



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

And I also said: a new interpretation of Judges ii 3

Kooij, A. van der

Citation

Kooij, A. van der. (1995). And I also said: a new interpretation of Judges ii 3. *Vetus Testamentum*, 45, 294-306. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/10616>

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

License: [Leiden University Non-exclusive license](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/10616>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

"AND I ALSO SAID":
A NEW INTERPRETATION OF JUDGES II 3¹

by

A. VAN DER KOOIJ

Leiden

I

The text of Judg. ii 3 reads as follows in the *New Revised Standard Version*:

So now I say, I will not drive them out before you; but they shall become adversaries to you, and their gods shall be a snare to you,

and, with an interesting difference at the beginning of the verse, in the version of the *Revised English Bible*:

So I said, I shall not drive them out before you; they will entice you astray, and their gods will become a snare for you.

The Hebrew text of Judg. ii 3 reads as follows:

וְנִם אֶמְרָתִי לֹא אֶנְרֵשׁ אִוְחִם מִפְּנֵיכֶם
וְהָיוּ לָכֶם לְצָדִים וְאֱלֹהֵיהֶם יִהְיוּ לָכֶם לְמוֹקֵשׁ

This verse is part of the speech, spoken by the messenger of the Lord, in which Israel, after having been brought into the promised land, is criticized for having made a covenant with the inhabitants of the land, and for not having broken their altars. It is generally assumed that Judg. ii 3 is meant as an announcement of punishment: God vows not to drive out the remaining nations, because Israel has broken the covenant with God by making a covenant with them. It is the aim of this article to propose another interpretation of Judg. ii 3 within its own context.

II

Scholars are of the opinion that Judg. ii 3 is to be seen as an announcement of punishment. A particular question appears to be

¹ I thank my colleague, Dr P.B. Dirksen, for reading the manuscript of this article and for making useful comments.

the translation of *wgm ʾmrty*. G.F. Moore argues that the rendering of this part of vs. 3 as "and I also said" is to be preferred to the understanding "so I now say".² He points out that many scholars from the past favour the second interpretation, by viewing *wgm ʾmrty* as a declaration of present purpose: because you have disobeyed my command (vs. 2), "I have now also said ..." In that case, however, vs. 3 would hardly begin as it does, but rather with "therefore I say". Moore then states: "It is preferable ... to regard v.³ as referring to a previous warning such as Jos. 23¹³ Nu. 33⁵⁵ " (p. 59). (In Josh. xxiii 12-13 it is stated that, if Israel intermarries with the remaining peoples, the Lord will not continue to drive them out; and in Num. xxxiii 55 it is said that if Israel does not drive out the inhabitants of the land, they will become a serious obstacle "like a barbed hook in your eye and a thorn in your side" [REB] to them.) J. Halbe, however, does not consider Judg. ii 3 dependent on Josh. xxiii 13 and Num. xxxiii 55; on the contrary, in his view vs. 3 is a direct reaction to the disobedience mentioned in vs. 2, and for that reason the beginning, *wgm ʾmrty*, is best translated by "Fürwahr, so erkläre ich hiermit".³ *gm* should not to be taken here as "nebenordnend" but as "unterstreichend". G. Schmitt, though agreeing that vs. 3 is to be understood as a reaction to the disobedience of the people (vs. 2), is of the opinion that contextually speaking the words *wgm ʾmrty* clearly refer to the past: "Auch habe ich gesagt".⁴ This leads him to the remark, "So, wie er dasteht, wirkt der Text schwächlich und hilflos". M. Fishbane,⁵ on the other hand, supports the interpretation "and hereby I also say" for *wgm ʾmrty* (cf. Halbe). He considers Judg. ii 2-3 to be a transformation of Exod. xxiii 29-30. In this passage it is announced that the banishment of the autochthonous peoples will be gradual, and since the Canaanite peoples will be present in the land, the Israelites are cautioned not to enter into a covenant with them. Exod. xxiii does not say that "the failure of complete conquest was a punishment inflicted upon the Israelites owing to their failure to

² *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Judges* (Edinburgh, 1895), p. 59.

³ *Das Privileg Jahwes Ex 34, 10-26. Gestalt und Wesen, Herkunft und Wirken in vordäteronomischer Zeit* (Göttingen, 1975), p. 353, n. 53.

⁴ G. Schmitt, *Du sollst keinen Frieden schliessen mit den Bewohnern des Landes. Die Weisungen gegen die Kanaanäer in Israels Geschichte und Geschichtsschreibung* (Stuttgart, 1970), pp. 40-1.

⁵ *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford, 1985), p. 202.

fulfill the covenant" (p. 202), but, so Fishbane argues, Judg. ii 2-3 does say so. "In Judg. 2:1-5 the messenger says that *because* the Israelites have made a covenant with the inhabitants of the land, and not destroyed their cult places (v. 2), *therefore* 'I will not banish them from before you ... and their gods will be a snare to you'" (p. 202). Together with Moore and Schmitt B.G. Webb adheres to the interpretation, "and I also said".⁶ The verse should be understood in the following way: YHWH calls to mind that "what he said he would do in the kind of situation which has now materialized" (p. 104). Webb further remarks that the implementation of the threat, formerly uttered, is described in Judg. ii 21: because of the disobedience of the people (vs. 20) YHWH will not continue to drive out the remaining peoples. As a last example I would like to mention R. Smend; he too is of the opinion that in vs. 3 "die Nicht-Vertreibung" "als Strafe angekündigt wird", and that consequently Judg. ii 3 is in line with Josh. xxiii 13 and Judg. ii 20-1, 23.⁷

Scholars agree, be it with a variety of argumentation, that Judg. ii 3 should be considered God's reaction to the disobedience of his people (vs. 2), that is to say, an announcement of punishment.⁸ The question, however, is whether this is as clear and convincing as it is supposed to be. In the following I will discuss the function and meaning of Judg. ii 3, by paying attention, among other things, to the question how to translate the beginning of vs. 3 (*wgm ʾmrty*), and to that of the relationship between our verse and other texts.

⁶ *The Book of the Judges. An Integrated Reading* (Sheffield, 1987), p. 104.

⁷ "Das Gesetz und die Völker. Ein Beitrag zur deuteronomistischen Redaktionsgeschichte", in H.W. Wolff (ed.), *Probleme biblischer Theologie. Gerhard von Rad zum 70. Geburtstag* (München, 1971), pp. 506-9.

⁸ See further e.g. C.F. Burney, *The Book of Judges* (2nd edn., London, 1930), p. 39; W. Rudolph, *Der "Elohist" von Exodus bis Josua* (Berlin, 1938), p. 264; L. Perlit, *Bundestheologie im Alten Testament* (Neukirchen, 1969), p. 22; F.E. Wilms, *Das Jahwistische Bundesbuch in Exodus 34* (München, 1973), p. 197; E. Otto, *Das Mazzotfest in Gilgal* (Stuttgart, 1975), p. 280; E.T. Mullen, "Judges 1:1-36: The Deuteronomistic Reintroduction of the Book of Judges", *HTR* 77 (1984), p. 33-54; H.N. Rösel, "Die Überleitungen vom Josua- ins Richterbuch", *VT* 30 (1980), p. 348, n. 16; R.D. Nelson, *The Double Redaction of the Deuteronomistic History* (Sheffield, 1981), p. 46; B. Halpern, *The First Historians. The Hebrew Bible and History* (San Francisco, 1988), p. 135; U. Becker, *Richterzeit und Königtum. Redaktionsgeschichtliche Studien zum Richterbuch* (Berlin, 1990), p. 49ff.; E. Blum, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch* (Berlin, 1990), p. 367.

III

As for the clause *wgm ʔmrty*, it is important to look more closely at the structure of Judg. ii 1b-3 as a whole. This passage can be divided up in the following way:

- A I brought you up from Egypt,
and I brought you into the land
which I vowed I would give to your forefathers;
- B *wʔmr*:
I will never break my covenant with you;
and you shall make no covenant
with the inhabitants of this land;
you shall break down their altars.
- C But you have not obeyed my command.
What is this you have done?
- D *wgm ʔmrty*:
I will not drive them out before you;
they will be as hunters⁹ to you,
and their gods will be as a snare to you.

It seems clear that the beginning of D, *wgm ʔmrty* (vs. 3), is to be seen as a continuation of B, *wʔmr*, "and I said" (last part of vs. 1). The particle *gm* seems to mark the verb *ʔmr* for focus, linking up the beginning of D with that of B, which is supported by the fact that the sayings of YHWH in both cases start with *lʔ*.¹⁰ The most natural interpretation, therefore, is to render the beginning of D (vs. 3) as "and I also said", and not as "and now I say" in the sense of "and therefore I now say". In that case one would expect a Hebrew text like *wʔth*, or *wlkn* (cf. Moore).

D together with B turns out to be part of the speech in which attention is drawn to what has been said by YHWH in the past. The introductory formula, *wgm ʔmrty*, is understandable because of the reproaching remark of C which separates D from B. It is further to be noted that C is in place here, because it is directly related to

⁹ For this translation see A. Spreafico, "Giud 2,3: *lʔdym*", *Bibl.* 65 (1984), pp. 390-2 (*lʔdym* understood as derived from the root *ʔwd*, "to hunt"). The vocalization of the MT is probably due to the influence of Num. xxxiii 55 and Josh. xxiii 13. See also n. 13.

¹⁰ See also C.H.J. van der Merwe, *The Old Hebrew particle gam. A syntactic-semantic description of gam in Gn—2Kg* (St Ottilien, 1990), p. 178.

the second part of B: the reproach of being disobedient concerns the command that one shall make no covenant with the inhabitants of the land, etc. So D, like B, contains a saying of YHWH from the past, whereas C, related to the second part of B, reveals the issue for which the people of Israel is criticized.

The question arises to which saying of YHWH our text (vs. 3) refers.

IV

Since our text is part of a particular context, Judg. ii 1-5,¹¹ the best thing to do is to see which passage(s) most closely related to Judg. ii 1-5, or more specifically to ii 1-3, as a whole. It has been observed by scholars that there are striking connections between Judg. ii 1-3 and Exod. xxiii 20-33 and xxxiv 11-15.¹² From a comparison of typical elements of our passage with both sections in the book of Exodus the following picture emerges:

- (a) "the messenger of the Lord" (vs. 1,4): see Exod. xxiii 20,23;
- (b) "to make no covenant with the inhabitants of the land" (vs. 2): Exod. xxiii 32, xxxiv 12;
- (c) "to break down their altars" (vs. 2): Exod. xxxiv 13;
- (d) the use of the verb *grš* (pi'el; vs. 3): Exod. xxiii 28-31 (four times; pi'el); see also Exod. xxxiv 11 (participle qal);
- (e) "their gods will be to a snare" (vs. 3): Exod. xxiii 33b, but compare also Exod. xxxiv 12.

This list indicates clearly that Judg. ii 1-3 has a close relationship with Exod. xxiii 20-33 in particular (see elements a, b, d and e), but also, although to a lesser extent, with Exod. xxxiv 11-15 (see element c in particular). As for the sayings of the Lord from the past, referred to by D of Judg. ii 1-3, it seems therefore best to consider Exod. xxiii, together with Exod. xxxiv.

Vs. 3 has three parts after *wgm ʾmrty*:

- (a) I will not drive them out before you,
- (b) they will be as hunters to you,
- (c) and their gods will be as a snare to you.

The last part, (c), is related to Exod. xxiii 33b as we have seen above. That does, however, not apply to (b), a part of the text

¹¹ For the literary unity of this passage see Halbe (n. 3), pp. 354-8.

¹² See Nelson (n. 8), pp. 45-6; Halbe (n. 3), pp. 363-5, and Becker (n. 8), p. 53-4. See also Fishbane (n. 5), p. 202, and Blum (n. 8), pp. 365ff.

which figures as a nice parallel to (c). Clause (b) has no parallel in Exod. xxiii or xxxiv, nor is there a phrase similar to it elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible.¹³ It seems to be an expansion of (c) in order to establish a nice parallelism in our text.

But what about (a)? R.D. Nelson¹⁴ is of the opinion that this part is verbally and conceptually dependent upon Exod. xxiii 30 and xxxiv 11. His renderings of the three texts under discussion are:

Judg. ii 3 "I will not drive them out from before you";

Exod. xxiii 30 "I will drive out from before you (...)"

Exod. xxxiv 11 "Behold I will drive them out from before you".

Both texts from Exodus announce that God will drive out the inhabitants of the land, whereas Judg. ii 3 is to be taken according to Nelson as an announcement of judgement (God will not drive them out). A closer look to these texts reveals, however, that the situation is more nuanced than just the difference between a positive statement in Exodus and a negative one in Judges. Actually, the text of Exod. xxiii 30 reads as follows: "Little by little (*m'q' m'q'*) I will drive them out from before you, until you have increased and possess the land" (NRSV). Further, since I have pointed out that (a), instead of being an announcement of judgement, is referring to a saying of YHWH in the past, both texts from Exodus do not seem to be the appropriate parallel. But there is another passage in Exod. xxiii which is much closer to our text, namely Exod. xxiii 29:

Exod. xxiii 29 *l' gršnw m'pnyk ...*

Judg. ii 3 *l' grš' w'tm m'pnykm*

Both texts have in common that YHWH will not drive out the inhabitants of the land. It seems best, therefore, to regard the saying of YHWH in Judg. ii 3 as referring to Exod. xxiii 29.

However, one has to admit that there is an interesting difference between both texts, because the text of Exodus continues this way: I (YHWH) will not drive them out "in one year", but gradually (vs. 30: "little by little"), that is to say, until the time that Israel is numerous, i.e. strong enough, to take possession of the land as

¹³ Num. xxxiii 55 is different: the Hebrew *šdy'm* is used here in the sense of "sides", a meaning which does not fit our text. As for the word *šdy'm*, "hunters", it may be that this word is meant as a word-play on *šdny'm*, Sidonians; cf. Judg. iii 3.

¹⁴ (n. 8), p. 46. See also Halbe (n. 3), p. 365 (Exod. xxxiv 11b).

a whole, the bounds of which, according to vs. 31, will be set from the Red Sea to the sea of the Philistines, and from the wilderness to the Euphrates. So the question arises why this notion of not driving them out in a short period of time is not hinted at in Judg. ii.

As we have seen above, Fishbane too is of the opinion that Judg. ii 3 is related specifically to Exod. xxiii 29, but, since he regards the text of Judges as a transformation of Exod. xxiii 29-30, the difference between both texts in the sense of "not yet" and "not" does not play a role in his discussion. However, the difficulty with his view is that it is based on the rendering "and hereby I also say" of the phrase *wgm ʾmrty*, in order are citable to understand vs. 3 as an announcement of judgement. As I have pointed out, it stands more to reason to translate the beginning of vs. 3 as "and I also said", which means that the rest of vs. 3 is to be regarded as a saying of YHWH from the past. So an answer to the question of the difference between the passage in Exodus and in Judges must be looked for in another direction.

In Exod. xxiii 28-33 the idea is that, as long as the inhabitants of the land are present and not driven out, the Israelites are warned not to enter into a covenant with them and with their gods, because this will be to them a snare (vs. 33). Judg. ii 1-3 reflects the same idea, because this passage has it that the Israelites, having been brought by God¹⁵ from Egypt into the promised land—(God) who said to them, I will be your God for ever¹⁶—, are criticized for having made a covenant with the inhabitants of the land, and for not having broken down their altars. Thus Israel is not blamed for not having driven out the inhabitants of the land, but for the fact that they have made a covenant with them, and with their gods (cf. vs. 3).¹⁷ The important thing is that Judg. ii, in the same way as is the case in Exod. xxiii, presupposes the presence of the original inhabitants in the land. It is precisely at this point that vs. 3 fits in: God had also said, they will not be driven out; their gods will be

¹⁵ The text has "the angel of the Lord", being one of the specific elements by which the passage of Judg. ii 1-5 is related to Exod. xxiii 20ff.

¹⁶ Literally, the text reads, "I will not break my covenant with you". Though this saying has no parallel in Exod. xix ff., it gives adequate expression to the underlying idea of Exod. xix-xxi + xxxii-xxxiv: despite the "great sin" of the people in Exod. xxxii, God did not break the covenant with his people.

¹⁷ Cf. Webb (n. 6), p. 104.

a snare to you. The Israelites are being reminded of the warnings given by God in the past.

But, again, what about the difference between Exod. xxiii and our text, the difference between "not yet" and "not"? First of all, it is at least possible to understand *l'*¹⁸ in Judg. ii 3 in the sense of "not yet",¹⁸ but since this is not certain in our case, I suggest that Judg. ii 3 uses "not" instead of "not yet" for contextual reasons. In the situation of Judg. ii the people must be reminded of the warnings given in the past concerning the inhabitants of the land, who, as far as Judg. ii 1-5 is concerned, are still there.¹⁹ Seen from the perspective of Exod. xxiii 30-1, it becomes evident that the time of the judges is not (yet) the period in which all the inhabitants will be driven out, because the picture offered in the book of Judges is not in line with the ideal situation of Exod. xxiii, namely, that the people of Israel one day will be so numerous and strong that they will possess the land in its entirety, that is, the land from the wilderness, the Negeb, to the river, the Euphrates. Actually, this perspective reminds one of the reign of Solomon, as depicted in 1 Kings iii-x (see e.g. MT 1 Kings v 1,4), though at the same time the perspective of Exodus goes even beyond that picture.²⁰

V

Let us now turn to other related texts which play an important role in the discussion: Num. xxxiii 55; Josh. xxiii 13; and Judg. ii 21.²¹ As we have seen, Moore has suggested that Judg. ii 3 refers to a previous warning such as Num. xxxiii 55. This text reads, in translation, as follows:

But if you do not drive out the inhabitants of the land from before you, then those of them whom you let remain shall be as barbs in your eyes and thorns in your sides, they shall trouble you in the land where you are settling (NRSV).

¹⁸ See G.E. Whitney, "*l'* ('not') as 'not yet' in the Hebrew Bible", *Hebrew Studies* 29 (1988), p. 43-8.

¹⁹ This applies also to Judg. i, and to the rest of the book.

²⁰ See 1 Kgs ix 15ff.: some of the inhabitants of the land are still there.

²¹ As for the view that Deut. vii 1-5 is later than Judg. ii 1-5, see e.g. Halbe (n. 2), pp. 359-63. See also M. Weinfeld, "The Ban on the Canaanites in the Biblical Codes and its Historical Development", in A. Lemaire and B. Otzen (ed.), *History and Traditions of Early Israel. Studies presented to Eduard Nielsen, SVT 50* (Leiden, 1993), pp. 142-60.

It may be clear that this text, being part of the Priestly Code, conveys a meaning different from Judg. ii 3. In Num. xxxiii the people is seen as responsible for driving out the inhabitants of the land; so far Israel is not successful in doing so, the remaining inhabitants will be an obstacle, and will make trouble (*šrr*). This is not the case in Judg. ii 3: here the people is not blamed for not having driven out the Canaanite peoples, but for having made a covenant with them. It is further to be noted that the verb *grš*, typical of Judg. ii and of Exod. xxiii and xxxiv as well, is not used in Num. xxxiii; instead, the verb *yrš* is found.²²

As for Josh. xxiii 13 and Judg. ii 21, it is the opinion of Smend that Judg. ii 3 is to be understood in line with these texts, namely, in the sense of an announcement of judgement (see above). Both texts read, in translation, as follows:

Josh. xxiii 13: (vs. 12: "For if you turn back, and join the survivors of these nations left here among you, and intermarry with them, so that you marry their women and they yours), know assuredly that the Lord your God will not continue to drive out (*yrš* hi.) these nations before you; but they shall be a snare and a trap for you, a scourge on your sides, and thorns in your eyes, until you perish from this good land that the Lord your God has given you" (NRSV).

Judg. ii 21: (vs. 20: "So the anger of the Lord was kindled against Israel; and he said, 'Because this people have transgressed my covenant that I commanded their ancestors, and have not obeyed my voice), I will no longer drive out (*yrš* hi.) before them any of the nations that Joshua left when he died'" (NRSV).

Both texts have much in common, but both are different from Judg. ii 3 in terminology, function, and contents. As in Numbers, the verb *yrš* is used here, and not the verb *grš*. Another terminological difference concerns the peoples of the land: whereas in Judg. ii 3 (cf. Exod. xxiii) the expression "inhabitants of the land" is used, in Josh. xxiii and Judg. ii 21 the Canaanite peoples are referred to by "the (remaining) nations" (*gwyym*). Instead of referring to an earlier saying of God, the related texts in Josh. xxiii and Judg. ii contain the idea that, if Israel does not obey "the covenant" (or, "the law of Moses", according to Josh. xxiii 6), but serves other gods, God will not *continue* to drive out the remaining nations. According to these texts, the driving out of the remaining

²² For the word *šdym*, see n. 13.

nations by God is seen as dependent on the obedience of Israel to "the covenant" (Josh. xxiii 16; Judg. ii 21), or to "the law of Moses" (Josh. xxiii 6). Unlike Num. xxxiii 55, these texts do not belong to P, but, as has been argued by Smend²³ on good grounds, they are to be ascribed to the so-called "nomistic" Deuteronomist (DtrN).

Though this is not the place to deal with the question of DtrN, a few remarks may be in order.²⁴ In my view, DtrN represents a late-exilic redaction, made up, first of all, by the "nomistic" part of Deuteronomy, the book of "the law (of Moses)" to be found in Dtn. iv-xxx,²⁵ and by related passages elsewhere in Genesis-2 Kings. Central to DtrN is the emphasis on "the law of Moses", and on compliance with this law. The great weight attached to all this becomes fully clear in the threat of being led into exile as the ultimate effect of disobedience to the law (see e.g. Josh. xxiii 13, 15).

The differences between Judg. ii 3, on the one hand, and Josh. xxiii 13 and Judg. ii 21, on the other, do not support the idea that Judg. ii 3 should be understood in line with them.²⁶ Judg. ii 3 does not reflect the idea of disobedience to the law of Moses, with the effect that God will not continue to drive out the nations. On the contrary, Judg. ii 3 is in line with the Epilogue to the Book of the Covenant (Exod. xxi-xxiii): it reminds Israel of the warnings given

²³ (n. 7), pp. 501-6. See also his *Die Entstehung des Alten Testaments* (Stuttgart 1981), pp. 115, 123-5.

²⁴ See e.g. W. Dietrich, *Prophetie und Geschichte. Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zum deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerk* (Göttingen, 1972); H. Spieckermann, *Juda unter Assur in der Sargonidenzeit* (Göttingen, 1982); T. Veijola, *Verheissung in der Krise* (Helsinki, 1982); Becker (n. 8), and M.A. O'Brien, *The Deuteronomistic History Hypothesis: A Reassessment* (Fribourg, 1989).

²⁵ This part of Deuteronomy, together with some passages in ch. xxxi, is to be seen as insertion, as has been argued by J.D. Levenson, "Who inserted the Book of the Torah?", *HTR* 68 (1975), pp. 203-33.

²⁶ This interpretation of our text in the light of both texts is not only part of modern exegetical discussion, but appears to be an ancient one, as is clear from the Vulgate and the LXX (A). The Vulgate has the following rendering of Judg. ii 3: *quem ob rem nolui delere eos a facie vestra ut habeatis hostes et dii eorum sint vobis in ruinam*. It represents an interpretation on the basis of Josh. xxiii 12-13 and Judg. ii 21, 23. LXX (A) Judg. ii 3 reflects a similar, but more sophisticated interpretation: καὶ ἐγὼ εἶπα Οὐ προσθήσω τοῦ μετοικῆσαι τὸν λαόν, ὃν εἶπα τοῦ ἐξολοθρεῦσαι αὐτοὺς ἐκ προσώπου ὑμῶν ... This text refers twice to a saying of the Lord, the first of which may be found in Josh. xxiii 13, and the second presumably in Exod. xxiii 31b or Deut. vii 22-4.

in this Epilogue, namely that, since God will not drive out the inhabitants of the land in a short period of time, but only in the long run, one must realize that the inhabitants will be present with all the dangers involved. These passages of Exod. xxiii and Judg. ii are part of a literary stratum which expresses an earlier theological view than does the late-exilic DtrN. They do not yet display the gravity and rigidity of "the law of Moses", with its ultimate consequence, in case of disobedience of the people, of exile from the land. On the contrary, a passage such as Exod. xxiii 30-1 reveals a perspective of quite a different nature (see above).²⁷

VI

To summarize, from the above it follows that Judg. ii 3 is not to be interpreted in line with texts such as Josh. xxiii 13 and Judg. ii 21. Our text ("And I also said, ...") does not represent an announcement of judgement, but refers to earlier sayings of YHWH, aiming at reminding Israel of the warnings given in the Epilogue to the Book of the Covenant (Exod. xxiii 28ff.). As long as the inhabitants of the land are still present, Israel should be aware of the dangers involved when making a covenant with them: "they will be as hunters to you, and their gods will be a snare to you". The basic issue of Judg. ii 1-5 is not why the inhabitants are still present, as in Josh. xxiii and Judg. ii 21, but how to behave towards them as long as they are there.

In closing, some comments on the question of the relationship between Judg. ii 1-3(5) and Judg. i are in order. Whatever the literary background of ch. i may have been, it is generally assumed that Judg. ii 1-5 is closely related to ch. i. It is a well-known view that ii 1-3 serves as a theological interpretation of ch. i, in that it contains the punishment of God for the fact that the tribes of Israel

²⁷ Most scholars agree that Exod. xxiii 20-33 represents a tradition which is older than Deuteronomy. For a different view see Blum (n. 8), pp. 366-77. The literary unity of the passage is a matter of dispute; see e.g. Halbe (n. 3), pp. 483-502; L. Schwienhorst-Schönberger, *Das Bundesbuch (Ex 20,22-23,33). Studien zu seiner Entstehung und Theologie* (Berlin, 1990), pp. 407-10; Y. Osumi, *Die Kompositionsgeschichte des Bundesbuches Exodus 20,22b-23,33* (Freiburg/Göttingen, 1991), pp. 212-16. Vss 28-31a are often regarded as an addition, among other things because of a discrepancy between vs. 27 and vs. 28. However, one can also argue that vs. 27 refers to enemies of Israel on his way from Egypt to Canaan (cf. vs. 20-23a), whereas vss 28ff. refer to the situation in the land.

did not succeed in driving out the Canaanite inhabitants from all places. As Halpern ([n. 8] p. 135) puts it, "2:1-5 condemns Israel for the lapse" of not having driven out them all.

This view is based on two assumptions: (a) the Israelite tribes were not willing to drive them out ("the failure was willful": Halpern [n. 8], p. 135); (b) ii 3 is understood as an announcement of judgement. As for the second element, it is my conclusion that Judg. ii 3 is not to be taken as an announcement of judgement. That means that ch. ii 1-5 does not support the idea that Israel should be blamed for not having driven out all the inhabitants of the land in ch. i. What both passages have in common is the motif of the presence of inhabitants of the land: ii 2 presupposes their presence, and ch. i seems to offer the background of that situation, for it tells the reader about the presence, in certain areas and cities, of Canaanite and Amorite inhabitants.²⁸

The first question, whether the Israelites were unwilling to drive out the Canaanites, is not an easy one. One could argue that the underlying idea is that the tribes, not being under one command (as in Joshua), but each of them operating on its own, were not strong enough to drive out the Canaanites from all places.²⁹ My interpretation of ii 3 seems to support this understanding of ch. i, on the assumption that ch. i and ii 1-5 are closely related.

This is not the place to deal with the complicated question of the redaction-critical position of Judg. i 1-ii 5 within the context of the books of Joshua and Judges. As far as my discussion of i 1-ii 5 goes, it does not support the idea of Smend that i 1-ii 5 is part of a DtrN insertion. It is further to be noted that ii 1-3 as understood in this article is in line with iii 5, the last verse of ii 6-iii 6:

So the Israelites lived among the Canaanites, the Hittites, the Amorites, the Perizzites, the Hivites, and the Jebusites; and they took their daughters as wives for themselves, and their own daughters they gave to their sons; and they worshipped their gods (NRSV).

These verses present the same picture of Israel living amidst the inhabitants of the land, who apparently are still there, contracting

²⁸ Judg. i offers a nuanced picture, interestingly with a clear emphasis on the northern regions of the land of Israel as still being populated by Canaanites. It seems to reflect a pro-Judah stance.

²⁹ Cf. the interpretation in the parallel texts in Joshua, which are part of the "priestly" redaction of the book: *l' yklw* (Josh. xv 63, xvii 12).

intermarriages (for the relationship between the making a covenant and the intermarriages, see Exod. xxxiv 15-16), and serving their gods. As for i 1-ii 5, therefore, much is in favour of the thesis of Halpern that this passage as a prologue "provided that some Canaanites survived, a precondition of apostasy" (p. 137), a prologue to be read simultaneously with ii 6-iii 6 (pp. 136-7).

AMOS UND JEROBEAM I.

von

CHRISTOPH LEVIN

Göttingen

Zu den Ergebnissen der Amos-Exegese, die breiteste Anerkennung gefunden haben, gehört, daß die Datierung "in den Tagen Usijas, des Königs von Juda, und in den Tagen Jerobeams, des Sohnes Joaschs, des Königs von Israel" innerhalb der Buchüberschrift Am. i 1 ein Nachtrag ist.¹ Die ungefüge Syntax und auch inhaltliche Erwägungen erweisen es. "Die breite Notiz ... entspricht den üblichen Formeln der Redaktoren, die die Propheten aus größerem Abstand geschichtlich einordnen (vgl. Hos 1,1; Mi 1,1; Zeph 1,1; Jes 1,1; Jer 1,2 ...). Neben dieser weiträumigen Angabe steht die ungewöhnlich genaue: 'zwei Jahre vor dem Erdbeben'. Ihr spürt man noch die Nähe des kürzlich erlebten Geschehens ab" (Wolff, p. 146). Für die nachgetragene Datierung bot, "was Jerobeam II. betrifft, neben 7,9 ... die Erzählung 7,10ff. den Anhaltspunkt" (Rudolph, p. 112). Merkwürdigerweise wurde die zwingende Folgerung aus diesem Befund bisher nicht gezogen: Die Datierung des Amos darf sich nicht an Am. i 1 ausrichten! Die Vorlage Am. vii 9, 10-17 aber muß gedeutet werden, als sei Am. i 1 nicht vorhanden.

¹ Angedeutet bei E. König, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (Bonn, 1893), p. 307. Ausdrücklich bei M. Löhr, *Untersuchungen zum Buch Amos* (Gießen, 1901), p. 3. W. Nowack hat die Beobachtung in die 2. Aufl. seines Kommentars übernommen (*Die kleinen Propheten* [Göttingen, 1903], pp. 126-7). Seither u.a. bei K. Marti, *Das Dodekapropheton* (Tübingen, 1904), p. 155; B. Duhm, *Anmerkungen zu den zwölf Propheten* (Gießen, 1911), p. 1; A. Weiser, *Das Buch der zwölf Kleinen Propheten I* (Göttingen, 1949), p. 113 (*1985, p. 131); W.H. Schmidt, "Die deuteronomistische Redaktion des Amosbuches", *ZAW* 77 (1965), pp. 169-70; H.W. Wolff, *Dodekapropheton 2: Joel und Amos* (Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1969), p. 146; W. Rudolph, *Joel-Amos-Obadja-Jona* (Gütersloh, 1971), p. 112; I. Willi-Plein, *Vorformen der Schriftexegese innerhalb des Alten Testaments* (Berlin, New York, 1971), p. 15; H.F. Fuhs, "Amos 1,1. Erwägungen zur Tradition und Redaktion des Amosbuches", in H.-J. Fabry (ed.), *Bausteine biblischer Theologie. Festgabe für G.J. Botterweck zum 60. Geburtstag* (Köln, Bonn, 1977), p. 274; J. Jeremias, "'Zwei Jahre vor dem Erdbeben' (Am 1,1)", in P. Mommer, W. Thiel (ed.), *Altes Testament. Forschung und Wirkung. Festschrift für H. Graf Reventlow* (Frankfurt am Main, Berlin, Bern, New York, Paris, Wien, 1994), p. 17.