

On the Problem of Studying Israelite History
Apropos Abraham Malamat's View of Historical Research

Niels Peter Lemche - Aarhus

1. *The study of Israel's literary, historical and religious tradition:
The missing correlation*

A survey of the study of the Old Testament historical books during the last decade shows a predominance of studies dealing with the biblical scriptures as literature. From a historian's point of view several of these investigations into literary problems are most important since, after all, the analyses concern our most relevant source material. On the other hand the survey also shows that only a minority of the scholars who occupy themselves with the biblical literature, are seriously interested in historical issues as well. As a matter of fact many scholars seem not to understand the historical consequences of their own literary studies.

This judgment is fair even though the study of the history of Israel in many aspects has produced several new "revolutionary" hypotheses during the last ten years and notwithstanding the appearance of more than a few "histories of Israel", extending from the one by A.H.J. GUNNEWEG in 1972 to A.LEMAIRE's in 1981¹. Only a few (or rather none) of

1 We may think of A.H.J.GUNNEWEG, *Geschichte Israels*, Stuttgart 1972, S.HERRMANN, *Geschichte Israels*, München 1973 (2.ed.1980) and G.FOHRER, *Geschichte Israels*, Heidelberg 1977, and among

these presentations attempt to provide us with a new synthesis; they only confine themselves "to pouring new wine into old winebags". They deal with single issues or aspects of the Israelite history, but none of them has produced a new and essentially different synthesis covering the whole span of years from the Late Bronze Age to the Hellenistic Period. My opinion of the general situation is valid in spite of the relatively small number of scholars, who have provided us with new answers to some very important questions.

Three main themes have been in focus. The first of the four pillars supporting the common opinion of the history of Israel c.1970 A.D. was Martin NOTH's hypothesis of an Israelite amphictyony of twelve tribes. It has now collapsed, and I am not going to make a fuss about the amphictyonic hypothesis in this paper, partly because only very few scholars may be counted among the supporters of that theory today, partly because this year I intend to publish a separate survey of the discussion devoted to the question of the so-called 'Period of the Judges' during the seventies². The second pillar which has crumbled was the idea of an early 'Period of the Patriarchs' before the appearance of the historical Israel in the beginning of the Iron Age. This crucial problem was tackled by the historical investigations of Thomas L. THOMPSON and by the literary analysis of John VAN SETERS³. The third pillar on the

non-German representations J.HAYES & J.M.MILLER (eds.), *Israelite and Judaean History*, London 1977, and A.LEMAIRE, *Histoire du peuple hébreu*, Paris 1981. Cf. also the newest edition of J.BRIGHT, *A History of Israel*, 3.ed., Philadelphia 1981, and from Scandinavia B.OTZEN, *Israeliterne i Palæstina*, Copenhagen 1977.

2 N.P.LEMCHE, "Israel in the Period of the Judges" - The Tribal League in Recent Research, *Studia Theologica* 38 (1984), in print.

3 T.L.THOMPSON, *The Historicity of the Patriarchal Narratives*, BZAW 133, Berlin 1974, and J.VAN SETERS, *Abraham in History and Tradition*, New Haven 1975. W.McKANE, *Studies in the Patriarchal Narratives*, Edinburgh 1979, is hardly a clear-cut exponent of the critics of THOMPSON and VAN SETERS, even though McKANE's approach

point of collapse is the notion that Israel originated outside of Palestine. This classic view of the origin of Israel has been vigorously attacked by various scholars, though irrespective of the rather pompous presentations made by some of them, they have so far only constituted a minority, and from a methodological point of view their argumentation is also somewhat inconsistent.

This situation is quite paradoxical, because those scholars, who like Norman K. GOTTWALD consider Israel to be the outcome of social processes among the Palestinian population, nevertheless provide us with a most traditional picture of the development of the biblical tradition. Thus even GOTTWALD sticks to the main lines of the amphictyonic hypothesis, since according to him the Old Testament tradition of Israel's earliest history must belong to the pre-monarchical period⁴. In their reconstruction of the history of the religion of Israel these scholars are amazingly conservative as well, and accordingly they consider the extraordinary Israelite religion, the worship of Yahweh, to have constituted the essential centre of ideological force among the early Israelites⁵. Confronting them - and this is the paradox - are on one side scholars, who advocate new hypotheses concerning the development of the Israelite religion,

is more conservative (or less radical) and more sympathetic to the possibility of some historical reminiscences in the traditions of the Patriarchal Age

4 Cf. N.K.GOTTWALD, *The Tribes of Yahweh*, New York 1979, 25-187, and 345-386. Cf. also G.E.MENDENHALL, *The Hebrew Conquest of Palestine* (1962), BARE III (1970) 117-120.

5 To MENDENHALL religion is the overriding factor. In pre-monarchical times Israel was a theocracy and its ruler was Yahweh. Cf. to this his *The Tenth Generation*, Baltimore 1973, and his rather eccentric review of GOTTWALD, *Tribes of Yahweh*, in his "Ancient Israel's Hyphenated History", in D.N.FREEDMAN and D.F.GRAF (eds.), *Palestine in Transition*, Sheffield 1983, 91-102. To GOTTWALD religion did not imply that ordinary political forces were not active in the stateless Israelite society, but religion was an integrated part of the constitution of early Israel, cf. *Tribes of Yahweh*, 599-602.

arguing that the specific Israelite religion was the result of a religious and ideological process and not a pre-existent fact, and on the other side scholars, who represent a much more radical understanding of the formation of the Old Testament tradition than f.ex. George E. MENDENHALL and GOTTWALD. Among the first group I would include Bernhard LANG because of his radical reconstruction of Israel's religious history, whereas his historical views follow the commonplace German tradition in the path of Albrecht ALT and Martin NOTH⁶. As a member of the second group I count Rolf RENDTORFF. During the last decade RENDTORFF has placed himself in the forefront of the critics of the literary tradition on account of his pentateuchal studies. This does not prevent him from writing an almost conventional synthesis of the history of Israel, which forms part of his new introduction to Old Testament studies⁷.

The Old Testament itself constitutes the fourth pillar, but although it has been shaken a little, it remains the most solid and is still considered the most important foundation for the study of the early history of Israel and its religious development. It is, however, my intention to test the solidity of this pillar. Simultaneously, I am going to comment on the consistent, but rather conservative view of the study of Israelite history, which Abraham MALAMAT represents. These remarks are in response to the contribution to the study of early Israel published by this scholar in *Theologische Zeitschrift* 1983⁸. I shall concentrate on MALAMAT's paper here as an example of the approach to history among not a few Israeli scholars - even though professor MALAMAT may not be considered "typical" of the dominating Israeli "archaeological approach" to the study of the Old Testament and Israelite history.

6 Cf. B.LANG, *Monotheism and the Prophetic Minority*, Sheffield 1983, and in this book especially his "The Yahweh-Alone Movement and the Making of Jewish Monotheism", 13-59.

7 R.RENDRORFF, *Das Alte Testament. Eine Einführung*, Neukirchen 1983, 1-79.

8 A.MALAMAT, *Die Frühgeschichte Israels - eine methodologische Studie*,

2. Abraham MALAMAT on the "protohistory" of Israel

My comments shall concentrate on three aspects, all mentioned in MALAMAT's paper. The first point concerns the general methodology, the second point is the historical model, which forms the basis of MALAMAT's historical reconstructions. The third point of interest is MALAMAT's understanding of the biblical literature as a historical source. MALAMAT, as a matter of fact, joins the three issues in such a way that they seemingly are inseparable.

MALAMAT's point of departure consists in the endeavour to propose a new definition of the study of the earliest history of Israel, which he does not consider to be *prehistory* but *protohistory*⁹. The prehistory concerns the period *before* the emergence of Israel, whereas the protohistory covers the span of years from the appearance of Israel to the emergence of its polity, from which moment we speak of historical time proper. Protohistory therefore deals with the era from the settlement of the tribes in Palestine to the first kings, Saul and David. It is, nevertheless, an interesting fact that MALAMAT does not want to include archaeological issues among his topics in this connection, and he argues that archaeology is not really relevant to the discussion in his paper. MALAMAT put forward the assertion that Old Testament scholarship must avoid *the danger of hypercritical scepticism*, which harasses many contemporary biblical scholars. Even though the biblical tradition is not very precise in many details, it is, according to MALAMAT, necessary and correct to follow the biblical account in its broad outlines. His argument is well worth citing. The biblical account must be preferred at the expense of the modern reconstructions for the following reasons, "Chronologically,

ThZ 39 (1983) 1-16.

9 ThZ 39 (1983) 1. MALAMAT makes a distinction between *Frühgeschichte* and *Vorgeschichte*.

it <the biblical account> is closer to the historical events by thousands of years, and it is the production of the original scene and as a consequence it is without comparison much more familiar with the country and its topographical, demographical, military, ecological, etc., conditions and possibilities"¹⁰. To this it is necessary to add the "Eigenbe-grifflichkeit" of the ancient Israelites, their own conception of the biblical world.

The concrete historical method consists in the study of these broad outlines, and in this connection MALAMAT proposes a *comparative procedure*. As an example MALAMAT draws attention to the documentary sources from Mari concerning tribal society in the ancient world, and he mentions the impact of these sources on Patriarchal studies and on the question of the earliest Israelite society. To parry the argument of Thomas L. THOMPSON (but without adducing decisive new methodological viewpoints) he mentions four issues, which are supposed to illustrate, how the biblical traditions of the Patriarchs are supported by the Mari texts: chronology, geography, social life, and ethnico-linguistical matters¹¹. MALAMAT's conceptions are, however, based on a specific understanding of the character of an Israelite ethnic coherence before the monarchy. On the other hand it will be wrong just to equate his viewpoints with the notion of an Israelite military conquest by invading tribes which is nearly mandatory to other more conservative Israeli scholars - in spite of the evidence which now speaks against the biblical version of the origin of the Israelite society outside and inside Palestine¹². The idea of Israel as a nation in pre-monarchical times gives birth to

10 ThZ 39 (1983) 13.

11 ThZ 39 (1983) 11-12.

12 There is really no reason to dwell upon this theme nor to illustrate it with a host of examples. Among the newest examples of this approach I shall only mention the newest study by B.MAZAR, The Early Israelite Settlement in the Hill Country, BASOR 241 (1981) 75-85.

several dependent assumptions. Some of them are mentioned in MALAMAT's paper, but many other assertions may be possible: the ethnical unity of the Israelite tribes, which developed into the later national self-knowledge and identity, the distinctive Israelite character, the unique Israelite religion.

It is worth noting that in his paper MALAMAT introduces not a few viewpoints, which question the use of the biblical account as a historical source. He acknowledges the fact that no authentic document is present in the Old Testament, which bears testimony to any event belonging to Israel's earliest history. We only find secondary sources of a much later date. He admits as well that the sources have been literarily embellished. They are idealized, romanticized and ideologized by the later redactors and editors. All the same, he thinks that a rationalistic analysis of the late source material makes it applicable even to the study of the Israelite protohistory, and it is his firm conviction that the continuous account of the history of the society as presented by the Old Testament, is going to survive this rationalizing procedure, at least as a "conceptual model".

3. *The "authentic" sources*

On the other hand, the fallacies of MALAMAT's argument is easy to establish. His belief in the general reliability of the biblical account is based on the conviction that the events recorded in the traditions actually took place. Therefore Israel had to be an "ethnical unity" which was present in Palestine before the formation of the state (the author does not, however, discuss the idea of "ethnical unity" at all, whether it consisted in a particular race, a particular people, or only in a group of human beings, who had *chosen to live together* in order to improve their possibility of survival¹³. The prerequisite is, however, the biblical

account itself, and the reality of that depends on the reality of the events in question. If f.ex. there is no correlation between the "actual" immigration of the tribes and the biblical account of the conquest, it might be more profitable not to study the traditions in question in order to explore the earliest history of Israel, but in order to describe how the later redactors and story-tellers visualized the origins of their society.

Now, MALAMAT admits that there are no authentic sources present in the Old Testament dealing with the Israelite protohistory, and thereby he refers to documentary sources either contemporary with or not far removed from the event itself. This deficiency is not really improved upon by the few inscriptions from the period and the area, which inform us about Palestinian society and history in the second part of the 2.mill. B.C. In reality, only three extra-biblical sources are worth mentioning: the el-Amarna letters, dating to the first part of the 14.cent.B.C., the smaller Beth-Shean stela of Seti I from c.1300 B.C., and the "Israel-stela" of Merenptah from the late 13.cent.B.C.¹⁴. Even though the last-mentioned

13 Owing to the introduction of sociology into historical research, and not only evolutionistic social anthropological theory, but also modern process social anthropology, some scholars today demonstrate a much more varying and adequate understanding of the factors which are decisive when it comes to defining of the elements which constitute a people, a nation, than was common previously. Older scholars in sociology and the humanities stressed much too readily the idea of "the bond of blood", which they understood as a *biological relationship*. The idea of "the bond of blood" is just as much an *ideological expression* of national coherence quite independently of actual blood relationships. Cf. on the idea of *ethnicity* the survey of R.COHEN, *Ethnicity: Problem and Focus in Anthropology*, *Annual Review of Anthropology* 7 (1978) 379-403, and the clever use of this conception by f.ex. K.A.KAMP and N.YOFFEE, *Ethnicity in Ancient Western Asia During the Early Second Millennium B.C.*, *BASOR* 237 (1980) 85-104.

14 As to the EA-archive, citations should be unnecessary. To the inscription of Seti I I shall only mention ANET³ 255. The newest re-

text bears witness to the fact that a society called "Israel" existed in central Palestine as early as in the second half of the 13.cent.B.C., it is impossible on the basis of this scant source material to reconstruct the history of this society, or to establish a valid picture of the institutions of this Israelite society. Therefore, it is wrong to leave out of consideration the archaeological evidence in a discussion devoted to the principles of the study of pre-monarchical Israel. As a matter of fact, the archaeological evidence presents us with the only substantial primary data belonging to the period of interest.

Therefore, the archaeological evidence is not only interesting and important to any discussion which deals with the study of early Israelite history as said by MALAMAT, it is even, to put it straight, by far the most relevant source material. After all, archaeology poses many problems for the writing of a continuous description of early Israelite history in the Old Testament. Plainly spoken, only few scholars or none would seriously have disputed the reliability of the Old Testament account of the conquest of the Land of Canaan by the Israelites if the archaeological evidence did not exist. Generally, I suppose that this fact is common knowledge, and of course I am not going to present my argument in detail here. I shall only refer to the remarks of J.MAXWELL MILLER that today no archaeological defense of the biblical account of the emergence of Israel is viable¹⁵. In another contribution MILLER himself pleads a model of the immigration congenial with the reconstruction of Albrecht ALT¹⁶. Likewise, a number of Israeli scholars now share the views

view of Merenptah's Israel-stela is the one by H.ENGEL, Die Siegesstele des Merenptah, *Biblica* 60 (1979) 373-379.

15 J.M.MILLER, W.F.Albright and *Historical Reconstruction*, BA 42 (1979) 40.

16 Cf. the presentation by MILLER in HAYES & MILLER, *Israelite and Judaeen History*, 213-284.

of ALT following in the foot-steps of the late Yohannan AHARONI¹⁷ - perhaps a little late, since at this moment serious attacks are directed against ALT's solution to the problem of the origin of Israel. It is very important at this point to stress the fact that the archaeological evidence does not support either the biblical account of the conquest or ALT's *sociological* model. On one hand, while it disproves the various conquest stories in the Book of Joshua, it does not comply with any details, nor does it present an alternative time horizon for the conquest¹⁸. On the other hand, the supporters of the theory of a nomadic infiltration into Palestine are not going to be buttressed by archaeological research, because no cultural innovations of any importance occur in Palestine during the last centuries of the 2.mill.B.C., except cultural traits, which owe their presence to the arrival of the Sea-Peoples, or traits, which turned up as a consequence of an indigenous cultural development in the country¹⁹.

- 17 Cf. Y.AHARONI, Nothing Early and Nothing Late, BA 39 (1976), 55-76. Cf. also his review of the immigration period in his posthumously edited *The Archaeology of the Land of Israel*, London 1982, 153-191.
- 18 I.e., if it was possible to change the time for the conquest from e.g. c.1225 B.C. to c.1450 B.C., because at that moment there existed a chronological coherence between the various events recorded by the Book of Joshua, then it was a simple solution to "move" the immigration. Such coherence is, however, untenable.
- 19 Two phenomena, the "four-room-house" and the "collared-rim" pottery can no longer be interpreted as specific Israelite cultural traits. The pottery also shows up at Sahab, well to the east of modern Amman in Jordan, and in abundant quantities, cf. M.M.IBRAHIM, *The Collared-Rim Jar of the Early Iron Age*, in R.MOOREY and P.PARR, *Archaeology in the Levant, Essays for Kathleen Kenyon*, Warminster 1978, 116-126, and the four-room-house was not, in spite of the discoveries at Tel Masos and the interpretation of it by V.FRITZ, *Die kulturgeschichtliche Bedeutung der früheisenzeitliche Siedlung auf der Hirbet el-MŠŠŠ und das Problem der Landnahme*, ZDPV 96 (1980), 121-135, specific Israelite. Serious objections to the theory about its origin, put forward by FRITZ, ruin his thesis, cf. N.P. LEMCHE, *Early Israel* (forthcoming). Moreover, this house type has now also been found in ancient Moab as well as Edom, cf. J.M.MILLER, *Site Identification: A Problem Area in Contemporary Biblical*

Thus there was no break in the cultural evolution, there was no increase of the population. The only fact which may be demonstrated archaeologically is a cultural, economical and demographical decline of the cities accompanied by a growth in village culture in the mountains. The villages did not, however, represent a new culture, rather the cultural tradition from the cities survived in the villages and only changed gradually²⁰.

Thus the *contemporary* information from the 2.mill.B.C. can not be used in support of the continuous historical account in the Old Testament irrespective of the number of scholars, who have maintained that this or that city was destroyed by the Israelites or this or that village was founded by Israelite newcomers (because it was situated in a territory, which at a later date belonged to the Israelite states). Of course the reason is the lack of infallible criteria, which would make it possible for us archaeologically to mention a culture by name, which never informs us of its identity. When f.ex. the villages in the Galilean mountains are generally considered to have been Israelite, the only reason being that the area concerned without doubt belonged to the Israelite state during the time of the monarchy. Irrespective of the tribal lists in the Book of Joshua we have no proof of the "Israelite" identity of these villages in the Early Iron Age; we don't know whether or not they belonged to the "Israel" mentioned by Merenptah²¹. The archaeological evidence is in fact mute as to the identity of a specific material culture, which is proven by referring to earlier periods in the history of Palestine as the Early Bronze Age or the Chalcolithic Period. After all, who would dare to place an ethnical tag on the Khirbet Kerak ware or the pottery from Tuleilat el-Ghassul?

Scholarship, ZDPV 99 (1983) 127 n.24.

20 On this LEMCHE, Early Israel, part II, chapter 7.

21 Cf. on these villages Y.AHARONI, Problems of the Israelite Conquest in the Light of Archaeological Discoveries, Antiquity and Survival II/2-3 (1957) 131-150, and finally his contribution to the Encyclopedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land II (1976) 406-408.

4. The historical exactitude of the biblical tradition

The only reason to believe that we may rely on the Old Testament account of the early history of Israel is the conviction that the authors, who wrote this account, were just as meticulous in their historical research as modern Western scholars are, and scholars who adhere to this view are also obliged to maintain that the ancient Israelites were almost objective or neutral observers, who did not intentionally distort their sources. As regards the conquest narratives, we already know that they could not be relied upon as authentic reports. The redactors either deliberately distorted the real facts, or they had no clear idea of the historical events - we may follow the viewpoint most congenial with our own mind. If they were not really informed as to conditions in Palestine during the 2.mill.B.C. we cannot, of course, follow MALAMAT when he argues that their historical knowledge was considerably better than ours because of their temporal proximity to the events themselves. If they knew about the historical development in the stateless period the consequence is that the Israelite history writers were not neutral observers, but deliberately wrote their account of the history by combining the facts according to other criteria than those utilized by modern historians. In both cases their qualifications for writing an even approximately accurate history of Israel were inferior to ours, although they themselves belonged to the society whose history they tried to reconstruct.

Both arguments are used by MALAMAT in order to prove his assertion of the fundamental applicability of the Old Testament account of Israel's history, but as a matter of fact they are mutually contradictory. Maybe he has not taken into consideration the importance of the conflict between the archaeological evidence and the written account in the Old Testament. The archaeological evidence is the *primary* source material because it contains the contemporary sources, even though only a few inscriptions have yet appeared. The Old Testament contains secondary source material simply because

it was only reduced into writing at a later date. To prove the historical exactitude of the Old Testament sources it is mandatory to demonstrate that the reconstruction of the history of Israel in the Tetrateuch and the Deuteronomistic History respectively is accurate and that the redactors themselves were anxious to present a *historically accurate picture* of Israel's past.

Even though these remarks were inspired by MALAMAT, whose subject is the pre-monarchical period, I shall concentrate on the Deuteronomistic History because the possibility that real and accurate historical reminiscences have survived in this work is far greater than in the case of the Tetrateuch. Any result obtained as to the biblical description of the history of the monarchy has consequences as well for the prehistory (or "proto-history"), because the result is an indication of the methods followed by the biblical authors when dealing with the past.

As my first example I shall quote the narrative of David's rise to power (1.Sam 16-2-Sam 5). I am able to make this section short because of my previous publication of a study, in which I tried to demonstrate that this narrative most of all must be interpreted as a pamphlet with a propagandistic aim, and that it was the intention of its author to clear David of the suspicion of any complicity in the fall of the house of Saul²². That my aim was not too far off is confirmed by the fact that some other studies have now appeared, which generally share my views, and in the paper of P.KYLE McCARTER there even is some verbal agreement²³.

It is difficult to establish the exact date of the story of David's

-
- 22 N.P.LEMCHE, David's Rise, JSOT 10 (1978) 9-25 (originally printed in Dansk teologisk Tidsskrift 38 (1975) 241-263).
- 23 See P.KYLE McCARTER, The Apology of David, JBL 99 (1980) 489-504 (compare our use of the latin idiom *cui bono*). See in the same issue also J.LEVENSON and B.HALPERN, The Political Import of David's Marriages, JBL 99 (1980) 507-518, and J.C.VANDERKAM, Davidic Complicity in the Death of Abner and Eshbaal, JBL 99 (1980) 521-539.

rise. Several proposals have been submitted spanning the years from the reign of king David himself to the deuteronomistic era. It is, however, certain that the deuteronomistic redactors re-edited the narrative, but as a whole the basic tradition seems to be of an earlier date. In reality nothing contradicts the possibility of its Davidic origin. If we assume that this is the case (and it must be stressed that this is only a working hypothesis), the presentation of the narrative says a lot about Israelite "history writing". So far it is adequate to maintain that it is the positive object of the narrative to clear David of some onerous accusations, and if David or some member of his staff was responsible for the actual form of the narrative, then he did not try to present the facts as they once took place, and it did not occur to him at all that he ought to write a neutral version of the events. It goes without saying that this kind of history writing was deliberately subjective, influenced by ideological motivations, and had a clear-cut propagandistic aim. Some were to be impressed, others to be countered, and the king to be cleared of suspicion of guilt. Of course the narrative does tell us how David became king of Israel, but primarily it is not a witness to the actual political circumstances, it is a testimony to the opinion of David of his career, or in the case the narrative was only composed at a later date, to the opinion of that time.

It is, however, most interesting that the apology of king David is not unique. On the contrary, it belongs to a tradition, which goes back at least as far as to the Late Bronze Age or even earlier. Several years ago Giovanni Buccellati called attention to the striking similarity between the fates of king David and king Idrimi of Alalach as far as concerns the general aspects of their respective seizure of power²⁴. It might only be sheer coincidence that the fates of two such individuals

24 G.BUCCELLATI, La "carriera" di David e quella di Idrimi, re di Alalac, *Bibbia e Oriente* 4 (1962) 95-99.

were very much the same, that is, if we read the two narratives recording the events as neutral testimonies to their careers. Now, Mario LIVERANI has demonstrated that the inscription of Idrimi is not to be considered a precise and neutral account of the events leading to his seizure of the throne, even though it was authorized by the king himself (the inscription is written on his statue), but the narrative must be considered a piece of propaganda and was written according to a pre-existent literary and ideological pattern, which also appears in the classic fairy-tale of the youngest brother, who leaves his paternal home to carry off the princess and the kingdom²⁵. Moreover, LIVERANI has shown that this fairy-tale or at least its basic structure was well-known in the Late Bronze Age and was used as a whole or in parts in different places²⁶. Thus it is not unreasonable to assume that also the narrative of David's career followed such a pre-existent pattern, which formulated "the rules for such stories". Or, to put it differently: if the message contained in the narrative about young David was to be accepted by its

-
- 25 M.LIVERANI, Partire sul carro, per il deserto, *AIUON* NS 22 (1972) 403-425. The Idrimi inscription is translated in *ANET*³ 557-558. The most recent comprehensive revision, translation and commentary as well as biography are presented by M.DIETRICH and O.LORETZ, *Die Inschrift der Statue des Königs Idrimi von Alalach*, *UF* 13 (1981) 201-269. Many of the questions up for discussion in the present paper are also discussed by DIETRICH and LORETZ, such as the relations between a literary product and historical reality, but as I read their treatment of the inscription and its problems it is my firm impression that the two authors have not fully grasped the basic radicality of LIVERANI's view on the application of ancient sources in historical research.
- 26 Cf. LIVERANI's reference to the Egyptian fairy-tale "The Pre-destinated Prince", and to other Egyptian parallels in his article on Idrimi, *AIUON* 22 (1973) 403ff. Other examples of this genre are perhaps the story of Joash (cf. M.LIVERANI, *L'histoire de Joas*, *VT* 24 (1974) 438-453) and of course the apology of Hattusilis III. As to his view on ancient historical texts cf. M.LIVERANI, *Memorandum on the Approach to Historiographic Texts*, *Orientalia* NS 42 (1973) 178-194.

audience (or by its readers) it had to follow a definite literary pattern. If not, it would have failed because of lack of understanding. The historical facts had to be manipulated with the purpose of bringing them in accordance with the pattern.

Perhaps it is necessary to counter an objection, which may be raised at this point. Someone might consider it unwarranted to doubt the general historical exactness of, in this case the deuteronomistic writers because of the content of their sources, which were not originally drawn up by them. As this objection runs, these documents were just handed over to them and were only the subjects of a slight redactional treatment in order to adjust them before they were included in the Deuteronomistic History of Israel. The redactors did not, however, deliberately distort historical reality. We may answer this objection by calling attention to the fact that on the other hand they did not try to correct the older traditions to adjust them to the "real" events of the past. Thus, in their redactional work with older historical sources they did not demonstrate that critical acumen, which we normally attribute to proper historical research. I think we have to admit this fact, and if so, we also have to part with the idea that the Israelite "history writing" is to be considered a true history writing, or else we must acknowledge that even though they were closer in time to the reign of David the deuteronomists did not have a better knowledge of and were better prepared to describe that period than we are. As a matter of fact, it should be stressed that we have to yield in both instances.

In order to illustrate this point I shall quote two more traditions which survive in the Deuteronomistic History, 1.Kgs 20 and 22, the accounts of the wars between Ahab of Israel and the Aramaeans. Some years ago it was demonstrated that these wars never took place. This correction was, however, not exclusively based on information given by the Old Testament; rather, it depended on written sources of Assyrian origin, which inform us about the era of the House of Omri²⁷. They clearly show that Ahab was an

ally of Damascus to his death. It is hardly likely that during the summer period he fought as a member of the same coalition as the Aramaeans, whereas in the autumn after the departure of the Assyrian armies he turned against his allies to the east in order to train his soldiers. This is a well-known fact, and we have no reason to oppose H.-C.SCHMITT, who maintains that the traditions concerning the "Aramean wars" of king Ahab have been inserted in the wrong place and belong to a later period, perhaps a generation or two later than the fall of the Dynasty of Omri²⁸. If we were to oppose SCHMITT the reason would be the alternative, which was proposed by B.O.LONG in a lecture at the I.O.S.O.T. congress in Salamanca in 1983. According to LONG the two chapters, 1.Kgs 20 and 22, are just two examples of *fictitious history writing*, drawn up by the deuteronomistic "historians" *without any historical background*²⁹. The reason why the deuteronomistic writers chose to invent such narratives is not too difficult to explain and their behaviour was not without parallels. Precisely the same kind of fictitious history writing is rather common in the books of Chronicles, and the deuteronomistic method must be compared to the Chronicler's procedure, as was demonstrated by Peter WELTEN more than ten years ago. If the Chronicler wanted to describe a certain king in a positive way he invented stories suitable to throw a positive light on the king in question, and *vice versa*. Furthermore, available to the Chronicler was a whole series of preconceived *topoi*, which were arranged according to the author's requirements³⁰.

-
- 27 Cf. ANET³ 276-281 on the inscriptions of Shalmanasher III.
 28 H.-C.SCHMITT, Elisa, Gütersloh 1972, 60-63 (he claims the original records to be no earlier than c.800 B.C.).
 29 B.O.LONG, Literary Artistry in Biblical Historiography: 1-2 Kings. This lecture has not been printed yet, but a short summary is to be found among the congress abstracts, p.31 (SC 9).
 30 Cf. P.WELTEN, Geschichte und Geschichtsdarstellung in den Chronikbüchern, WMANT 42, Neukirchen 1973.

5. Rationalizing ancient historical sources

Thus the myth of dependable Israelite history writing must be refuted. Such an idea is not only wrong, it is totally false. This discovery is not at all new, except that my wording is perhaps more radical than usual. Nevertheless, the majority of Old Testament scholars who have occupied themselves with the study of Israelite history with Martin NOTH as a spectacular exception, have based their research on the biblical account; that is they have followed it in its "broad outlines". When I mention NOTH as an exception this is due to the fact that he correctly saw that since the formation of the tradition about the earliest Israelite history took place in the tribal league, these traditions are primary sources to the "amphictyony" and only secondary sources to the early history before the establishment of the confederacy³¹. As I have mentioned elsewhere the problem today arises because of the dismissal of the amphictyonic hypothesis. When we disregard the idea of a great Israelite tribal confederacy in the last centuries of the 2.mill.B.C., we by necessity have to find another "Sitz im Leben" for the ideology of the twelve tribes, which forms the backbone of the historical tradition³². On the other hand scholars have been somewhat hesitant, when it comes to rethinking the historical traditions of ancient Israel. The following quotation by LIVERANI may illustrate this point:

"The indolence of the historians is high, and when they deal with a certain period and they are confronted by a continuous account of the course of events, which already has been included in some sort of 'ancient' documentary source (which is perforce not contemporary with the events themselves) they are all too happy to adopt the account, and they confine their work to a paraphrase of it or even to a rationalizing version of it"³³.

31 Cf. M.NOTH, *Geschichte Israels*, Göttingen 1950, chapter III, "Die Traditionen des sakralen Zwölfstämmebundes", 105-130.

32 Cf. N.P.LEMCHE, *Studia Theologica* 38 (1984).

33 Quotation from M.LIVERANI, *Storiografia politica hittita II*:

The quotation introduces a (from a methodological point of view) most penetrating demolition of the picture the Hittites held of their oldest history, which is presented as a continuous narrative in the edict of Telipinus³⁴. Bit by bit LIVERANI demonstrates how the description of the Old Hittite Kingdom was reconstructed in a biased way in this document of the 16.cent.B.C., and was edited with a most definite purpose, motivated by the ideological and political circumstances which prevailed during the reign of king Telipinus. Thus, we are confronted with a continuous historical documentary source, which was drafted by the society, whose history was the subject of the document in question, whereas the span of years between the piecing together of the document and the events contained in it is even shorter than in the Israelite case. Nevertheless, it is possible to point out several historical inaccuracies (even basic ones) as well as deliberate distortions in the edict of Telipinus. In no way does the document represent a primary source to the Old Hittite Kingdom; it is the reconstruction of a later period.

The usual procedure has generally consisted in a paraphrase of such a documentary source by rationalizing means. This method was, however, already rejected by Eduard MEYER in the beginning of this century. I shall quote MEYER's remarks on methodology in spite of the fact that they were cited by Helmuth ENGEL only a few years ago. The quotation is so expressive that it deserves all possible attention:

"Besides, then and now I regard every endeavour to be futile and beyond dispute, which tries to answer these questions or even to translate the Israelite sagas into history according to the very much appreciated fashion. Generally, they deliberately skip -

34 Telipino, ovvero: Della Solidarietà, Oriens Antiquus 16 (1977) 105. The Telipinus Edict has been translated by J.FRIEDRICH in AO 24/3 (1925) 21ff., and by E.H.STURTEVANT and G.BECHTEL, A Hittite Chrestomathy, Philadelphia 1935, 183-193.

without considering how fantastic the enterprise is - half a millennium and deal with the narratives as suitable historical sources, irrespective of their youth and after they have brushed them up by rationalizing means. They even consider these sources to be the imperturbable basis of Israel's nationality and religion³⁵.

Irrespective of the youth of the Old Testament narratives many scholars have preferred to paraphrase their content in spite of the fact that the same scholars are perfectly acquainted with the late date of the documents in question. In principle, the procedure has been the same, no matter whether we speak of a Protestant or a Catholic milieu. Though, nowhere is the paraphrasing technique so dominant as in contemporary Israel. Here historical research has to a large degree been reduced to new "original" collocations of various sources in the Old Testament, and to the use of a mostly rather heavy-handed comparative method utilizing extra-biblical evidence.

The root of the difference between modern historical reconstruction of the Israelite history and the procedure of the biblical writers themselves is really the discrepancy between the now classic Newtonian (but now obsolete) picture of the world and the picture of the world supposed to be present in the Bible. This incongruity between our picture (the "popular" scientific) and the biblical picture seems to be destructive, because it is so difficult to harmonize them. In reality, *the problem is a logical one*, because the fundamental issue concerns the choice of a criterion of truth in the modern Western World and in the ancient oriental societies. The Western biblical scholar may obscure his own possibility of understanding the ancient writings as far as he is tempted exclusively

35 Quotation from E.MEYER, *Die Israeliten und ihre Nachbarstämme*, Halle 1906 (reprinted 1967), 50. Cf. also H.ENGEL, *Die Vorfahren Israels in Agypten*, Frankfurter Theologische Studien 27, Frankfurt a/M. 1979, 77-78.

to judge the scriptures according to a European criterion of truth. A certain item, event, etc., is either true or it is false, *tertium non datur*. The law of gravitation is valid or it is not valid, and if the law is valid, then everything behaves according to its rules. When this criterion is transferred to biblical studies the result is that either the statements of the Bible are true, or they are false; a third possibility does not exist. If a statement is true, it cannot at the same time be false, because the distinction is absolute. This attitude is characteristic of modern man, and we are generally unable to acknowledge the independent validity of any other picture of the world than ours. Evidently, we are not at all prepared to acknowledge the importance of any other picture, even though it might be done without disregarding our own picture as inferior, perhaps quite to the contrary, but *we are not even prepared to acknowledge the possibility that other pictures exist.*

Of course I have pushed my argument to extremes here, but in reality it is not unreasonable to understand a great deal of biblical study in the light of this attitude. The actual reason is that we under no circumstances are able to imagine a history writing, as represented, e.g., by the biblical history books, which is unrelated to any objective reality (in spite of the fact that we belong to a cultural environment, in which the novel has been carried to perfection). After all, our own historical writings are always related to events, which took place (we believe) in the real world at a fixed time and place.

6. "Neutral" or "biased" reconstructions of history

In every aspect of historical research the salient point is one's view of the source material. In a forthcoming history of Israel, which has been written according to some new principles, I polemize against the endeavours to dig out the historical reality at all costs. In fact, it is only the a priori assumption of the scholars behind these efforts that

there must be a historical substance, whereas it is quite possible that such a kernel is not present, as in Per Gynt's onion³⁶. It goes without saying that in this connection it is most important to distinguish between contemporary sources and later sources. Therefore it is impossible for me to subscribe to the proposed distinction between "protohistory" and "prehistory". The classical definition is still the best, and it maintains that the historical period is the era from which contemporary written sources survive. If such documentary evidence is not present, then it is not historical time, and in this connection it is totally insignificant whether or not we distinguish between prehistory and protohistory. Admittedly, the boundary between contemporary and later sources is only a quantitative and not a qualitative difference, since also the contemporary sources describe something after it took place and according to the interpretation of the witnesses. Nevertheless, the majority of historians naturally prefer, and rightly so, sources which are close in time to the events themselves at the expense of later sources. Thus we may say that the closer a written account is to the period in which a certain event is supposed to have taken place, the more likely it is that the document informs us about a real historical event. If the documentary source belongs to a period perhaps separated by a generation or two from the episode which it describes, the uncertainty factor multiplies, because now we neither know for sure if the document is talking about a real historical event, i.e. something, which once took place, nor do we know if it is a historical source at all and not a novel, a fairy-tale, or at least some kind of fictional literature.

36 In this connection I refer to my "Det gamle Israel. Samfundet og historien" (Ancient Israel. The Society and its History), which is likely to appear in print this year. The book will be in Danish, but an English version might be feasible at a later date. As to the question involved I must refer to the second chapter "Teksten og historien" ("The document and history").

I have already pointed to some examples which show that this uncertainty factor is most decisive when there is a question of the evaluation of a particular historical document in the Old Testament. At the same time, this tells us that the boundary between the historical period and prehistory is not absolute but flexible, as some traditions have survived, which may not be considered proper historical documents, even though they derive from the so-called historical period, the era of the Hebrew kingdoms. In fact, they most of all express the capability of the then-contemporary and later history writer's imagination.

Therefore I may conclude that the notion of a neutrally minded Israelite history writing is absurd; neutral reports were never the goal of Israelite "historians" and therefore they never existed (it is only arm-chair European scholars, who may kindle such an ideal). The basis of this categorical assertion is, on the other hand, solid and consists of several strata.

The first stratum, the first reason, is based on sociological arguments. Is it likely that there existed an audience to the kind of history writing in Israel, to which we are accustomed today? Did the ancient Israelites read history just as we do? As we try to answer these questions, it is necessary to stress that in spite of the written sources, which have survived, Israelite society was predominantly orientated towards oral communications just as most peoples are, who have not been part of the same cultural development as the Western World during the last few centuries. Accordingly, an author who is interested in the reception of his message among his audience, by necessity uses the kind of narrative which is most likely to impress his listeners or readers. In a oral society the narratives generally have to contain a "point", some kind of instruction. The narrative must be relevant to the audience. For the same reason we should expect the traditional genres of narratives to have played an important part in the oral presentations of a certain tradition. After all, the use of a well-known pattern at the beginning of a narrative prepares the audience for

the point, which the audience knows will come. Finally, the use of pre-conceived forms also enables the author to surprise his listeners by introducing an unexpected point, as Isaiah perhaps did by quoting the "song of the wine-yard" (Is 5,1ff.). So far there was really no difference between the history writing in the Old Testament, in the ancient Near East or in the Classical World.

I have already adduced examples of the presence of preconceived narrative patterns and I am not going to repeat myself here. Though, it is most interesting that the redactors of composite works like the Tetrateuch or the Deuteronomistic History did not select the narratives arbitrarily. On the contrary, the choice of narratives followed their points, which seemed most fit to promote the message of the authors. This is not just another postulate. As to the Deuteronomistic History we can be sure that a specific view of Israelite history governed the principle of selection. On the other hand there is no reason to believe that the deuteronomists themselves "invented" the narratives which they included in their history (at least not normally). It is true that they were responsible for the appearance of the narratives, but the several different narrative forms which the deuteronomistic writers used show that the narratives in question were older than their inclusion in the Deuteronomistic literature (as a matter of fact, from a literary point of view their history is rather heterogenous). The only exceptions, which do not follow the normal narrative technique, are the small sections, which weave together the reigns of the various kings and which we normally consider to be quotations from the official annalistic literature of the two Hebrew kingdoms (*pace* TIMM)³⁷. Strictly speaking, they only transmit

37 The common view of these "annalistic notes" is called into question by S.TIMM, *Die Dynastie Omri*, FRLANT 124, Göttingen 1982, 14ff. I shall not in this place try to take up TIMM's argument in a serious way. I shall only put forward this simple observation: The fact that in the critical periods, during which the Northern Kingdom

neutral information and their purpose is not to impress the readers in any way. This the deuteronomistic redactors acknowledged and they tried to influence the neutral attitude of the notes by adding their own evaluations of the kings.

When the deuteronomistic history writing (and it is also possible to include the Yahwistic, the Priestly and the Chronicler's histories) most consciously collected pre-existent traditions and combined them according to a historical scheme, which they themselves constructed, the reason was not that they wanted to present a *subjective* account of the Israelite history instead of an *objective* version. This alternative was simply not relevant to them (they would not, plainly spoken, have understood that there was a problem involved). This is the second stratum of my argument and it depends on the criterion of truth, which I referred to above, and which was relevant to the peoples of Antiquity. This criterion of truth was conditioned by the idea of causality in the Ancient Near East. I shall be brief, but the argument will be presented in a more elaborate way in my forthcoming history of Israel. The argument on which the deuteronomists based their history was the fact that they considered Yahweh to be the cause of historical events, whereas we understand these events as the outcome of social, economical, political and cultural processes in the Israelite society. Since this was the opinion of the deuteronomists it had consequences as well for their history writing³⁸. Since it

was on the brink of disaster, the chronological information becomes rather imprecise indicates that the deuteronomistic redactors had no chronological information about these periods and had to rely on not too precise guesswork, because official annalistic records were not available (did not exist).

- 38 The deuteronomistic theology of history has been analyzed by several authors, perhaps no better than by the late G.VON RAD (f.ex. in his *Theologie des Alten Testaments I*, München 1957 (4.impression 1966), 346-359). Consequently, there is really no need to take up the question in this paper. The question here is not the content of the deuteronomistic theology but the consequences

was the opinion of the ancient Israelites that Yahweh governed the fate of his people and even punished Israel because of her transgressions, then every record of the Israelite past must necessarily talk about the acts of God; if they did not, they were not included, as they would have been considered improper or even false. The notion that it is possible to distinguish between two categories of arguments, one representing a theological cause of events, the other a "naturalistic" one, would have been absurd to ancient peoples and therefore pointless. Thus, the deuteronomists submitted a narrative to redactional reworking in order to make it fit their theology of history. This was not a historical forgery, as it was considered to be true history. It is irrelevant whether the historical account was true or false, since it was simply the capability of the narrative to illustrate that Yahweh was the God of history, which decided the inclusion of the narrative in the Deuteronomistic History.

My third argument is related to the preceding one. The so-called "primitive" idea of causality which governed the deuteronomistic redactional work had as its principal presupposition the common conception of the world in those days. After all, everybody considered his fate an expression of the will of God, the outcome of his God's approval or rejection of his behaviour. Therefore, ancient peoples structured their experiences according to this "logical" pattern and simply did not conceive of reality as we do. Again, I have to draw attention to LIVERANI, not in order to bore my readers, but because I doubt if any other Near Eastern scholar has explained the importance of the primitive idea of causality in a way comparable to this Italian assyriologist. At this instance I shall quote LIVERANI's paper on king Rib-Adda of Byblos as the "righteous sufferer"³⁹. It is the intention of LIVERANI in this

of the application of such a theological framework to historical studies.

39 M.LIVERANI, Rib-Adda, *Giusto sofferente*, AOF 1 (1974) 175-205.

article to show that in his letters to Pharaoh, indeniably contemporary documents, Rib-Adda described "the circumstances" not as they were, but as he perceived them, and he looked at them not as they were, but in accordance with a preconceived pattern. Furthermore, he structured his description of his experiences by using this pattern.

7. *Reconstructing ancient history*

Thus we may conclude that there exists an almost absolute contrast between our idea of history and of the world and the one common among ancient peoples. Therefore, from the beginning the endeavour to reconstruct the historical course of events on the basis of a single documentary source from the Ancient Near East is really without prospect of success. In order to arrive at something which we may consider a reflection of what happened we have to make the purpose of the authors clear and to explain how and why they were influenced by it. This was my aim in my paper on the history of David's rise. This procedure is, however, not without its own problems, because it is only suited to show if the document was a piece of propaganda, and for that reason it leaves us in the dark as concerns the real course of events. After all, the accusations against David were no more "neutral" than his apology. My study of this narrative was guided by the fact that the various episodes in which David claimed to have played no rôle demonstrate an astonishing continuity. Between them they indicate that David deliberately strived after the throne of Saul.

On the other hand this procedure is first and foremost dictated by necessity and to be candid, its results are highly hypothetical, even though many familiar historical reconstructions depend on the same method, because of the lack of other information, which would have enabled us to check the biblical sources. An exceptional case is the wars of Ahab, and

of course we possess other written documents outside the Old Testament which we may utilize to check the Deuteronomistic History and, clearly enough, the deuteronomistic version is not *invariably* wrong. Though, in the case of the prehistory, but also to some degree in the case of the historical period, we must admit that external evidence for checking the biblical narratives is not available. Moreover, the lapse of time between the assumed "historical" events in the pre-monarchical era and the written narratives dealing with them in the Old Testament is so conclusive that it must be considered absolutely wrong to think that the Old Testament narratives form a point of departure for the historical study of Palestine during the later half of the 2.mill.B.C. *The Old Testament narratives are, perforce, secondary historical sources.* Apart from the above-mentioned exceptions no written reports of the fate of Palestine in pre-monarchical times exists, which are only approximately contemporary with the period in question. What we have is an abundance of archaeological material, which is our primary source.

It goes without saying that any endeavour to describe the earliest history of Israel on the basis of such source material must fail, as the biblical reconstruction of the stateless period is in no way supported by the primary evidence, neither in its broad outlines nor in its details. To the contrary, the primary sources mostly contradict the Old Testament version where it is possible to combine the two bodies of source material, an event which is, however, exceptional. The only way open to us is to propose some hypothetical "heuristic" model and to reconstruct history so that the model used is not at variance with the available primary sources, but rather to the contrary is supported by them. If such a reconstruction differs fundamentally from the Old Testament, the outcome is not that our reconstruction is wrong, but that we are forced to reconsider our understanding of the Old Testament traditions.

MALAMAT's insistence on using the Old Testament as a "conceptual model" (in fact a *heuristic* model) cannot be sustained. Not because he is wrong from a methodological point of view, which he is not, the Old Testament

being a most obvious starting point for the study of Israelite history and even prehistory. The Old Testament model - or account - of early Israelite history is, however, disproved by the archaeological sources to such a degree that I consider it better to leave it out of consideration. As a consequence, the real issue at stake is the right and wrong use of the Old Testament source material which derives from a culture quite different from ours and therefore problematic to us. Evidently, much modern historical research dealing with the fate of ancient Israel is at the present trapped in a *cul-de-sac*, and the reason is our ethnocentric, European and Western concepts of the world. When, generally, Israeli scholarship on the Old Testament seems to be more conservative than f.ex. German and Scandinavian research the reason is likely to be that very few historians are able to describe the history of their own nation in an unbiased way, because they are themselves part of that history. Of course any historical reconstruction is to some extent "contemporary history" as maintained by Benedetto CROCE, i.e. it reflects the ideas of ours more than of (in this case) the ancient Israelites. Nevertheless, it is our duty as historians to reduce our personal involvement as much as it is possible even though it is impossible to be totally "neutral".

Appendix

The present paper was almost concluded when I received the new monograph of John VAN SETERS on historiography⁴⁰. Although the subject is of course related to the presentation here of some problems connected with the study of the history of Israel, it does not interfere with my argument.

40 J.VAN SETERS, *In Search of History*, New Haven 1983.

Rather, I should say that my argument may be turned against VAN SETERS to some degree, not in a serious opposition to his ideas, but as an indication of some problems which are obviously present in his book. VAN SETERS evidently, is more interested in the study of the historical tradition than in the study of history. By taking up such a position VAN SETERS misses one important aspect of any historical tradition, namely the dialectical relationship between the written report and the actual event itself. It goes without saying that I don't intent to say that we may reach the actual event. Nevertheless, the event provoked the written record of it, and there must be some relationship between the event and the record, even a negative one as I demonstrated by referring to the biblical account of the conquest. By neglecting this aspect VAN SETERS to some degree misses some characteristics of Israelite history writing (although he has pointed out several other, even important aspects). These remarks can be illustrated by quoting his treatment of the narrative of David's rise⁴¹. VAN SETERS stresses the quality of it not as a historical report, but as a narrative, and he focusses on the technique of the author. What is lacking is a judgment of how the author used his sources, and consequently the real purpose of the author in writing the history of young David is, in fact, not exposed by VAN SETERS.

The second point, where as I see it VAN SETERS does not live up to expectations, concerns his lack of willingness (or ability) to explain (or understand) the mind of the history writers. Seemingly, it never occurs to him that the writers were governed by preconceived patterns, and the application of such structures has as one of its results that e.g. the supposed similarity of the narrative of the anointing of David to that of Saul is not by necessity the outcome of a literary dependence, since it may owe its existence to a general pattern of such call narratives⁴².

41 VAN SETERS, *In Search of History*, 264-271.

42 VAN SETERS, *In Search of History*, 264f.

I am not going to write a new paper dealing with the monograph of VAN SETERS, at least not in this place, but I shall confine myself to these two remarks. Evidently, in many aspects I share the views of VAN SETERS as to the late date of Israelite historiography, even though I differ in details. I shall, however, stress that the somewhat "flexible" method used in this book indicates that perhaps the end of the classic analytical approach to the history books in the Old Testament is drawing near. I don't consider VAN SETERS' book to present a new point of departure for the study of the historical tradition among the Israelites, it is rather the end of such research.

The second point, where as I see it VAN SETERS does not live up to

41 VAN SETERS, in Search of History, 122-111.
42 VAN SETERS, in Search of History, 122.