

71

NORMAN K. GOTTWALD

Sociological Method in the Study of Ancient Israel

Sociological method in Old Testament studies supplements and enriches historical method by providing a complementary grid of understanding for viewing biblical communities as social entities in process. The biblical communities arose, developed, and declined according to regularities known from a wide range of studies in comparative anthropology and social history.

The fruitfulness of sociological method for understanding the origins of Israel as a social revolutionary movement primarily of peasants; for delineating Israel in relation to Canaanites, 'apiru, pastoral nomads, and Philistines; and for assessing the social organization presupposed in the patriarchal narratives is illustrated. The necessity of carefully applied sociological theory and method in order to avoid arbitrary and unsupported comparisons between Israel and other peoples is underscored by these examples.

The article explains the methodological framework that informs the author's The Tribes of Yahweh: A Sociology of the Religion of Liberated Israel, 1250-1050 B.C.E. (Mankroll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1979).

Historical method and sociological method are different but compatible methods for reconstructing ancient Israelite life and thought. Historical study of ancient Israel aims at grasping the sequential articulation of Israel's experience and the rich variety of its cultural products, outstandingly its literature and religion. Sociological study of ancient Israel aims at grasping the typical patterns of human relations in their structure and function, both at a given moment or stage (synchronics) and in their trajectories of change over specified time spans (diachronics). The hypothetically "typical" in collective human behavior is sought by comparative study of societies and expressed theoretically in "laws," "regularities," or "tendencies" that attempt to abstract translocal and transtemporal structural or processual realities within the great mass of spatiotemporal particularities. In such terms, the tribal phase of Israel's social history is greatly illuminated by a theoretical design of social organization (as developed by Sahlins and Fried, among others).¹

Historical method embraces all the methods of inquiry drawn from the humanities (e.g., literary criticism, form criticism, tradition history, rhetorical criticism, redaction criticism, history, history of religion, biblical theology). Sociological method includes all the methods of inquiry proper to the social sciences (e.g., anthropology, sociology, political science, economics). Sociological method in data collection and theory building enables us to analyze, synthesize, abstract, and interpret Israelite life and thought along different axes and with different tools and constructs from those familiar to us from historical method. Sociological inquiry recognizes people as social actors and symbolizers who "perform" according to interconnecting regularities and within boundaries or limits (social systems).

If we wish to reconstruct ancient Israel as a lived totality, historical method and sociological method are requisite complementary disciplines. Historical method has long recognized the need for collaboration with archaeology, which as a discipline does not fit immediately or comfortably into the molds of the humanities. It is increasingly clear that the need of historical method for sociological inquiry into ancient Israel is just as urgent as its need for archaeology.

The social system of ancient Israel signifies the whole complex of communal interactions embracing functions, roles, institutions, customs, norms, symbols, and the processes and networks distinctive to the subsystems of social organization (economic production, political order, military defense, judiciary procedure, religious organization, etc.). This social system must be grasped in its activity both in the communal production of goods, services, and ideas and in the communal control of their distribution and use.

We must resist the tendency to objectify Israel's social system into a static and monolithic hypostasis. It developed unevenly, underwent change, and incorporated tension and conflict. It was a framework for human interaction in which stability struggled against change and change eroded away stability. To call this complex of human interaction a social system is meaningful in that it was something more than an aggregation of discrete interhuman relations. There were regularities in the ways that Israelites organized their actions and thoughts, cooperated and contended with one another and with outside groups. These

regularities form an analyzable system in the additional sense that they placed Israelite behavior and valuing under impulses and pressures toward normativeness or standardization. The social system tended to validate particular uses and distributions of natural and human resources and to delimit the exercises and constraints of physical coercion and symbolic persuasion. By carefully noting the regularities and normative tendencies, it is possible to identify deviations and idiosyncrasies, both those that appear to have been "social waste" and those that augured "social innovation."

The materials for sociological study of ancient Israel are the biblical text and all available extrabiblical evidence, written and material. In addition, the contents, structures, and developmental trajectories of other social systems—whether in Israel's immediate milieu or far beyond in time and space—are potentially relevant for comparative study. What is vital is that those contents, structures, and trajectories be examined in their total contexts and that they be compared with Israel in its total context. Alleged comparison of isolated social data torn out of systemic context is not comparison at all, but superficial juxtaposition lacking criteria for evaluation.

Sociological method works as a totality with its own analytic tools and theoretical perspectives quite as much as does historical method. Since historical method has already "staked out" the field of biblical study, sociological method tends to arrive on the scene as a "tracked on" adjunct to the customary privileged methods. As long as it performs in the role of supplying addenda or trying to do "rescue work" on texts and historical problems that are momentarily resistant to historical methods, sociological method in biblical study will appear tangential and quixotic, as a problematic interloper.²

In any given text the sociological data may be no more than traces or shattered torsos. What are we to make, for example, of the kinship and marriage patterns attested in the patriarchal accounts? When sociological method is called in to assist on this problem, it must try to contextualize the fragments within their larger complexes. So far, what is loosely called "sociological" inquiry in this instance is a ransacking of ancient Near Eastern societies for parallel social phenomena. As in the appeal to Nuzi parallels to patriarchal kinship and marriage practices, insufficient attention is paid to the nature of the compared texts and to the social systems presupposed by the texts.

We are becoming freshly aware of the scandalous imprecision of such "sociological" dabbling in the patriarchal traditions. The historical and social loci of the patriarchal traditions are simply not specifiable with any degree of confidence, and, in fact, there is every reason to believe that the historical and social horizons of the separate units and cycles of tradition are highly diverse.³ In this stalemated situation, sociological inquiry can be most helpful when it extends the examination of how biblical texts with similar social data function in relation to texts or traditions of a similar nature among other peoples, whether literate or preliterate. Working on its own ground, sociological method will try to build up a body of knowledge about types or families of texts and traditions containing social data of certain kinds. How do these tradition types reflect or refract

social reality in various types of social systems? How, for example, do general-ogies function in oral and written traditions, as separate pieces and as elements within larger compositions, in tribal and in statist societies, etc.?⁴

In other words, a sociology of ancient Israel can be a proper complement to literary and historical inquiry only as it pursues its own proper object of reconstructing the Israelite social system as a totality, without prejudging which of its results are likely to be germane to understanding specific texts or historical problems and without diverting too much energy at the start to narrowly or obscurely framed "social puzzles" in idiosyncratic literary and historical contexts.

In order to approximate comprehensive reconstruction of the Israelite social system, sociological method depends upon literary and historical criticism to undertake their tasks in a similarly comprehensive and systemic way. It also relies upon archaeology to break loose from the domination of historically framed orientations and to become an instrument for recovering the total material life of ancient Israelites irrespective of immediate applications to texts or to historical and sociological problems.

We may illustrate the way the integral projects of sociological method intersect with historical methods by noting the impact of the introduction of a new model for understanding the origins of Israel within its Canaanite matrix. The proposal that earliest Israel was not an invading or infiltrating people but a social revolutionary peasant movement within Canaan is at least a quasi-sociological model.⁵ This heuristic model gives a new way of looking at all the old texts, biblical and extrabiblical, and the material remains.⁶ Its effect has been to shift attention away from the precise historical circumstances of Israel's occupation of Canaan and toward the social processes by which Israel came to dominance. The effort to reconstruct a history of the occupation has long been dented by the sparse historical data. A sociological model in this case provides a way of reviewing the fragmentary historical data and in the end may help us to understand why the historical data are as obscure as they are. Finally, the specifically historical project of identifying the agents and spatiotemporal course of the emergent dominion of Israel in Canaan may be freshly facilitated by the working out of a different conception of the process at work in that achievement.

The effect of the peasant-revolt model of the origins of Israel has been to replace uncritical cultural assumptions about Israel's alleged pastoral nomadism with sharper sociological inquiry into the internal composition of early Israel, demographically and socioeconomically.⁷ What exactly was this formation of people called Israel which took control in Canaan and whose social system took form as it gained the upper hand in the land? From what social spaces in Syro-Palestine did these people derive? What brought them together, enabled them to collaborate and to succeed? What were the goals these people shared and what social instrumentalities and material conditions contributed to their accomplishment? How does this social system of earliest Israel relate to those that preceded it and those against which it was counter-posed? In other words, a proper model of the Israelite emergence in Canaan is not attainable apart

from a proper model of the social system of the people who gained dominion in the land.⁸ And of course neither the historical course of Israel's coming to power nor its emergent social system can be grasped without an understanding of the cultic-ideological process of tradition formation.

Up to the present, biblical studies have grappled with a model of the settlement and with a model of the cultic production of traditions, but there has been no adequate mediation between these two forms of inquiry within a larger analytic model of the social system involved in the twin process of taking power in the land and of building its own traditions. Martin Noth and George Mendenhall have made suggestive, incomplete, and at times mistaken attempts at an encompassing societal model. By drawing together the seminal contributions of Noth and Mendenhall, while weeding out their errors and false starts, we have the beginnings of a comprehensive social model for early Israel—or, more precisely, we have an inventory of the questions to be pursued and a general sense of the appropriate range of model options.⁹

A theoretical model of the origins and operations of early Israelite society will entail two axes of investigation: (1) the analysis of Israel's internal composition and structure at its several organizational levels and in its sectoral subsystems; (2) the characterization of Israel's social system as an operational and developing totality in comparison and contrast with other social systems. Both types of inquiry have synchronic and diachronic dimensions, and both types of inquiry will proceed dialectically in movement back and forth between concrete data about specific social systems and more abstract heuristic models, such as a theoretical design of "tribalism."¹⁰

As for the first task, evidence of the internal composition and eclectic structure of early Israel is largely biblical, but there are significant checkpoints in the Ugaritic, Alalakh, and Amarna texts, as well as rich resources concerning the material culture which have yet to be sufficiently mined. These immediate social data must be reflected upon against the backdrop of the large body of information and theory we now possess as a consequence of anthropological field studies, work in pre-history, and theorizing about social organization.

To what levels, ranges, and functions of social organization do the designations *ševet*, *mšpāḥa*, and *bet* 'av refer? To date it has seemed sufficient to give them the native meanings of "tribe," "clan," and "household" or "extended family," without further ado. If early Israel is conceivable as a form of "retribalization," what were the bonding organizational elements for holding together the segmented "tribes" of diverse origin? Noth provided the summary answer of "a sacral league," but his analogy between the Greek amphictyony and the intertribal league of Israel holds good at such an abstract level that it is of doubtful value in illuminating the crucial features of Israel's retribalization process. If Israel was a revolutionary movement within Canaanite society, how did matters develop from the uncoordinated restiveness of peasants and *'apiru* in Amarna days into the coalition of Israelite tribes? So far only Alt has offered a bare sketch of diachronic possibilities.¹¹ Merely appealing to Mosaic traditions and Yahwistic faith as "explanations" for this coalescing process does not clarify and reconstruct the arduous struggle by which Israel put itself together in Canaan.

As for the second task, what was the over-all character of Israel's social system in comparison with other preceding and contemporary social systems? Such a comparison depends upon prior analysis of the social systems compared, and this analysis must follow an inventory of social desiderata so that we do not simply accept at face value either the form or the preponderance of specific social data as they happen to appear to us in texts. The comparison of social systems must constantly contextualize social systems and subsystems within the systems as a whole and in terms of the direction of their movement (e.g., expansion, differentiation, decline, transition to new systems, etc.).

Whether two different social complexes can be meaningfully compared is of course a matter of much discussion.¹² In biblical studies there has been an abundance of hasty and superficial cross-cultural comparisons. With each new discovery in the ancient Near East—such as the Amarna, Mari, Ugaritic, or Ebla texts—there has been a rush of claims for direct correlations between them and the biblical text, or for wholesale borrowings of systems or institutions or offices by Israel. On more careful analysis these "parallels" either vanish or are greatly scaled down and nuanced. Such defaults establish the urgency of developing more reliable ways of comparing and contrasting social data and systems. If we wish, for example, to compare early Israelite society with its Canaanite counterpart and matrix, we face serious gaps in our knowledge of aspects of both entities, but these difficulties need to be brought out more systematically so that we will be clearer about the explanatory strength or weakness of our theory and thereby more aware of the kinds of research needed to test and improve theory.

It is evident that comparison of early Israel with other contemporary social systems entails diachronic and synchronic approaches. The social systems under comparison were not static, isolated entities; they developed internally and stood in varying relations to one another over spans of time and in different regions. A great deal of nuancing in treating these societal interfaces is required, often dismally lacking, for example, in the way "Canaan" and "Israel" are counter-posed by biblical scholars, like characters in a morality play. According to all known analogies of revolutionary movements, we should expect that by no means all of the people of Canaan will have been "polarized" by the nascent Israelite movement. It should be expected that as the Canaanite and rising Israelite social systems collided and conflicted, there will have been many people—probably a majority at first—who were conflicted in their own feelings and stances toward the two options. We should expect to find those who strove for neutrality, by choice or necessity, some who were half-hearted converts and those who switched sides, others who were secret supporters and yet others who were opportunist in their allegiances.¹³ A reexamination of Israel's early traditions in terms of these dynamics of social revolutionary movements will reveal unexpected results toward a clearer conception of how Israel arose. The result is likely to be that the initially simplistic-seeming peasant revolt model will turn out to be even more complex and nuanced than the previous conquest and immigration models of Israel's origins.

In pursuing the comparative approach to Israelite society a major issue is

how we are to decide which social systems should be compared with Israel's. Here we encounter the vexed problem of determining the boundaries of social systems in relation to the boundaries of the various historic state, tribal, and cultural formations which appear under various, vaguely depicted proper names and gentiles in the biblical and extrabiblical texts. No doubt we should identify the Canaanite city-state system as the dominant and definitive social system within earliest Israel's horizon.¹⁴ But do the 'apiru of the Amarna period form another such system? Here the time trajectory enters into consideration. The 'apiru appear as a sub-set within Amarna "feudalism" or Asiatic mode of production,¹⁵ but insofar as the 'apiru are seen as forerunners and one of the contributors to early Israel, they may indeed merit attention as another social system in embryo or as one trajectory along which the Canaanite social system declined and the Israelite social system rose. And it would be a grave methodological error to assume that early Israel arose along only one such trajectory. More often than not, the relation of the *apiru* to early Israel has been examined as though it was the only or the primary pertinent relationship and that, if the *apiru* data could not account for all or most of the features of early Israel, then they were irrelevant.

Pastoral nomadism as the supposed socioeconomic condition of early Israel might be viewed as another social system, but we now see how doubtful it is that we can locate an autonomous pastoral nomadic system in the immediate environment of Canaan contemporary with early Israel. The trans-human, village-based pastoral nomadism of Israel's environment was a minor sub-set of village tribalism subordinated socioeconomically and politically to sedentary Canaan. This pastoral nomadism was at most a minor contributor to early Israel. Nonetheless, it is necessary that this pastoral nomadic sub-specialization of village tribalism be carefully analyzed in order to reassess properly its vastly overstated role in Israelite origins.¹⁶

Other possible social systems in Israel's milieu come to mind. Do the Philistines constitute a new social system or are they merely heirs of the Canaanite system with new organizational twists, mostly of a political and military nature?¹⁷ And what are we to make of the Ammonites, Moabites, and Edomites, whose origins were roughly contemporary with Israel and yet who did not become a part of Israel? Did these people feel the tug of Israel's social mutation, did some of them actually engage in social revolution, and if so, why did they accept kingship earlier than did Israel itself?¹⁸

Against this methodological sketch, we can see why the patriarchal traditions are particularly resistant to sociological analysis. From all appearances, those traditions belong to any number of peoples moving along various trajectories toward their convergence in early Israel. The patriarchal traditions can only be Israelites. Just as Noh recognized that the patriarchal traditions of united Israel approached backwards, working out of the congealing traditions of united Israel in Canaan, so the sociological analysis of the patriarchal communities must be approached backwards from the coalescing peoples of the intertribal community in Israelite Canaan. No sociological wonders will be workable on the patriarchal traditions until much more is known of their literary form and function, of their

temporal horizons, and of their rootage in one or another of the social trajectories along which sectors of the Syro-Palestinian peoples converged toward their unity in Israel.¹⁹

An instance of the great difficulties in precise sociological analysis of the groups represented in the patriarchal traditions of Genesis 25-35 is the practice of using the connubium reported in Genesis 34 between Shechemites and Israelites as evidence for clan exogamy, a habit that goes back at least to the nineteenth-century anthropologist E. B. Tylor.

Genesis 34 tells us only that the two parties began to reach agreement on an alliance that was to include the exchange of wives. It does *not* tell us that a presupposition for the proposed wife-exchange was that Israelites or Shechemites could not marry among themselves and thus were obliged to get wives from outside. It does *not* tell us that the wives to be exchanged between the group constituted all or most of the marriage arrangements to be made by Israelites and Shechemites, thereby sharply reducing or excluding intragroup marriages or intermarriage with other groups. In other words, since we do not know the actual scope demographically or the internal social structure of the two contracting entities in Genesis 34, we have to try out various hypotheses to see how clan-exogamous they look on close examination. The results are not reassuring.

If, for example, "Israel" in Genesis 34 was actually only a relatively small social group (still proto-Israelite), the connubium formula might be read—especially noting the phrase "we will become one people" (v. 16)—as alluding to an early endeavor to meld together two groups of people into one tribal formation as complementary moieties. We might in that case be witnessing an initial act by which a member of later Israel (Manasseh or a section of Manasseh?) was formed from two originally separate groups that become segments practicing exogamy and thus exchanging wives within the newly shaped tribe. Granted that the formation was not carried through according to Genesis 34, it could at least be construed that connubium covenant was a means by which some peoples did come together as tribal entities within Israel, the tribes being built up by exogamous clans.

If, on the other hand, we imagine (as the final state of the text certainly does), that many Israelite tribes are present and that this is an "external" arrangement between autonomous entities, a matter of intertribal "foreign policy," we could say that Israel developed, or sought to develop, peaceful relations with some surrounding peoples by connubium covenant. But would a tribal organization (Israel) and a city organization (Shechem) be likely to enter into such an exogamous connubium? Would a large assemblage of tribes be able to get enough wives from one city for an exclusive connubium if exogamy forbade marriage of Israelites to fellow Israelites? The anthropological evidence is that whole tribes are not exogamous; it is clans within a tribe that are exogamous and that take wives from and give wives to other exogamous clans, the tribe as a whole remaining endogamous (although marriages may be allowed or prescribed outside the tribe in certain cases). The more large-scale the Israelite partner in the proposed connubium is conceived to have been, the more likely

it becomes that the group already would have worked out marriage patterns, exogamous or otherwise (that cannot be known from the text), among its member units, and thus the more peripheral the connubium with Shechem would become as a wife-exchange mechanism and the more it would look like an alliance sealed with limited intermarriage bearing no correlation whatsoever with exogamy rules. Maybe the difficulties can be eased by conceiving the proposed connubium as an arrangement involving only a single clan or group of clans (of Manasseh?) located in the vicinity of Shechem. In that way a possible symmetrical, exogamously based exchange of wives could be made plausible, but that hypothesis still fails to deal with the issue of whether a city would be interested in, or capable of, wholesale exogamy.

The farther our analysis and speculation about alternatives runs, the more evident it becomes that even if Genesis 34 goes back to early times, the obstacles to perceiving its exact sociohistoric context, the parties involved, and the mechanisms posited, are insuperably opposed to any reasonable confidence that this tradition shows the existence of exogamous clans in early Israel. A careful examination of other early biblical traditions thought to attest to clan exogamy yields similarly doubtful or flatly negative results.²⁰

A main sociological task in the study of early Israel is the development of an adequate socioeconomic and cultural material inventory. This will require further historico-territorial and topological studies (of the sort begun by Alt and carried on by Rowton). Archaeology will have to attend not only to fortified cities but to the agricultural village/neighborhood complexes that included settlements, roads, fields, springs, irrigation, terrace systems, etc. Renewed attention will have to be given to population size, density, and distribution. The role of technological factors taken in combination will have to be explored more thoroughly: the introduction of iron, waterproof cisterns, improved terracing, and irrigation works. The archaeology of biblical Israel, previously overwhelmingly oriented to direct synchronizations with biblical literature and history (e.g., who were the kings of Genesis 14:1?), will increasingly offer a wider spectrum of data for the social and cultural reconstruction of the early Israelite movement. More and more we can hope for the collaboration of all methodologies in clarifying the material and socioreligious processes by which the Israelites came into dominance in the hill country of Canaan.²¹

The sociological inquiry which I have here illustrated in the instance of Israel's origins will equally apply to the major social transition to the monarchy and the resulting tensions and conflicts between state, empire, and tribe, as well as to the later period of the disintegration of the Israelite states and the survival and reconstruction of social forms into the postexilic age. It is obvious that in this task it will be necessary to call upon a host of specialists so far only sporadically enlisted in the task of reconstructing ancient Israel, e.g., agronomists, botanists, hydrologists, geologists, demographers, etc. The reconstructed cultural-material complexes will bear important indicators for social, military, and religious organization, especially when contextually compared with agrarian complexes and urban center/rural periphery complexes of similar sorts that can be studied at first hand by contemporary ethnologists.

In sum, it is essential that we devise a constructive model of the Israelite social system in its own right, firmly rooted in its material conditions, a model which delineates the major subsystems and segmented organization, as well as a model that grasps the integrating mechanisms and the solidifying ideology of the social whole.²² This model will necessarily be viewed genetically in order to show how Israel arose, achieved its first cohesive form, and then passed over into other forms in the course of time through a combination of internal and external pressures. Synchronisms and diachronics, internal dynamics and external interfaces and interpenetrations will be drawn together under the principle or law of internal relations whereby an alteration in any element of the whole will be seen to bring about alterations in the entire system.

A model of the Israelite social system will incorporate the highly centralized and richly articulated religion of Yahweh. But it must do so sociologically by understanding the religion as a social phenomenon (institutionally and symbolically) and therefore related to all the other social phenomena within the system by the law of internal relations. This socioreligious inquiry must proceed without simplistic recourse to the tautological, philosophically idealist claim that because religion was central to the social system, it can be posited as the unmoved mover of the Israelite mutation.²³

The sociological contribution to biblical hermeneutics is that the Israelite traditions must not only be interpreted within their original matrices, but must be interpreted from out of the social matrix of the interpreter. In the end it will be learned that an adequate biblical hermeneutics will require the investigation of the evolution of social forms and systems from biblical times until the present!²⁴ Any interpreter who claims continuity with the biblical texts must also assume the continuity of the history of social forms as an indispensable precondition of the hermeneutical task.

NOTES

1. Marshall Sahlins, *Tribesmen* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1968); Morton H. Fried, *The Evolution of Political Society: An Evolutionary View* (New York: Random House, 1968).
2. Frank S. Frick and Norman K. Gottwald, "The Social World of Ancient Israel," *SBLSP* 1 (1975), pp. 165-78.
3. The precariousness of attaching patriarchal tradition to Bronze Age historical and social settings is independently demonstrated by Thomas L. Thompson, *The Historicity of the Patriarchal Narratives: The Quest for the Historical Abraham* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1974) and John Van Seters, *Abraham in History and Tradition* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1975).
4. Renger, working with Amorite texts in which he finds exogamous clan organizations, posits patriarchal exogamy for the biblical patriarchs, but can only succeed by capriciously regarding the biblical genealogies sometimes as actual descent lineages and sometimes as fictitious or eponymous constructs (J. Renger, "mārat ilim: Exogamie bei den semitischen Nomaden des 2 Jahrtausends," *Archiv für Orientforschung* 14 [1973]: 103-7). Much more sophisticated in using comparative methods and thus advancing our comprehension of biblical genealogies are Abraham Mala-

mat, "Tribal Societies: Biblical Genealogies and African Lineage Systems," *Archives Européennes de Sociologie* 14 (1973): 126-36, and Robert R. Wilson, *Genealogy and History in the Biblical World*, Yale Near Eastern Researches, 7 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1977). See also Norman K. Gottwald, *The Tribes of Yahweh: A Sociology of the Religion of Liberated Israel, 1250-1050 B.C.E.* (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1979), pp. 308-10, 334-37.

5. See George E. Mendenhall, "The Hebrew Conquest of Palestine," *BA* 25 (1962): 66-87, and *The Tenth Generation: The Origins of the Biblical Tradition* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973). The same broad conclusion that early Israel was "the first ideologically based socio-political revolution in the history of the world" was reached independently by Jan Dus, "Moses or Joshua? On the Problem of the Founder of the Israelite Religion," *Radical Religion* 2, nos. 2 and 3 (1975): 26-41. See also the discussions in the May 1978 issue of *JSO* by Alan J. Hauser, "Israel's Conquest of Palestine: A Peasants' Rebellion?," pp. 2-19; Thomas L. Thompson, "Historical Notes on 'Israel's Conquest of Palestine: A Peasants' Rebellion?,'" pp. 20-27; and Norman K. Gottwald, "The Hypothesis of the Revolutionary Origins of Ancient Israel: A Response to Hauser and Thompson," pp. 37-52.

6. A striking example of heuristic value of a sociological model for textual criticism and historical reconstruction is Marvin L. Chaney, "HDL-II and the 'Song of Deborah': Textual, Philological, and Sociological Studies in Judges 5, with Special Reference to the Occurrences of HDL in Biblical Hebrew" (Ph.D. diss., Harvard University, 1976).

7. Norman K. Gottwald, "Were the Early Israelites Pastoral Nomads?" in *Rhetorical Criticism: Essays in Honor of James Muilenburg*, ed. J. J. Jackson and M. Kessler (Pittsburgh: Pickwick, 1974), pp. 223-55; idem, "Nomadism," *IDBSup* (1976), pp. 629-31; idem, *The Tribes of Yahweh*, pp. 464-92.

8. Gottwald, *Tribes of Yahweh*, pp. 493-587.

9. My critiques of Noth's and Mendenhall's models for early Israel will be found in *Tribes of Yahweh*, pp. 220-33, 345-57, 376-86, 599-602. See Note 5 above for Mendenhall, and Martin Noth, *A History of the Pentateuchal Traditions* [1948] (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1972).

10. For an elaboration of this programmatic statement, see *Tribes of Yahweh*, pp. 228-33, and for provisional conclusions on the content, see pp. 237-587.

11. Albrecht Alt, "The Settlement of the Israelites in Palestine [1925]," *Essays in Old Testament History and Religion* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1966), pp. 175-204.

12. Walter R. Goldschmidt, *Comparative Functionalism: An Essay in Anthropological Theory* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1966).

13. For an analysis of Israel's Canaanite converts, allies, and neutrals, see *Tribes of Yahweh*, pp. 555-583.

14. W. Helck, *Die Beziehungen Ägyptens zu Vorderasien im 3. und 2. Jahrtausend v. Chr.* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1962); M. A. K. Mohammad, "The Administration of Syro-Palestine during the New Kingdom," *Annales du Service des Antiquités de l'Égypte* (Cairo) 56 (1959): 105-37; Giorgio Buccellati, *Cities and Nations of Ancient Syria*, Studi Semitici, 26 (Rome: Università di Roma, 1967).

15. Norman K. Gottwald, "Early Israel and 'The Asiatic Mode of Production' in Canaan," *SBLSP* (1976), pp. 145-54.

16. On classificatory typology of pastoral nomadism, see Douglas L. Johnson, *The Nature of Nomadism* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1969), and for

ancient Near East pastoral nomadism, see M. B. Rowton, "Autonomy and Nomadism in Western Asia," *Orientalia* 42 (1973): 247-58, and "Urban Autonomy in a Nomadic Environment," *JNES* 32 (1973): 201-15.

17. Cf. Albrecht Alt, "Ägyptische Tempel in Palästina und die Landnahme der Philister [1944]," in *Kleine Schriften*, I (Munich: Beck, 1953), pp. 216-30; Hanna E. Kassas, "Gath and the Structure of the 'Philistine' Society," *JBL* 84 (1965): 259-71.

18. Cf. S. H. Horn, "Ammon, Ammonites," *IDBSup* (1976): 20; J.R. Bartlett, "The Rise and Fall of the Kingdom of Edom," *PEQ* (1972): 26-37, and "The Moabites and the Edomites," in *Peoples of Old Testament Times*, ed. D. J. Wiseman (Oxford: Clarendon, 1973), pp. 229-58.

19. Gottwald, *Tribes of Yahweh*, pp. 32-44, 105-10.

20. *Ibid.*, pp. 301-15.

21. *Ibid.*, pp. 642-63.

22. *Ibid.*, pp. 191-663.

23. *Ibid.*, pp. 591-691.

24. *Ibid.*, pp. 692-709.