or apparently even by virtue of treading on them.<sup>189</sup> Ancient battles already provided legitimation for Jacob according to Genesis 48:22, and the battles in Exodus, Numbers and Joshua would by their own virtue have provided legitimation already for the first readers (or hearers) of Pentateuch-Joshua, even if the document was put together relatively early, even not too much after the events it describes. And, the ultimate source for the conquest is to set up a new pure Yahwistic society in the place of an old corrupted order. While the Israelites are to use the right of conquest, the ultimate legitimation and power comes from Yahweh (see e.g. Numbers 14; Joshua 7-8; Joshua 24:12).

### *Tilling the soil and peopling the land*

As Day describes, if a supplanting society wishes to secure its control of a territory, it must be able to people it.<sup>190</sup> Claims made without bringing people in generally prove tenuous. As Kakel describes, in some respects, the conquest of North America was achieved in bedchambers rather than on battlefields.<sup>191</sup> Supplanting societies would also often wish to develop the land, and this might further help justify their invasion and secure their subsequent occupation of the land and the dispossession of the existing inhabitants.<sup>192</sup> Such could be the case especially if the previous inhabitants were nomadic, but even if not, the inhabitants could nevertheless be portrayed as not having developed the land all the same.<sup>193</sup> The land might even have been portrayed as having been in a pristine natural state before the arrival of the new entrants who would then convert it into use.<sup>194</sup>

With early Israel, we can see how the population explosion, as it has been called,<sup>195</sup> in the highlands would fit perfectly well with expansion out from there in the ensuing centuries.<sup>196</sup> It is the argument of this essay that the population explosion and subsequent expansion was connected with an ideology that is portrayed in the biblical documents, and that the origin of the society that carried this process was outside Israel, in line with the biblical documents, but that the society also incorporated indigenous elements.<sup>197</sup> As for example an examination of early America shows, such processes may include periods of apparently peaceful coexistence, and then extensions of the process of settlement that may include further fighting, and may also include assimilating, or attempts to assimilate indigenous peoples.<sup>198</sup> In terms of fit with the biblical documents, while the Israelite narrative in the book of Joshua can be

read to emphasise aspects of war and sudden conquest, it does also indicate a continuing settlement process that took a lot of time. Conversely, the narrative of Judges does emphasise the gradual settlement and coexistence aspect, without however denying that there was also violence (e.g. Judges 1).

Interestingly, the biblical documents do not deny the existence and sophistication of the previous inhabitants of the land and do not really describe them as for example pastoral peoples. Rather, the biblical documents largely describe the Israelites as reusing the towns and infrastructure of the previous inhabitants (see e.g. Numbers 21:25, Deuteronomy 6:10; Joshua 24:13), except of course for the religious and moral infrastructure that must be destroyed and replaced with the Israelite one. The reason for this may be partly that the Israelites did not consider themselves as more advanced than the Canaanites except in religious matters, and, again, religion is expressly the area of focus of the Israelite documents. It appears that this feature of emphasising religion is somewhat unique to the Israelite documents, even though, based on archaeological considerations, some of the architectural features such as four room houses, even though not entirely unique to the Israelites, could have been considered as an improvement from the previous practices of the highlands, at least in some respects.<sup>199</sup> Also, the significant feature of many new settlements in the highlands would be likely to have elicited a feeling of achievement in the eyes of the Israelites, and a bit of such mentality appears to have been preserved in Joshua 17:14-18.<sup>200</sup>

### *Defending the territory*

Day describes how supplanting societies put considerable effort in defending the territory they wanted to hold, and much of this was achieved by setting up fortifications in the conquered territory.<sup>201</sup> Numerous examples from history include the castles of the Anglo-Normans in England, British and later US forts and military posts in Northern America, the wall of Constantinople, the great wall of China and the Israeli wall in Palestine areas today.<sup>202</sup> Natural features, such as rivers and seas could also of course serve as naturally defensible borders.<sup>203</sup>

With early Israel, there seems to be a relative lack of mention of fortifications and fortifying in Pentateuch-Joshua. However, interestingly, the conquest and settlement of the interior of Australia where there were fortifications really only in the coast against encroachment from outside Australia may provide a historical parallel of sorts.<sup>204</sup> But Numbers 32 does indicate that the Israelites fortified and had fortified towns in Transjordan, and Deuteronomy 3:5 suggests fortified towns with “many” unfortified villages in Transjordan,<sup>205</sup> which would also fit with the large number of unfortified settlements in Cisjordanian highlands in IA I. It would appear that the Israelites took over fortified towns where they existed and where they could conquer them (cf. Josh 10:20; 14:12; 1 Sam 6:18, 20:6, 15). When conquest was not possible, the Israelites may have been able to control the towns in question (thus according to e.g. Joshua 16:10; 17:13; Judges 1:29, 33).<sup>206</sup> The fact that one had to labour a bit to reach the highlands from the coasts may in itself already have helped to form a naturally defensible border for the early Israelite settlers, even if such a border would be somewhat vague and ultimately quite porous, if a sufficient effort would be exercised by a potential conqueror.

In the later history of Israel, David is of course portrayed to have conquered the fortified town of Jerusalem (2 Samuel 5:6-10).<sup>207</sup> Solomon is then described as fortifying at least Jerusalem, Hazor, Megiddo and Gezer (1 Kings 9:15), and the existence of fortifications in Hazor, Megiddo and Gezer is confirmed by archaeology, even when there has been a considerable debate as to whether these fortifications are Solomonic or later.<sup>208</sup> The recently discovered fortifications from Khirbet Qeyafa seem to fit this category, if not the period.<sup>209</sup> The books of Kings describe further acts of fortification by later Israelite kings (see e.g. 1 Ki 12:25; 15:17; 22:39).

### *Organising the supplanting society*

Early America provides an interesting comparison with the biblical materials in terms of organising the supplanting society. The declaration of American independence was followed shortly by the formulation of the American constitution that provided a blueprint for the new nation that has largely remained intact to this day, with only a few modifications (amendments).<sup>210</sup> While the US constitution was envisaged as a realistic programmatic document for early America, we cannot be sure as to what extent the authors of Genesis-Joshua would have considered their document as a realistic programme. In this regard, we may keep in mind that there is a debate on whether ancient Near Eastern legal materials were theoretical, as for example no court cases attesting reference to them exist.<sup>211</sup> Even if the book of Joshua (Joshua 20-21) describes the cities of refuge and levitical towns as having been allotted based on a corresponding command in Numbers and Deuteronomy, this allotment could be considered as ultimately programmatic and not necessarily as having been practically fulfilled at any time in the history of Israel. The centralization laws in Deuteronomy also seem ultimately fairly unrealistic in practical terms, even if to be applied in peaceful times only.<sup>212</sup> And, as already indicated, much of the focus in Pentateuch-Joshua is of course to provide didactic reasoning, argumentation and exhortation so that its readership would follow Yahweh.<sup>213</sup> At the same time, we may observe the following quote by Wolfe, tying back to the conquest aspects of settler-colonialism and supplanting: “settler colonialism has, as observed, two principal aspects – not only the removal of native society, but also its concomitant replacement with settler institutions. This latter, positive aspect involves the establishment and legitimation of civil hegemony, a project that would be pointlessly complicated by the openly irregular slaughter of people who no longer have the capacity seriously to obstruct the formation of settler society. The logic of elimination is not simply killing for its own sake but elimination for a purpose, and by a variety of strategic means”.<sup>214</sup> In addition, “eliminary strategies all reflect the centrality of the land, which is not merely the component of settler society but its basic precondition”,<sup>215</sup> and the centrality of the land surely also applies to the positive aspect(s). In this way, the overall ancient Israelite strategy and message attested in Pentateuch-Joshua becomes quite clear.

### *The Promise-Fulfilment Theme and Cognitive Dissonance in Pentateuch-Joshua*

Finally, we already suggested in the beginning of this essay that Pentateuch-Joshua has previously been analysed in terms of a number of its explicitly theological themes in biblical scholarship. Much of that relates to the rest that Israel is to achieve with Yahweh dwelling in its midst in the land<sup>216</sup> that Yahweh has promised to their forefathers. This vision is seen to come to fruition at the end of the book of Joshua,

with the tabernacle whose building is described in Exodus 25-40 and which otherwise occupies a central place in the narrative of Pentateuch-Joshua, erected in the midst of Israel (Joshua 21:43-45; 18:1; cf. Joshua 22:29; Joshua 24), itself also tying to the idea of a restoration of creation.<sup>217</sup> At the same time, importantly, together with these expressions of fulfilment of promises, there is talk about the incompleteness of the conquest and encouragement for the Israelites to continue following Yahweh and to not join with non-Israelite peoples that remain in the land (Joshua 13:1-7; Joshua 23). Many commentators have seen these two at least apparently contradictory viewpoints as puzzling and difficult to interpret.<sup>218</sup> However, from the perspective of settler colonial studies, it is typical that settler colonial societies generally somehow wish to “disavow” their violent origins. According to Veracini, as one part of such processes, “an anxious reaction to disconcerting and disorienting developments produces a drive to think about a pacified world that can only be achieved via voluntary displacement”.<sup>219</sup> Also, while “settlers are natural men engaged in building a settled life in an ahistorical locale, recurring representations of settler original idylls insist on a immaculate foundational setting devoid of disturbing indigenous (or exogenous) others”.<sup>220</sup> And, “ultimately, the fact that these images coexist with ongoing (explicit, latent, or intermittently surfacing) apprehension may actually suggest the activation of a splitting of the ego-like process, where two antithetical psychical attitudes coexist side by side without communicating, one taking reality into consideration, the other disavowing it”.<sup>221</sup> Accordingly, the contradiction between complete and incomplete settlement in the book of Joshua, and thus Pentateuch-Joshua as a whole (and beyond), can be accounted for by recourse to settler colonial theory.

### **Concluding comments**

The above analysis suggests that Pentateuch-Joshua could have been advocating a settler-colonial transformation in the Canaanite highlands that relates to ancient Israel. If so, this could imply a time when such processes were actually ongoing (cf. Joshua 23 and 24). I will however not attempt to postulate a more specific provenance for Pentateuch-Joshua here. This said, if the work could be seen as pre-exilic, there would still be a possibility that it was updated afterwards, in line with comparable processes in the ancient world.<sup>222</sup> If so, some of the additions and modifications might have served to cloud the document’s original setting and message. Another significant feature that would have clouded the original message and setting is the severing of the book of Joshua from Pentateuch-Joshua and, at least potentially, the composition and addition of the historical books that follow Pentateuch-Joshua and eventually would have brought about the formation of an Enneateuch as a whole. If so, in the postexilic period, an emphasis on *torah* based on a Pentateuch that does not have any easily conceivable political, even imperial, connotations, would have served the small community of ancient Judahites under Persian imperial rule rather well. And, similarly, the concept of *torah* would fit with later Judaism, up to the present day.

Based on the above interpretation, Pentateuch-Joshua can be seen as a piece of world literature from a quite early time in world history that attests a programme of constituting a new settler-colonial supplanting society in and around the highlands of ancient Canaan. It is a real literary and ideological masterpiece, breathtakingly so, even when it attests the ethically problematic genocidal imperative that is typical of settler-colonial supplanting societies. What is also breathtaking especially for the study of settler colonialism and ancient colonialisms in general is that an analysis of

Pentateuch-Joshua suggests that settler colonialism as an ideology could be attested in at least a relatively developed form already at such an early time in world history, well before any onset of modernity with which it has often been associated thus far.

- A Genesis 1-11, *Primeval History* of the world as background for the history of Israel
- B1 Genesis 12-50, *The patriarchs* Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and Joseph. The promise of the land of Canaan to the patriarchs (to Abraham first in Genesis 12), circumcision (Gen 17), Jacob removes foreign gods at Shechem (Gen 35), move to Egypt with Joseph (Gen 37ff), burial of Jacob in Canaan (Gen 49:29-50:14), death of Joseph in Egypt (Gen 50:22-26).
- B2 Exodus 1-12, *The exodus from Egypt*. Moses's divine encounter for rescuing the Israelites (Ex 3), the plagues and leaving Egypt (Ex 7-12), Passover (Ex 12:1-30) and Circumcision (Ex 12:43-48)
- B3 Exodus 13-15, *Miraculous crossing of the Sea of Reeds* into the wilderness
- B4 Exodus 16-18, *Wilderness* before arriving at Mount Sinai. The miracles of manna and quails as provision for food (Ex 16) and water from the rock (Ex 17:1-7)
- B5 Exodus 19-24, *Covenant at Mount Sinai*, initial covenant stipulations
- B6 Exodus 25-31, *Instructions for building the tabernacle* (a tent sanctuary) as a place where Yahweh dwells
- B7 Exodus 32, The idol of the golden calf and *breaking of the covenant* by the Israelites
- B8 Exodus 33, *Yahweh's presence* reaffirmed
- B7' Exodus 34, *Renewal of the covenant*, additional covenant stipulations
- B6' Exodus 35-40, *The building of the tabernacle* (tent sanctuary) and its initiation
- B5' Leviticus 1-Numbers 10:10, *Further legal stipulations* in relation to the covenant
- B4' Numbers 10:11 – 36, *Wilderness* after leaving Mount Sinai, *death of the first generation* due to rebellion. The miracles of manna and quails (Num 11) and water from the rock (Num 20)
- B4'' Deuteronomy 1-34, *Renewal of covenant for the second generation and further legal stipulations*. Installation of Joshua as the new leader of the Israelites (Dt 31:1-8) and the death of Moses (Dt 34)
- B3' Joshua 1-4 Preparations for the conquest (Josh 1-2) and *miraculous crossing of the river Jordan* into the land of Canaan (Josh 3-4)
- B2' Joshua 5-12 *Initial conquest/invasion* (Josh 6-12) that begins with Jericho (Josh 6) and Ai (Josh 7-8). Circumcision (Josh 5:1-8), celebrating Passover (Josh 5:10-11), ceasing of manna as food (Josh 5:12), Joshua's divine encounter for war (Josh 5:13-15)
- B1' Joshua 13-24, *Settlement of the land* as fulfillment of the promise to the patriarchs. Division of land (Josh 13-21), covenant renewed and foreign gods relinquished at Shechem (Josh 24) and the bones of Joseph buried in the promised land (Josh 24:32), Joshua dies and is buried (Josh 24:29-30).

Figure 1. The chiasmic structure of Pentateuch-Joshua, based on J. Milgrom, *Numbers*, in JPS Torah Commentary (Philadelphia and New York: Jewish Publication Society, 1989), p. xviii

BIBLICAL PERIOD	BIBLICAL BOOKS DEPICTING THE PERIOD	ARCHAEOLOGICAL PERIOD(S)	APPROXIMATE DATES (BCE)
The patriarchs	Genesis	Bronze Age	1800-1300
Exodus from Egypt and wilderness wanderings	Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy	Late Bronze Age	1300-1250
Conquest and settlement	Numbers, Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges	(Late Bronze Age-) Early Iron Age (Iron Age I in archaeology ca. 1200-1000)	1250-1000
Early Monarchy (Samuel, Saul, David, Solomon)	1-2 Samuel, 1 Kings 1-11; 1 Chronicles 1-2 Chronicles 9	Iron Age IIA	1050-930
Divided monarchies	1 Kings 12-2 Kings 25; 2 Chronicles 10-36	Iron Age IIB-C	930-586 (note the exile of the northern kingdom in 722)
Babylonian exile	(Jeremiah, Ezekiel)	Iron Age III/Neo-Babylonian period	585-539
Postexilic period	Ezra, Nehemiah	Persian period	539-333

Figure 2: Basic periodisation of events described in the Old Testament and related archaeological periodisation and approximate timeline

<sup>1</sup> I would like to thank David Day, L. Daniel Hawk, Dirk Moses, Eckart Otto and the anonymous reviewers for reading an earlier draft of this article and for their feedback. All of the content and the views expressed are of course my own responsibility.

<sup>2</sup> I will otherwise normally use the term Old Testament in this essay, those preferring the term Hebrew Bible may simply substitute with it in the presentation.

<sup>3</sup> Subsequently, the book of Judges describes the history of the tribes in the land (ca. 1200-1000BCE) after Joshua's death, the books of Samuel tell the story of how the tribes consolidate into a monarchy led by David from his new capital Jerusalem (ca. 1000BCE). The books of Kings (with a parallel in the books of Chronicles) describe how the Israelite monarchy fares from David's son Solomon and a division of the monarchy into two kingdoms of Israel (north) and Judah (south) into the destructions of the Assyrians and the Babylonians and a resulting exile and loss of political autonomy of Israel in the late 8<sup>th</sup> century BCE and of Judah in the early 6<sup>th</sup> century BCE. The books of Ezra and Nehemiah describe the return of the Judeans from Babylonia under the Persians. In addition, the Old Testament/Hebrew Bible includes books that describe issues that are less historically oriented (even if a number of these have at least a purported historical setting), such as the prophetic books, wisdom books and the Psalms. See Figure 2 at the end of the essay for the basic periodisation and timeline of the biblical history of Israel.

<sup>4</sup> See e.g. John Docker, *The Origins of Violence: Religion, History and Genocide* (London: Pluto Press, 2008), esp. 113-129, with reference to past scholarship. In addition to the works mentioned in Docker's book that relate to postcolonial analysis of the biblical materials, I would like to single out here M.G. Brett, *Decolonizing God: The Bible in the Tides of Empire*, *The Bible in Modern World* 16 (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2008), and L. Daniel Hawk's recent excellent *Joshua in 3D: A Commentary on Biblical Conquest and Manifest Destiny* (Eugene, Or: Cascade Books-An Imprint of Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2010).

---

<sup>5</sup> It would seem fair to say that Docker, *The Origins of Violence* can be considered to include more or less indirect settler colonial analysis of aspects of the ancient world (see below for further details).

<sup>6</sup> Broadly speaking, J (*Jahwist*) and E (*Elohlist*) were classified as general narrative sources, basically depending which of the words Yahweh or Elohim they used for god.

<sup>7</sup> This essentially consists of the book of Deuteronomy.

<sup>8</sup> Abbreviation for Priestly material (*Priesterschrift*). This consists of ritual and cultic materials and may also include narrative materials in a corresponding style. A separate source within P, a so-called Holiness Code (H; *Heiligkeitsgesetz*; largely consisting of Leviticus 17-26) was also distinguished in the 19<sup>th</sup> century; see Christophe Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to the Pentateuch: A Study in the Composition of the Book of Leviticus*, *Forschungen zum Alten Testament 2. Reihe 25* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007), esp. 4-11 for a summary of scholarship on H.

<sup>9</sup> See Julius Wellhausen, *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israel*, sechste Ausgabe (Berlin: Druck und Verlag Georg Reimer, 1905; first published 1878); ET: *Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel*. J and E were dated to ca. 9th-8th centuries BCE, D 7th century BCE, P/H ca. 5th century BCE, for a summary, see Gordon J. Wenham, 'Pentateuchal Studies Today', *Themelios* 22.1 (October 1996): 3-13. Redaction essentially means postulating editing by combining sources and/or otherwise adding in new material to an existing work in biblical studies discourse, this could range from quite mechanical to very purposeful, depending on the case.

<sup>10</sup> See E. Otto, *Deuteronomium 1,1-4,43*, HTKAT (Freiburg: Herder, 2012), 62-230 for an excellent summary of Pentateuchal scholarship from the perspective of the study of Deuteronomy. See also Wenham, 'Pentateuchal Studies Today' for a summary of developments till the mid-1990s.

<sup>11</sup> There is also the issue of whether one should speak about an Enneateuch that spans Genesis to Kings as the book of Judges in its current form continues the story of Joshua and spans as a relatively continuous story till the Babylonian exile described at the end of the books of Kings. For a nice overview of issues involved, see the recent Thomas Dozeman, Thomas Römer and Konrad Schmid, eds, *Pentateuch, Hexateuch, or Enneateuch? Identifying Literary Works in Genesis through Kings*, *Ancient Israel and Its Literature 8* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011). However, it would seem that any Enneateuchal redaction is ultimately secondary.

<sup>12</sup> The designations Hexateuch and Genesis-Joshua are normally used in biblical studies, but I think that Pentateuch-Joshua may sound more expressive for those who do not have a biblical studies background.

<sup>13</sup> See e.g. Otto, *Deuteronomium 1,1-4,43*, 83-87; esp. Julius Wellhausen, *Die Composition des Hexateuchs und der historischen Bücher des alten Testaments*, vierte unveränderte Auflage (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1963; first published 1876).

<sup>14</sup> See esp. Gerhard von Rad, 'Das Formgeschichtliche Problem des Hexateuch' (1938), in idem, *Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament* (München: Kaiser Verlag, 1958), 9-86.

<sup>15</sup> See Martin Noth, *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien, Teil 1: Die sammelnden und bearbeitenden Geschichtswerke im Alten Testament*, *Schriften der Königsberger Gelehrten Gesellschaft, Geisteswissenschaftliche Klasse 18,2* (Halle: Niemeyer, 1943). Roughly speaking, Genesis-Numbers are in a narrative (J/E) style with large amounts of material in priestly style integrated in, and Deuteronomy and Joshua are in a Deuteronomistic style, with some material in priestly style included in Joshua. Judges-2 Kings are also in an overall Deuteronomistic style. Again, roughly speaking, Noth thus rather saw Deuteronomy-2 Kings as a unit and the formation of the Pentateuch as secondary to that.

<sup>16</sup> There were some exceptions, e.g. Otto Eissfeldt.

<sup>17</sup> See e.g. J. Gordon McConville, 'The Old Testament Historical Books in Modern Scholarship', *Themelios* 22/3 (1997), 3-13 (3-5) for a summary. The main point about the double redaction theory was that there was a first version of the work in the late 7<sup>th</sup> century BCE, and with the triple redaction theory that the exilic work essentially consisted of a basic version to which material that emphasized law and prophecy were added.

<sup>18</sup> A notable work in this respect is C. Westermann, *Die Geschichtsbücher des Alten Testaments: Gab es ein deuteronomistisches Geschichtswerk?* (Gütersloh: Chr. Kaiser/Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1994).

<sup>19</sup> E.g. E. Otto, *Das Deuteronomium im Pentateuch und Hexateuch: Studien zur Literaturgeschichte von Pentateuch und Hexateuch im Lichte Des Deuteronomiumrahmens*, *FAT 30* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000), D.M. Carr, *The Formation of the Hebrew Bible: A New Reconstruction* (New York: OUP, 2011), and this author.

<sup>20</sup> One may keep in mind here that the best example of the text of the Old Testament in Hebrew is the Leningrad Codex, written in ca. 1008 CE. In essence, there are some earlier versions, such as the Aleppo Codex and versions of individual books (and fragments) that survive from an earlier time,

---

including from the Qumran Caves from the first few centuries BCE on, but not any substantial portions of Pentateuch-Joshua, plus manuscripts of the Greek translation of the Old Testament (the Septuagint) from the fourth century CE, and other ancient translations from the common era, see Ernst Würthwein, *The Text of the Old Testament: An Introduction to the Biblical Hebraica*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edn (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1995; translated from the 5<sup>th</sup> German edn of 1988), and cf. Emanuel Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 3<sup>rd</sup> edn, revised and expanded (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2012).

<sup>21</sup> Note that the use of chiasm was a common literary device for the biblical authors, and for contemporary ancient authors in general (cf. James E. Patrick, *The Prophetic Structure of 1-2 Samuel*, D.Phil Thesis, Oxford University, forthcoming). In such cases, the centre of the chiasm was often seen as an emphasised component towards which the overall chiasm pointed.

<sup>22</sup> See e.g. Milgrom, *Numbers*, xviii and Figure 2 at the end of this essay.

<sup>23</sup> See Figure 2 at the end of this essay and e.g. Pekka M.A. Pitkänen, *Joshua*, Apollos Old Testament Commentary (Leicester: IVP, 2010), 105-106, 110 (referring to M. Ottosson, *Josuaaboken: en programskrift för davidisk restauration*, Acta Universitatis Uppsaliensis, Studia Biblica Uppsaliensia 1 (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1991), 31, 79. Importantly, these connections cannot be explained by recourse to Deuteronomy alone (i.e. they do not easily square with the Deuteronomistic History hypothesis; cf. also below).

<sup>24</sup> This is not to say that such analyses (i.e. ones that may take no or only limited recourse to how the work was formed from its sources) have been entirely neglected, at least for the Pentateuch. For example, D.J.A. Clines, *The Theme of the Pentateuch*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edn, JSOTSS 10 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997) is one work that incorporates synchronic perspectives. And, Eckart Otto's recent commentary on Deuteronomy of which two out of four volumes have been published to date (E. Otto, *Deuteronomium 1,1-4,43* and *idem., Deuteronomium 4,44-11,32*, HTKAT [Freiburg: Herder, 2012]) seeks to incorporate both diachronic and synchronic perspectives over Deuteronomy in its wider Hexateuchal context.

<sup>25</sup> I will however make some limited comments of diachronic nature on composition at the end of the essay. I am also separately preparing a paper on how (the) various sources could have been put together for an essentially unified composition of Pentateuch-Joshua.

<sup>26</sup> See Lorenzo Veracini, *Settler Colonialism: A Theoretical Overview* (Basingstoke, Palgrave MacMillan, 2010), 1-15.

<sup>27</sup> See Veracini, *Settler Colonialism*, 1-15 for a summary of past research.

<sup>28</sup> See Patrick Wolfe, 'Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native', *Journal of Genocide Research* 8(4) (2006), 387-409 (390, 401)

<sup>29</sup> Veracini, *Settler Colonialism*, 6.

<sup>30</sup> Veracini, *Settler Colonialism*, 3, also with reference to the work of M. Mamdani.

<sup>31</sup> Veracini, *Settler Colonialism*, 53.

<sup>32</sup> Veracini, *Settler Colonialism*, 8.

<sup>33</sup> See Veracini, *Settler Colonialism*, 16-17; italics mine. This relates to the concept of "logic of elimination" or "structural genocide" (rather than simply genocide) as expressed in Wolfe, 'Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native', 401, 403. Note also that while the exploitation of the labour of the indigenes is not the primary objective of the colonizers, such exploitation can take place as part of the process of elimination (see Patrick Wolfe, *Settler Colonialism and the Transformation of Anthropology: The Politics and Poetics of an Ethnographic Event*, Writing Past Colonialism [London: Cassell, 1999], 29).

<sup>34</sup> Veracini, *Settler Colonialism*, 35-51, listing 26 different forms of transfer.

<sup>35</sup> Wolfe, *Settler Colonialism and the Transformation of Anthropology*, 2, 163; *idem.*, 'Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native', 402.

<sup>36</sup> Veracini, *Settler Colonialism*, 123n13.

<sup>37</sup> Veracini, *Settler Colonialism*, 26.

<sup>38</sup> Veracini, *Settler Colonialism*, 27. The African slaves in the Americas (segregation), and the French Acadians in colonies taken over by the British.(deportation) would belong to this category.

<sup>39</sup> Veracini, *Settler Colonialism*, 27-28 (cf. below for a potential biblical example).

<sup>40</sup> Veracini, *Settler Colonialism*, 28.

<sup>41</sup> See David Day, *Conquest: How Societies Overwhelm Others* (Oxford: OUP, 2008).

<sup>42</sup> See Wolfe, 'Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native', 403. Speaking somewhat metaphorically, we may suggest that the external and internal are ultimately two sides of the same coin.

<sup>43</sup> See Wolfe, 'Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native', 393-395.

<sup>44</sup> Wolfe, 'Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native', 393, referring to the work of Isabel Hull.

---

<sup>45</sup> See Wolfe, 'Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native', 394.

<sup>46</sup> See Wolfe, 'Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native', 394-395.

<sup>47</sup> See e.g. Michael Dietler, *Archaeologies of Colonialism: Consumption, Entanglement and Violence in Ancient Mediterranean France* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2010); Henry Hurst and Sara Owen, eds., *Ancient Colonizations: Analogy, Similarity and Difference* (London: Duckworth, 2005); Gil J. Stein, ed., *The Archaeology of Colonial Encounters: Comparative Perspectives*, School of American Research Advanced Seminar Series (Santa Fe: School of American Research Press/Oxford: James Currey, 2005); Claire L. Lyons and John K. Papadopoulos, eds., *The Archaeology of Colonialism*, Issues and Debates 9 (Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute, 2002); Chris Gosden, *Archaeology and Colonialism: Cultural Contact from 5000 BC to the Present*, Topics in Contemporary Archaeology (Cambridge: CUP, 2004).

<sup>48</sup> See esp. Dietler, *Ancient Colonialisms*, 27-53.

<sup>49</sup> One scholar has even explicitly argued that a "terra nullius" form of colonialism is a wholly modern phenomenon, see Gosden, *Archaeology and Colonialism*; one may already instinctively guess that Gosden's "terra nullius" is roughly equivalent to what we would here classify as settler colonialism.

<sup>50</sup> Dietler, *Ancient Colonialisms*, 18.

<sup>51</sup> It should be noted that all comparison is ultimately based on analogy (Owen 2005, 9; Dietler, *Ancient Colonialisms*, 42). In many ways, we are dealing with a comparative study where similarities and differences should be taken into account (cf. Dietler, *Ancient Colonialisms*, 43).

<sup>52</sup> Note also the comments in Lyons and Padapoulos, 'Archaeology and Colonialism', in *idem.*, *The Archaeology of Colonialism*, 9: "Colonialism represents and ideal subject for cross-cultural comparison because it is, at the same time, a culturally specific local phenomenon as well as a system that transcends specific regions and time periods".

<sup>53</sup> A move from a particular ancient colonial interpretation to interpretation of modern colonialism and back has been identified to have taken place with the study of Greek and Roman colonialisms in the recent past in particular (see Dietler, *Ancient Colonialisms*, 14-15, 27-53; Owen 2005, 10-12). The danger of involving circular argumentation can be alleviated by engaging in a kind of "hermeneutical spiral" as known from biblical studies (Osborne, *Hermeneutical Spiral* [ca. 1993]), *mutantis mutandis*, and, as Dietler (2010, 4) suggests, "participant observation" (and cf. *ibid.*, 15). In any case, this is what biblical studies which has a comparable (*mutantis mutandis*) role to its Western public appropriation as e.g. Greek and Roman colonialism has on the whole tried to do. Generally, from a more philosophical perspective, one may in any case ask the question of to what extent a theory is fiction (see Docker, *The Origins of Violence*, 212, quoting Lyotard: "Is there a real difference between a theory and fiction?"). So, we can also ask if history is fiction (cf. Ann Curthoys and John Docker, *Is History Fiction*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edn [Sydney: University of New South Wales Press, 2010]; When writing about ancient history, the question might further be, to what extent might the accounts of ancient historians and those of modern scholars, each be fiction?). The point is that theories connect dots and there are ultimately differing ways to do that (cf. Docker, *The Origins of Violence*, 212; Paul Feyerabend, *Against Method*, 3<sup>rd</sup> edition [London: Verso, 1993; 4<sup>th</sup> edition in 2010]). And, the popularity of a theory, especially in the Humanities and similar academic fields, also depends on the dispositions and preferences of readers and reading communities (cf. e.g. Wolfe, *Settler Colonialism and the Transformation of Anthropology* for Anthropology and Settler colonialism; Feyerabend, *Against Method*; cf. Dietler, *Ancient Colonialisms*). Thus, the interpretation here is one possible suggested way to connect dots within potentially even a myriad, sometimes cacophonous intersections of other such enterprises and associated narratives, and I am here giving my reasons for a particular reconstruction. Again, this is not to claim "undue" relativism or nihilism, though, and, while keeping the comments made above in mind, perhaps the approach here can be described as "participant observation" (e.g. Dietler, *Ancient Colonialisms*), critical realism, or even aiming at a postpositivist approach at best, etc.

<sup>54</sup> Docker, *The Origins of Violence*.

<sup>55</sup> Docker, *The Origins of Violence*, 2.

<sup>56</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>57</sup> Docker, *The Origins of Violence*, 113-129.

<sup>58</sup> Docker, *The Origins of Violence*, 17-28 (esp. 20, 25), referring to Jane Goodall's *The Chimpanzees of Gombe* (1986).

<sup>59</sup> See e.g. Anthony D. Smith, *The Ethnic Origins of Nations* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1986).

<sup>60</sup> See Mu-Chou Poo, *Enemies of Civilization: Attitudes toward Foreigners in Ancient Mesopotamia, Egypt and China* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2005).

- 
- <sup>61</sup> Cf. e.g. Carolyn A. Higginbotham, *Egyptianization and Elite Emulation in Ramesside Palestine: Governance and Accommodation in the Imperial Periphery*, Culture and History of the Ancient Near East 2 (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2000).
- <sup>62</sup> Janine L. Gasco, 'Spanish Colonialism and Processes of Social Change in Mesoamerica', in Stein, ed., *The Archaeology of Colonial Encounters*, 69-108 (p. 87).
- <sup>63</sup> Cf. Veracini, *Settler Colonialism*; Wolfe, 'Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native'; but cf. Wolfe, *Settler Colonialism and the Transformation of Anthropology*, 29.
- <sup>64</sup> Cf. above.
- <sup>65</sup> We note here that both archaeological and textual evidence suggests that early Israel was a relatively egalitarian society, see e.g. Avraham Faust, *Israel's Ethnogenesis: Settlement, Interaction, Expansion and Resistance* (London: Equinox, 2006); *idem*, 'Early Israel: An Egalitarian Society', *Biblical Archaeology Review* 39:04, Jul/Aug 2013, 46-49, 62-63; *idem*, "'Mortuary Practices, Society and Ideology": The Lack of Iron Age I Burials in the Highlands in Context', *Israel Exploration Journal* 54 (2004), 174-190 (my thanks to Avi Faust for sending a copy of the two articles to me); Joshua Berman, *Created Equal: How the Bible Broke with Ancient Political Thought* (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 2008). In line with what was typical of the ancient world, priests could have constituted one (small) elite cadre, and, at least parts of Pentateuch-Joshua have been seen as the work of priests (While the so-called Priestly materials that are more or less prominent throughout Exodus, Numbers and Joshua are the prime example, Deuteronomy has also been suggested to be of priestly origin, but oriented towards laity, see Eckart Otto, *Das Deuteronomium im Pentateuch und Hexateuch: Studien zur Literaturgeschichte von Pentateuch und Hexateuch im Lichte Des Deuteronomiumrahmens*, FAT 30 [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000], 253), whatever one may infer about the dating of those documents. Cf. also the comments in Smith, *The Ethnic Origins of Nations*, 36-37 on the role of priests as disseminators of ethnic myths and symbols through religion. Interestingly, the role of an at least relatively small elite was also significant in 19<sup>th</sup> century (colonial) England (see Dietler, *Ancient Colonialisms*, 31-33). Also interestingly, the thinking of individuals throughout could potentially range from coexistence and cooperation (cf. the concept of "middle ground"; cf. Irad Malkin, 'A Colonial Middle Ground: Greek, Etruscan, and Local Elites in the Bay of Naples', in Lyons and Papadopoulos, *The Archaeology of Colonialism*, also referring to the "classic" study of White), to violence, especially when access to land (and related resources) might be relevant (as was the case in the USA; see Wolfe, 'Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native', 391-999).
- <sup>66</sup> That Western societies had a considerable technological advantage in comparison to indigenous people during the past 500 years and, especially towards the end to the period, were able to assert a fairly uniform approach to colonization was significant for the "success" of settler colonialism in that era.
- <sup>67</sup> cf. e.g. Nicholas Purcell, 'Colonization and Mediterranean History', in Hurst and Owen, eds., *Ancient Colonizations*, 115-139.
- <sup>68</sup> See e.g. Dietler, *Ancient Colonialisms*, 18.
- <sup>69</sup> Note however the criticisms/reservations by Dietler, *Ancient Colonialisms*, 51-53 of/on the concept of hybridity (and related terms of creolization and *métissage*).
- <sup>70</sup> Cf. also B. Kiernan, *Blood and Soil: A World History of Genocide and Extermination from Sparta to Darfur* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007), 56-57 who describes Cato's perception and opposition (apparently against the tide) of influence flowing from countries occupied by Rome, especially Greek influence.
- <sup>71</sup> For some examples of ancient migrations, see e.g. Kenneth A. Kitchen, *On the Reliability of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 254.
- <sup>72</sup> This has especially been claimed for Greek colonization (see e.g. Purcell, 'Colonization and Mediterranean History', 123)
- <sup>73</sup> Cf. Veracini, *Settler Colonialism*, 53.
- <sup>74</sup> In terms of ancient Israel, while the literary presentation of the arrival of the Israelites is that of a single migration, there is clear evidence in the documents for the category of exogenous others. Note especially the concept of *ger* (sojourner; see e.g. Ex 12:38; Dt 14:29; Josh 8:33) as an exogenous other and the rules about uplifting foreigners into the Israelite collective, see Deuteronomy 23:1-7. Note also that abject others might include people who have been subject to the *karat* punishment of being cut off from the people (Lev 7:20-27; 17:4-14; 18:29 etc.)
- <sup>75</sup> Cf. Veracini, personal communication, July 2013.
- <sup>76</sup> This of course is really the case at least to some extent with any textual evidence, whether ancient or modern.

---

<sup>77</sup> Note here e.g. that finding out the existence of an Assyrian trading colony in Kanesh (early 2<sup>nd</sup> millennium BCE) would not have been possible based on material culture only as there is nothing that differentiates the colony in terms of material culture, it is only textual evidence that reveals the matter, see e.g. Maria Eugenia Aubet, *Commerce and Colonization in the Ancient Near East* (Cambridge: CUP, 2013; Spanish original 2007) esp. 321.

<sup>78</sup> Cf. comments in Sara Owen, 'Analogy, Archaeology and Archaic Greek Colonization', in Hurst and Owen, eds., *Ancient Colonizations*, 5-22 (esp. 7-8). The question of the relationship between text and archaeology is a major one in the study of the Old Testament also.

<sup>79</sup> Cf. also the comments in Dietler, *Ancient Colonialisms*, 42-44, including on the potentially differing subdisciplinary discourses and emphases. Cf. below for further comments on this in relation to the specific topic of ancient Israel under study here, and Pitkänen, *Joshua*, esp. 34-64.

<sup>80</sup> See e.g. Dietler, *Ancient Colonialisms*, esp. 158. Dietler (*ibid.*) lists the following as the the three main sources of evidence that are potentially available in the specific context of ancient Southern France, and this is likely to not be far off the mark for other ancient situations: Firstly, ancient texts; secondly, material evidence of conflict in archaeological contexts, including weapons, traces of destruction at settlements and any graphic representations of warfare; thirdly, physical evidence of violence to individual bodies, that is, skeletal evidence of trauma.

<sup>81</sup> In terms of the explicit focus of this article, note that the Israelites are in the texts described as not always destroying conquered towns (Joshua 11:13) and in general as appropriating significant aspects of the material culture (Joshua 24:13). There are clear problems with evidence from Jericho and Ai, though (Joshua 6, 8), which according to the biblical narrative were destroyed (see e.g. Pitkänen, *Joshua*, esp. 162-169; 182-184 for related considerations), on the other hand, a destruction layer which fits the period in question has been found from Hazor which is stated by the biblical text to have been destroyed (Joshua 11:10-11; cf. e.g. Pitkänen, *Joshua*, 232). Cf. also the comments in Dietler, *Ancient Colonialisms*, 173 from a comparative perspective.

<sup>82</sup> Cf. Dietler, *Ancient Colonialisms*, 158.

<sup>83</sup> See e.g. Faust, 'Mortuary Practices', 178-179. Relevant to our case, burials are almost completely non-attested for Iron Age I, the main period under consideration in this article, see Faust, 'Mortuary Practices'; idem., 'Early Israel: An Egalitarian Society'. There is also a lack of evidence in the Transjordanian highlands (A. Faust, personal communication, August 2013).

<sup>84</sup> Some of the recent trends in scholarship may also represent an opposite swing of pendulum to the distortions of the past where particular interpretations of ancient colonialisms were used to support Western imperialism and colonization.

<sup>85</sup> See Aubet, *Commerce and Colonization in the Ancient Near East*, 163-167 (ca. 3700-3400 BCE). Aubet suggests that the Uruk culture in the area of Susiana is "clearly intrusive" and that "its appearance is accompanied by a break in the general sequence of the site at Susa", changing into a new phase that is "unequivocally Sumerian" in character and "is a response to a genuine colonisation by groups of people coming from the valley of Mesopotamia" rather than "acculturation" (*ibid.*, 163). Interestingly, Aubet suggests that the colonisation occurred "in circumstances of an internal demographic slump at Susa" that "had already started at the end of the fifth millennium" (*ibid.*) which can perhaps be compared with settler colonialism in the Americas where there was also a demographic decline at the time of the conquest (European diseases) and also that a general demographic decline was attested in Canaan in the Late Bronze Age, especially in relation to the hill country which was only sparsely settled at the time (see e.g. Koert van Bekkum, *From Conquest to Coexistence: Ideology and Antiquarian Intent in the Historiography of Israel's Settlement in Canaan* [PhD Thesis, Kampen, 2010], 53-55).

<sup>86</sup> See Ran Zadok, 'The Aramean Infiltration and Diffusion in the Upper Jazira, ca. 1150-930 BCE', in Gershon Galil, Ayelet Gilboa, Aren M. Maeir, and Dan'el Kahn, eds., *The Ancient Near East in the 12th-10th Centuries BCE: Culture and History*, AOAT 392 (Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2012), 569-579.

<sup>87</sup> See the Mesha stele from the 9<sup>th</sup> century BCE. For example, lines 8-14 say: "(Now) Omri had occupied the land of Medeba, and (Israel) had dwelt there in his time, and half the time of his son (Ahab), forty years; but Chemosh dwelt there in my time. And I built Baal-meon, making a reservoir in it, and I built Qaryaten. Now the men of Gad had always dwelt in the land of Ataroth, and the king of Israel had built Ataroth for them; but I fought against the town and took it, and slew all the people of the town as satiation (intoxication) for Chemosh and Moab. And I brought back from there Arel (or Orel), its chieftain, dragging him before Chemosh in Kerioth; and I settled there the men of Sharon and men of Maharith.', translation from James B. Pritchard, *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*, 3<sup>rd</sup> edn with Supplement (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1969), 320.

<sup>88</sup> See Dietler, *Ancient Colonialisms*, 100.

---

<sup>89</sup> See Docker, *The Origins of Violence*, 39-59.

<sup>90</sup> See Docker, *The Origins of Violence*, 145-159; cf. Dietler, *Ancient Colonialisms*, 158-161. And, cf. the biblical claims for what clearly seems to involve settler colonialism that accompanies migration in Deuteronomy 2:20-22.

<sup>91</sup> Even though the Mesha stele (line 16: “for I had devoted them to destruction for (the god) Ashtar-Chemosh”, translation from Pritchard, op. cit., 320) uses the concept of a (total) destruction which we also encounter in the Israelite documents (see e.g. Dt 7:1-2; the corresponding word *herem* [or, with ancient Hebrew and Moabite, consonantly, η[ρμ] is the same in both Hebrew and Moabite).

<sup>92</sup> Cf. Elizabeth DeMarrais, ‘A View from the Americas: “Internal Colonization”, Material Culture and Power in the Inka Empire’, in Hurst and Owen, eds., *Ancient Colonizations*, 73-96 (esp. 76-79).

<sup>93</sup> Day, *Conquest*.

<sup>94</sup> A fair bit of this may have to do with the date of publication in this emerging field.

<sup>95</sup> For further details, focusing on reading the book of Joshua, see Pitkänen, *Joshua*.

<sup>96</sup> According to Day, by the term “supplanting society” is meant “a society that moves onto the land of another with the intention of making that land its own” (Day, *Conquest*, 6). But, Day does also include “internal” colonization in the definition (*ibid.*); cf. our considerations above.

<sup>97</sup> Day, *Conquest*, 7.

<sup>98</sup> Day, *Conquest*, 8.

<sup>99</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>100</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>101</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>102</sup> Day, *Conquest*, 7-9.

<sup>103</sup> I will analyse based on: staking a legal claim, mapping the land, naming, foundation stories, supplanting the savages and the genocidal imperative, by right of conquest, tilling the soil and peopling the land, defending the territory.

<sup>104</sup> Day, *Conquest*, 11-27. Much of Day’s analysis here is based on Patricia Seed, *Ceremonies of Possession in Europe’s Conquest of the New World, 1492-1640* (Cambridge: CUP, 1995). Note that Seed suggests that the European colonists could explicitly try to look back at ancient Rome in formulating their practices (Seed, *Ceremonies of Possession*, 180-184, esp. 181 and 181n4).

<sup>105</sup> Day, *Conquest*, 13.

<sup>106</sup> Day, *Conquest*, 14.

<sup>107</sup> Day, *Conquest*, 16.

<sup>108</sup> Day, *Conquest*, 18, quoting C.M.H. Clark, *Sources of Australian History* (Oxford: OUP, 1952), 12-18 (*non vidi*).

<sup>109</sup> Day, *Conquest*, 22.

<sup>110</sup> Day, *Conquest*, 20, 98; D.E. Stannard, *American Holocaust: Columbus and the Conquest of the New World* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992), 65-66.

<sup>111</sup> Cf. the comments on in a number of respects comparable ANE conquest motifs in S.L. Richter, *The Deuteronomistic History and the Name Theology: λ<sup>ε</sup>σ5ακκε4ν σ5<sup>ε</sup>μo= σ5α4μ in the Bible and the Ancient Near East*, BZAW 318 (Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2002). For the archaeology, see A. Zertal, ‘Mount Ebal: Excavation Seasons 1982-1987, Preliminary Report’, TA 13-14 (1986-1987), 105-165, and most recently R.K. Hawkins, *The Iron Age I Structure on Mt. Ebal: Excavation and Interpretation*, BBRSup 6 (Winona Lake, In: Eisenbrauns, 2012).

<sup>112</sup> Cf. e.g. M. Noth, *Überlieferungsgeschichte des Pentateuch* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1948).

<sup>113</sup> It is not straightforward to determine to what extent the bible directly influenced the American (and related British) mentality, see e.g. N. Guyatt, *Providence and the Invention of the United States* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007). I thank Amy Greenberg for reinforcing this point (private communication) and drawing my attention to this book.

<sup>114</sup> Cf. also possibly Genesis 34 and fairly certainly Genesis 24:3; 26: 34-35 in terms of marriage relationships. Note that the treaty made in Genesis 21:22-34; cf. 26:1-33 seems to have connotations with the [later] Philistines who, even though residing in the promised land proper, are otherwise met with quite a bit of silence in Pentateuch-Joshua in terms of rhetoric against peoples of the land. And, Abraham does accept gifts from the Egyptians (Genesis 12:10-20), and Joseph of course achieves much in Egypt, and has an Egyptian wife (Genesis 37-50; Genesis 41:50-52 for Joseph’s wife, and his sons Ephraim and Manasseh were thus half Egyptian in modern terms), and the Israelites are saved from famine because of Joseph and Egyptian care. Thus, these narratives could indicate that, while the Israelites were hostile towards the Philistines and the Egyptians, there was also an acknowledgement that there were ties between them also. This might then explain the lack of direct mention of the Philistines in Genesis-Joshua as nations falling under the “genocidal imperative” and could perhaps

---

also explain why the Egyptians are not mentioned in Genesis-Joshua even though they had control over the ancient southern Levant till about 1150.

<sup>115</sup> See below for further comments on Gen 9:25-26.

<sup>116</sup> Cf. e.g. Pitkänen, *Joshua*, 67-70.

<sup>117</sup> Day, *Conquest*, 29, and 28-48.

<sup>118</sup> Day, *Conquest*, 28-29.

<sup>119</sup> Day, *Conquest*, 29-38.

<sup>120</sup> See Day, *Conquest*, 29-39 for North America, Australia, Northern Honshu and Hokkaido (Japanese conquest of the Ainu) and Russian conquests of Siberia. Cf. the discussion in Wolfe, 'Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native', 391-393 which includes the role of common men (even "rabble") in the actual process of settlement in the USA and Australia. Interestingly, for ancient Israel, whatever the exact ideologies of the apparently very small elite about the land (this is also related to the question of the date of the biblical documents), it would have been left to the common people of the highland settlers to actually claim land and occupy it in practical terms based on their needs of land, resources and livelihood.

<sup>121</sup> Day, *Conquest*, 38.

<sup>122</sup> Day, *Conquest*, 41.

<sup>123</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>124</sup> Day, *Conquest*, 39.

<sup>125</sup> Cf. Stannard, *American Holocaust*, 164-174, which also extends the origins of such thinking all the way back to the ancient world. In connection with this, one can at least potentially think of e.g. Gilgamesh being half divine and half human in ancient Near Eastern myth, and Enkidu as a wild man.

<sup>126</sup> The Hebrew root טור in 13:1 has also the meaning "to spy".

<sup>127</sup> Cf. also R.J.A. Talbert, ed., *Ancient Perspectives: Maps and their Place in Mesopotamia, Egypt, Greece and Rome* (Chicago:University of Chicago Press, 2012) for an analysis of ancient cartography, also showing that cartography cannot be considered to have been restricted to the modern world.

<sup>128</sup> The biblical narrative in Numbers 14, with considerable literary links with Exodus 32-34, presents this as an initial fear and refusal (vv. 1-10), Yahweh's punitive oracle of killing everyone except Moses due to the fear (vv. 11-12), Moses's intercession (vv. 13-19); Yahweh's renewed but mitigated punishment of a delay of a generation with the conquest (vv. 20-35), people's refusal to accept the oracle and punishment (vv. 36-40), and a subsequent failed attempt at the present time of the narrative (vv. 41-45).

<sup>129</sup> In the narrative context, the process is executed after Judah and Joseph (Ephraim and Manasseh [Cisjordanian part]) have already received their share, suggesting the primacy of these tribes in the mind of the author (see Joshua 18:1-9).

<sup>130</sup> See e.g. Z. Kallai, *Historical Geography of the Bible: The Tribal Territories of Israel* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press / Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1986); *idem.*, *Biblical Historiography and Historical Geography: Collection of Studies*, BZEATAJ 44 (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1998); *idem.*, *Studies in Biblical Historiography and Geography: Collection of Studies*, BZATAJ 56 (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2010), and many other works.

<sup>131</sup> Cf. e.g. Pitkänen, *Joshua*, 261-264, quoting G. Beckman, *Hittite Diplomatic Texts*, SBL Writings from the Ancient World 7, ed. Harry A. Hoffner, Jr (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996; 2nd edn, 1999), 109-111, for an example of (second millennium BCE) Hittite border descriptions (in a treaty context). Cf. also the Babylonian *kudurrus* (border stones) and ANE land grants that are attested already in the second millennium BCE (cf. also Prov 22:28) That ancient borders could be porous and flexible in contrast to modern ones that tend to be more fixed does not take away the fact that such borders could and did exist for the ancients.

<sup>132</sup> See e.g. I. Finkelstein, *The Archaeology of the Israelite Settlement* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1988), 324-330; A. Faust, *Israel's Ethnogenesis: Settlement, Interaction, Expansion and Resistance* (London: Equinox, 2006), esp. 159-166, 221-226; cf. E. Junkkaala, *Three Conquests of Canaan: A Comparative Study of Two Egyptian Military Campaigns and Joshua 10-12 in the Light of Recent Archaeological Evidence* (Turku: Åbo Akademi University Press, 2006; PDF version available for download from <https://oa.doria.fi/handle/10024/4162>, accessed 13/10/2012), esp. pp.308-309; cf. also quite recently Yigal Levin, 'Ideology and Reality in the Book of Judges', in Galil, Gilboa, Maeir, and Kahn, eds., *The Ancient Near East in the 12th-10th Centuries BCE*, 309-326 (esp. 318-321) and Koert van Bekkum, 'Coexistence as Guilt: Iron I Memories in Judges 1', in Galil, Gilboa, Maeir, and Kahn, eds., *The Ancient Near East in the 12th-10th Centuries BCE*, 525-548.

<sup>133</sup> See D.L. Preston, *The Texture of Contact: European and Indian Settler Communities on the Frontiers of Iroquoia, 1667-1783* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2009), 1-22.

---

<sup>134</sup> This vision was famously articulated as the doctrine of “manifest destiny” in the 19<sup>th</sup> century.

<sup>135</sup> See Day, *Conquest*, 119-120, 162.

<sup>136</sup> Day, *Conquest*, 38-39.

<sup>137</sup> See Day, *Conquest*, 176-179, 211-214.

<sup>138</sup> See Kakel, *The American West and the Nazi East*, 42.

<sup>139</sup> See Kakel, *The American West and the Nazi East*, passim. In general terms, this relates to the question of the objectives of colonisers and how well they are able to carry them out (cf. above). I also wish to state here that the comparison with German history is meant purely for comparative purposes. Should the parallel seem disturbing, one may note the following comment in Mark Ferro, *Colonization: A Global History* (London: Routledge, 1997; French original 1994), x (quoting Césaire [1954]), “What the very Christian bourgeois of the twentieth century cannot forgive Hitler for is not the crime in itself, the crime against humanity, not the humiliation of humanity itself, but the crime against the white man...; it is the crime of having applied to Europe the colonialist actions as were borne up till now by the Arabs, the coolies of India and the Negroes of Africa”, which, among other things, helps suggest that a comparative analysis can be attempted. At another level, the potential parallel can illustrate how academic interpretation of the past often is not a politically neutral project (cf. e.g. Wolfe, *Settler Colonialism and the Transformation of Anthropology* [*mutantis mutandis*]).

<sup>140</sup> Also, the Mesha stele from the 9<sup>th</sup> century BCE (cf. above) would seem to attest an example of the crumbings of the Israelite territorial vision, in that it beat back some of the possessions that the Israelites (apparently) had had according to the (original) vision (cf. 2 Kings 10:32-33, also referring to the 9<sup>th</sup> century BCE).

<sup>141</sup> Kakel, *The American West and the Nazi East*, 130.

<sup>142</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>143</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>144</sup> One may however question where the river Euphrates is supposed to be according to this vision, i.e. e.g. whether the starting points of its tributaries could already delimit the border.

<sup>145</sup> See e.g. the discussion in M. Weinfeld, *The Promise of the Land: The Inheritance of the Land of Canaan by the Israelites* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993); also available at <http://ark.cdlib.org/ark:/13030/ft596nb3tj/> (accessed 4/12/12), 52-76.

<sup>146</sup> See e.g. Weinfeld, *The Promise of the Land*, 71-72.

<sup>147</sup> On a related note, this might also help account for how the territorial descriptions in Joshua 13-21 were apparently malleable in that the town lists may not entirely correspond to the territorial borders described, and also, as it seems to me, that the town lists could and would be updated in later periods in the history of Israel, especially in the monarchic time.

<sup>148</sup> One idea of this arrangement could have been that these places would also serve as centres of dissemination of the Yahwistic religion (again, cf. Smith, *The Ethnic Origins of Nations*, 36-37 on the role of priests as disseminators of ethnic myths and symbols through religion). If so, this could in some respects also be seen as comparable with centres of administration typically implemented in colonial contexts through which the political hold and (in many cases) cultural influence on the colonisers could be effected.

<sup>149</sup> See e.g. Pitkänen, *Joshua*, 332-352 for further details, and Jeremy M. Hutton, ‘The Levitical Diaspora (II): Modern Perspectives on the Levitical Cities (A Review of Opinions)’, in Mark Leuchter and Jeremy M. Hutton, eds, *Levites and Priests in Biblical History and Tradition*, Ancient Israel and Its Literature 9 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011), 45-81 for a review of past scholarship. Interestingly, 1 Samuel 10:2 rather casually mentions Rachel’s tomb. This clearly implies the existence of grave traditions at time of writing the books of Samuel, and an early date of composition for these books has been suggested before (see e.g. M. Garsiel, ‘The Book of Samuel: Its Composition, Structure and Significance as a Historiographical Source’, *JHS* 10, 5 (2010), 1-42, [http://www.jhsonline.org/Articles/article\\_133.pdf](http://www.jhsonline.org/Articles/article_133.pdf) [accessed 30/1/2013]). On the other hand, as Kallai (Z. Kallai, ‘Rachel’s Tomb: A Historiographical Review’, in *idem.*, *Studies in Biblical Historiography and Geography: Collection of Studies*, BZEATAJ 56 [Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2010], 142-149 [144-145]) points out, according to the bible, pretty much except for Rachel and Joseph, all notable patriarchs (and matriarchs) are buried in the cave of Machpelah close to Hebron (Genesis 23; 49:31; 50:13; note in passing that Deuteronomy [34:6] explicitly states that no one knows where Moses was buried), and the possibility that the burial tradition about Rachel is early may imply the same for the burial traditions of the(se) other patricarchs (and matriarchs). This may then provide a key for the emphasis on Hebron in the books of Numbers and Joshua (Caleb traditions, esp. Num. 13-14; Josh. 14:6-15) and a reason for why David first ruled from the town (2 Sam. 5:1-16). This could then in principle have to do with the programmatic vision of priestly towns assigned from the South also.

- 
- <sup>150</sup> Day, *Conquest*, 49-68.
- <sup>151</sup> Day, *Conquest*, 63.
- <sup>152</sup> Day, *Conquest*, 60.
- <sup>153</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>154</sup> Day, *Conquest*, 60-61.
- <sup>155</sup> Day, *Conquest*, 61-62.
- <sup>156</sup> Wolfe, 'Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native', 389.
- <sup>157</sup> See e.g. *Junkkaala*, Three Conquests, 274. It may be possible that the name Jebus may have had only tenuous hold based on the hold of the town by the Jebusites, and it may also be possible that the town was called by *Urusalim* for the purposes of international correspondence (cf. also the names Suomi vs Finland, Hanguk vs Korea and Deutschland vs Germany at present).
- <sup>158</sup> Cf. Pitkänen, *Central Sanctuary and Centralization of Worship in Ancient Israel: from the Settlement to the Building of Solomon's Temple*. Making pilgrimage three times a year clearly seems idealistic.
- <sup>159</sup> Day, *Conquest*, 136.
- <sup>160</sup> See Day, *Conquest*, 132-144.
- <sup>161</sup> See Day, *Conquest*, 132-139.
- <sup>162</sup> See Day, *Conquest*, 146 and 146-158.
- <sup>163</sup> Wilderness also provides a motif of testing, and in many ways this is intended didactically for the later generations so that these generations who hear about the testing and failure would not repeat the errors of the early generation that ultimately come down to the error of not following Yahweh wholeheartedly.
- <sup>164</sup> These can be compared with Greek genealogies (see e.g. Margalit Finkelberg, *Greeks and Pre-Greeks: Aegean prehistory and Greek Heroic Tradition* [Cambridge: CUP, 2005], 24-41).
- <sup>165</sup> Interestingly, the Canaanites, who are to be supplanted, are described as accursed, see Genesis 9:18-27, esp. v. 25. That the Philistines are apparently seen as originating from the Japhethites (Genesis 10:2-4; cf. Genesis 9:27) may provide a further reason why the Israelites ultimately held them in greater esteem (cf. comments above). Note also that, at least in broad terms, the closer the genealogical relationship, the more friendly the Israelites are towards the people concerned, and this ties with studies of ethnicity (see e.g. D. Horowitz, *Ethnic Groups in Conflict* [Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2000; reprint of 1985 edition with a new preface], esp. 55-92).
- <sup>166</sup> This regardless of whether one reads "sons of Israel" or "sons of God" in Dt 32:8 (considering differences in extant manuscripts).
- <sup>167</sup> See e.g. M.S. Smith, *The Early History of God: Yahweh and Other Deities in Ancient Israel*, 2nd edn (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002); *idem.*, *The Origins of Biblical Monotheism: Israel's Polytheistic Background and the Ugaritic Texts* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001).
- <sup>168</sup> See e.g. Smith, *The Early History of God*, 32-43.
- <sup>169</sup> See Feder, *Blood Expiation in Hittite and Biblical Ritual*.
- <sup>170</sup> See Richard S. Hess, 'Joshua and Non-Israelite Personal Names', a paper presented at the Society of Biblical Literature Annual Meeting, Chicago, November 2012 (I thank Rick Hess for sending me a copy of the paper).
- <sup>171</sup> At the same time, note also the comment by Wolfe, *Settler Colonialism and the Transformation of Anthropology*, 208, "Colonialism does not appropriate a historical indigeneity; it replaces it with a conveniently mythical one of its own construction". While the statement arises from a relatively modern Australian context, nevertheless, this may by analogy provide a hint towards why, as has often been critically remarked on, information in the Israelite documents about the pre-Israelite inhabitants may not be entirely accurate or fully representative (e.g. the seven nations [e.g. in Dt 7:1]; these can also be compared to the formulaic "nine bows" as traditional foes of Egypt in ancient Egyptian documents; cf. Poo, *Enemies of Civilization*, 21 who also [*ibid.*, 46-47] mentions that such "lumping" took place also in China and that "The numbers nine, or eight, seven, six, for that matter, are obviously numerical metaphors for 'many'"). Note also the comments in Dietler, *Ancient Colonialisms*, 85-86 about the ancients as ethnographers.
- <sup>172</sup> Could it be possible that as Shiloh appears to have been a religious centre in the Late Bronze Age, before the Israelites (as suggested by I. Finkelstein, 'Shiloh Yields Some, but Not All, of Its Secrets', *Biblical Archaeology Review* 12.1 [1986], 22-41 [35-36]), the Israelites could have incorporated old Shilonite cultic traditions in the legal materials of the Pentateuch, themselves having Hurro-Hittite links?
- <sup>173</sup> Cf. also Carla M. Antonaccio, 'Excavating Colonization', in Hurst and Owen, eds., *Ancient Colonizations*, 97-113.

---

<sup>174</sup> See Day, *Conquest*, 69-91, with numerous examples.

<sup>175</sup> See Day, *Conquest*, 176-197 and the plethora of recent genocide studies, e.g. M. Levene, *Genocide in the Age of the Nation State, Volume I: The Meaning of Genocide* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2005); *idem.*, *Genocide in the Age of the Nation State, Volume II: The Rise of the West and the Coming of Genocide* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2005), Stannard, *American Holocaust*, Kakel, *The American West and the Nazi East*.

<sup>176</sup> Note these also in relation to Veracini's concept of transfer (cf. above). For examples of expulsion and assimilation (including forced assimilation) in North American history, see e.g. Kakel, *The American West and the Nazi East*, *passim*.

<sup>177</sup> See Wolfe, 'Structure and Event', 105, 115-119.

<sup>178</sup> I am not able to say how much it was a problem to see one's father naked, even accidentally, in ancient Israel, the narrative in Genesis 9 of course does seem to indicate that it was a serious problem.

<sup>179</sup> It appears that, for example with Sihon who occupied Transjordanian territory that was to be conquered by the Eastern tribes, the problem described in Numbers 21:21-26; Deuteronomy 2:24-37 was simply icing on a cake for the genocidal imperative (see Deuteronomy 2:30; cf. Joshua 11:19-20). This said, the biblical texts do also indicate that the status of Transjordan was slightly ambiguous in terms of whether it belonged to Israel proper or not (see Numbers 32, Joshua 22:9-34).

<sup>180</sup> *Contra* e.g. Earl, *Reading Joshua as Christian Scripture*, 174-180 and *passim*.

<sup>181</sup> Note also that, as "another side of the coin", the legal material in Dt 13 demands the killing of idolaters within the society of Israel, and this can be classified as "internal colonisation" (cf. also our comments above). With all this in mind, it is noteworthy to highlight that there seem to be no racial reasons for the genocidal imperative, in contrast with modern colonialisms.

<sup>182</sup> Note also the sisters of Zelophehad in Numbers 27; 36; Joshua 17 who have been suggested as reflecting assimilation from the central hill country (see e.g. Pitkänen, *Joshua*, 274, 304-306. And, this has been suggested to be the case with the Shechemites (see e.g. N. Sarna, *Genesis*, JPS Torah Commentary [Philadelphia: JPS, 1989], 405-407). As part of all this, while enclaves of Canaanites were (also) left in the land, even then individual people (perhaps including from the Canaanite lowlands; cf. Norman K. Gottwald, *The Tribes of Yahweh: A Sociology of the Religion of Liberated Israel, 1250-1050 BCE*, Biblical Seminar 66 [Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999; first published 1979 by Orbis Books, Maryknoll, NY].) might have joined the Israelites, probably also creating fictive kinships that would fit the Israelite scheme (cf. Horowitz, *Ethnic Groups in Conflict*, 78-79; Finkelberg, *Greeks and Pre-Greeks*, esp. 28-29; and cf. further Ryan Byrne, 'The Refuge of Scribalism in Iron I Palestine', *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 345 (2007), 1-37 (p. 12n52) for a reference to Nuzi in the context of loans where a debtor adopts a creditor and the creditor gives the debtor a "gift" in exchange for inheritance rights to the debtor's property). All this might then also be at least potentially considered as at least a partial ethnogenesis (cf. Jonathan D. Hill, ed., *History, Power, and Identity: Ethnogenesis in the Americas, 1492-1992* [Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 1996]), with some of the native groups disappearing, even if not necessarily as a demographic extinction (cf. Whitehead 1996, esp. 94), and this would on this occasion also tie with the concept of assimilation as transfer in Veracini, *Settler Colonialism*, 37-39 (cf. also the transfer by accounting in *ibid.*, 39-40). In this, links between peoples through intermarriage over generations could also be significant (cf. Deuteronomy 7:3 vs Judges 3:5-6). Finally, note that the episodes of Rahab and the Gibeonites would also seem to reflect what might be termed as "unintended" consequences of colonialism.

<sup>183</sup> Note also comments in Wolfe that assimilationist policies became predominant in the US after the territorial conquest had been completed in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century; Wolfe, 'Structure and Event', 117-118), this can be compared with 1 Kings 9:20-23 which could perhaps suggest a move towards assimilation during the reign of Solomon, rather than elimination, due to the (settler colonial society's) need of labour for the extensive building projects during his reign.

<sup>184</sup> See Kakel, *The American West and the Nazi East*, 213-214.

<sup>185</sup> See Day, *Conquest*, 92-99.

<sup>186</sup> See Day, *Conquest*, 102-103.

<sup>187</sup> See Day, *Conquest*, 105-110.

<sup>188</sup> See Day, *Conquest*, 96-97, explicitly referring to the defeat of king Sihon, and making a parallel with later conquistadors.

<sup>189</sup> Day, *Conquest*, 96; see e.g. Joshua 1:3; 14:9.

<sup>190</sup> Day, *Conquest*, 198-222.

<sup>191</sup> Kakel, *The American West and the Nazi East*, 122, referring to a vision of the British Foreign Secretary Viscount Castlereagh.

- 
- <sup>192</sup> Day, *Conquest*, 159 and 160-175.
- <sup>193</sup> Day, *Conquest*, 159-175.
- <sup>194</sup> See e.g. *ibid.*
- <sup>195</sup> See William G. Dever, *Who Were the Early Israelites and Where Did They Come From?* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2003), 98.
- <sup>196</sup> Cf. e.g. Junkkaala, *Three Conquests*, esp. 308-309 for a summary description of the expansion in geographical terms.
- <sup>197</sup> Cf. Faust, *Ethnogenesis*, esp. 170-187, which argues that the Israelites came from outside. Note also that one interesting change from the late Bronze Age to the Early Iron Age is that practically no temples are found in the Iron Age I highlands, in contrast to the Late Bronze Age (see Wolfgang Zwickel, 'Cult in the Iron Age I-IIA in the Land of Israel', in Galil, Gilboa, Maeir, and Kahn, eds., Galil, Gilboa, Maeir, and Kahn, eds., *The Ancient Near East in the 12th–10th Centuries BCE*, 581-594.
- <sup>198</sup> See Kakel, *The American West and the Nazi East*. Cf. also e.g. Preston, *Texture of Contact*, 1-22.
- <sup>199</sup> Cf. e.g. Faust, *Israel's Ethnogenesis*, 71-84 for an archaeologically based analysis of the four room house.
- <sup>200</sup> This passage could also, at least in some sense, be a(n apparent) sole example that reflects the idea of conquerors often describing the land to be conquered as 'undeveloped' and as a 'wilderness', see e.g. Day, *Conquest*, 159-175; but cf. Numbers 32:34-38.
- <sup>201</sup> Day, *Conquest*, 112-131.
- <sup>202</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>203</sup> Day, *Conquest*, 128.
- <sup>204</sup> See Day, *Conquest*, 123-124.
- <sup>205</sup> Archaeological evidence seems to support at least relative fortification of Transjordan at the time, see Larry G. Herr, 'Jordan in the Iron I and IIA Periods', in Galil, Gilboa, Maeir, and Kahn, eds., Galil, Gilboa, Maeir, and Kahn, eds., *The Ancient Near East in the 12th–10th Centuries BCE*, 207-228 (e.g. 210, Tell El-Umeiri). In general, the use of fortifications in the ancient Near East at the time is not in doubt.
- <sup>206</sup> Note that in settler-colonial history, where people cannot be driven out, if possible, they are controlled (cf. e.g. the British in India controlling India with British in North America where indigenous peoples were driven out, and with South Africa where the indigenous peoples were only partially driven out or displaced, and we can also remember the era of apartheid as a form of control in the 20<sup>th</sup> century there). In case of early/early monarchic Israel, one may think in this respect that such towns as Gath (Tell es-Safi) and Dor could have been under Israelite political influence at certain times, even if the material culture does not necessarily indicate that the sites became Israelite "proper"; cf. e.g. A.M. Maeir, 'Insights on the Philistine Culture and Related Issues: An Overview of 15 years of work at Tell Es-Safi/Gath', in Galil, Gilboa, Maeir, and Kahn, eds., *The Ancient Near East in the 12th–10th Centuries BCE*, 345-404 for a summary of the archaeology of Tel Es Safi/Gath (note in particular comments on pp.380-385 about the development of material culture), and e.g. Junkkaala, *Three Conquests*, 283-287 for a summary of the archaeology of Dor.
- <sup>207</sup> Recent archaeological evidence may support that the town was fortified at the time, see A. Faust 'Did Eilat Mazar Find David's Palace?'
- <sup>208</sup> See e.g. W.G. Dever, 'Histories and Non-Histories of Ancient Israel: The Question of the United Monarchy, in John Day, ed., *In Search of Pre-Exilic Israel: Proceedings of the Oxford Old Testament Seminar* (London/New York: T&T Clark/Continuum, 2004), 65-94; cf. also e.g. D.A. Frese and T.E. Levy, 'The Four Pillars of the Iron Age Low Chronology', in T.E. Levy, ed., *Historical Biblical Archaeology and the Future: The New Pragmatism* (London: Equinox, 2010), 187-202 (both of these articles are from the standpoint of defending the traditional dating, but with references to works advocating the so-called low chronology [and biblical "minimalism"]).
- <sup>209</sup> See Y. Garfinkel, S. Ganor and M.G. Hasel, 'The Iron Age City of Khirbet Qeiyafa after Four Seasons of Excavations', in Galil, Gilboa, Maeir, and Kahn, eds., *The Ancient Near East in the 12th–10th Centuries BCE*, 149-174.
- <sup>210</sup> Note that while the US constitution may have been influenced by the bible, at least in terms of the belief of it being part of God's plan for America by its political advocates, it seems unlikely that it was formulated with direct parallels of the biblical materials as presented in Genesis-Joshua as a potential founding document of early Israel in mind, see Guyatt, *Providence and the Invention of the United States* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 142-146.
- <sup>211</sup> See e.g. R., Westbrook, 'Introduction: The Character of Ancient Near Eastern Law', in R. Westbrook, ed., *A History of Ancient Near Eastern Law* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2003), 1-90 (16-19, esp. 19).

---

<sup>212</sup> For one interpretation of these laws and the likely accompanying vision(s), also in relation to the other legal codes of the Pentateuch, see Pitkänen, *Central Sanctuary*; also cf. the related comments above.

<sup>213</sup> Again, the wilderness murmuring stories, and the parenthesis of Deuteronomy are some of the examples of this.

<sup>214</sup> Wolfe, 'Structure and Event', 130n71.

<sup>215</sup> Wolfe, 'Structure and Event', 103.

<sup>216</sup> Yahweh was seen as dwelling in the tabernacle in the so-called holy of holies section (room) of it, localised on top of the ark of the covenant (see esp. Ex 25:10-22; exact details of his localisation on, or perhaps rather, at, the ark ambiguous), a kind of throne (of cherubim which were ancient mythological creatures), which itself was the ancient Israelite version or adaptation/replacement of the concept of ancient cultic objects/images within which deities were considered to dwell and which generally were placed in temples in the ancient Near East at large; for details, see Pekka Pitkänen, *Central Sanctuary and Centralization of Worship in Ancient Israel: from the Settlement to the Building of Solomon's Temple*. 2<sup>nd</sup> Gorgias Press Edition (Piscataway, N.J.: Gorgias Press, 2004; first edition 2003), esp. 26-68; idem., 'Exodus 25-40', in M. Boda and J. Novotny, eds., *From the Foundations to the Crenellations: Essays on Temple Building in the Ancient Near East and Hebrew Bible*. AOAT 366, Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2010, 255-280.

<sup>217</sup> Note that there is creation symbolism in the description of the tabernacle in Exodus 25-40; see e.g. C. Meyers, *Exodus*, NCBC (Cambridge: CUP, 2005), 252, 282; T.B. Dozeman, *Exodus*, Eerdmans Critical Commentary (Grand Rapids, Mi: Eerdmans, 2009), 571-574; Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to the Pentateuch*, 59-68. For example, roughly speaking, the garden in which Adam was placed after creation (Genesis 2:8) and where he (and Eve) could encounter Yahweh (Gen 2-3) but from which he (and Eve) was expelled after the fall (Gen 3, incl. 3:23-24) is reproduced inside the tabernacle, where, again, Yahweh is now present (but note e.g. that the tabernacle is accessible only to priests, not the general population directly). In addition the question about the presence of Yahweh in the midst of Israel is at the centre of the Hexateuchal chiasm (see above and Figure 1). Thus, the building of the tabernacle and its erection at Shiloh in the midst of Israel in the new land signified, in the ancient Israelite view, a restoration of creation in the world.

<sup>218</sup> See e.g. R.S. Hess, *Joshua*, in TOTC (Leicester: IVP, 1996), 284-286; Nelson, *Joshua*, in OTL (Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster John Knox, 1997), esp. 12-13, 242-243; cf. E.A. Knauf, *Josua*, in Zürcher Bibelkommentar (Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 2008). The presentation in the book of Joshua is also considered to be in contradiction with the book of Judges which clearly describes an incomplete conquest.

<sup>219</sup> Veracini, *Settler Colonialism*, 89.

<sup>220</sup> *Ibid.*, 88. Note also the depiction of the time of Solomon, the second king of Israel, in 1 Kings 4:20-34, in contrast with 1 Kings 11 where a comparable cognitive dissonance appears to take place.

<sup>221</sup> *Ibid.*, 89.

<sup>222</sup> See e.g. J. Tigay, *The Evolution of the Gilgamesh Epic* (Wauconda, Ill: Bolchazy-Carducci Publishers, 2002, a reprint of 1982 edition published by Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press); Carr, *The Formation of the Hebrew Bible*. On the date, there are academics who have previously proposed a late second millennium date for the essentials of the tradition (i.e. a date that is close to the events portrayed), see e.g. Kitchen, *On the Reliability of the Old Testament*; cf. the history of scholarship of Deuteronomy in the context of the Pentateuch in Otto, *Deuteronomium 1,1-4,43*, 62-230, esp. 186; and see Pitkänen, *Joshua* for a proposed 11<sup>th</sup> century BCE setting for the book of Joshua. Whatever setting and date one might propose for Pentateuch-Joshua, even on an early option, additions to or retouching of an initial work might be attested e.g. in Leviticus 10 and Numbers 16 (cf. e.g. Otto, *Das Deuteronomium im Pentateuch und Hexateuch*, 263-264), Joshua 15 (esp. the town lists of Judah; see Pitkänen, *Joshua*, 259-260), Deuteronomy 4 and 29-30 (references to the exile) and Exodus 32 (adjusting the golden calf narrative together with 1 Kings 12), etc.