

*“The mission of Tyndale Seminary is to provide Christ-centred graduate theological education for leaders in the church and society whose lives are marked by intellectual maturity, spiritual vigour and moral integrity, and whose witness will faithfully engage culture with the Gospel.”*

<b>Course</b>	<b>JOSHUA-JUDGES</b> OLDT 0670 1S
<b>Date and Time</b>	JANUARY 13 – APRIL 11, 2025 THURSDAYS, 2:15 – 5:05 PM SYNCHRONOUS ONLINE
<b>Instructor</b>	<b>GORDON OESTE, PhD.</b> Email: <a href="mailto:goeste@tyndale.ca">goeste@tyndale.ca</a>
<b>Class Information</b>	The classes will be livestreamed on Thursday from 2:15 PM – 5:05 PM  Office Hours: by appointment via email
<b>Course Material</b>	Access course material at <a href="https://classes.tyndale.ca">classes.tyndale.ca</a> or other services at <a href="#">Tyndale One</a> . Course emails will be sent to your @MyTyndale.ca e-mail account only.

## I. COURSE DESCRIPTION

This course is a survey of the structure and the historical and social context of the books of Joshua and Judges, with an emphasis on their literary structure, rhetorical function, and theological relevance both within ancient Israel and for the church today. The course will include an understanding of the workings of Hebrew narrative as a means of accessing the message of these books.

*Prerequisite: BIBL 0501; Recommended OLDT 0511*

## II. LEARNING OUTCOMES

At the end of the course, students should be able to:

### A. Knowledge and Understanding

- 1) Demonstrate a working knowledge of key issues related to the interpretation of the books of Joshua and Judges.

- 2) Understand several positions related to the interpretation of warfare in Joshua and Judges.
- 3) Have read, compared, contrasted, and evaluated scholarly proposals for how to understand the ethics of war in the Bible, focusing on its expression in the books of Joshua and Judges.
- 4) Demonstrate a knowledge of some of the basic hermeneutical considerations involved in Old Testament interpretation.

#### B. Discipline-specific Skills

- 1) Critically evaluate several hermeneutical approaches to the ethics of war in the Bible
- 2) Gain practice and skill in critically evaluating the strengths and weaknesses of biblical commentaries.
- 3) Have synthesized their own view of how to best understand biblical war passages in Joshua and Judges by developing a presentation which could be used with lay audiences in churches.

#### C. Transferable Skills

- 1) Distill complex scholarly arguments and positions to communicate key insights to lay people.
- 2) Strengthen a desire to learn how to apply scripture to the life of the church.
- 3) Have reflected meditatively, exegetically, theologically upon the relevance of Joshua and Judges for the church in the 21<sup>st</sup> century through completion of the reflective journal.

### III. COURSE REQUIREMENTS

#### A. REQUIRED READING

A modern translation of the Bible (e.g. NIV, NRSV, NLT, NASB, ESV)

Wray Beal, Lissa M. *Joshua*. The Story of God Bible Commentary. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2019.

Younger, K. Lawson, Jr. *Judges, Ruth: Revised Edition*. NIV Application Commentary. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2021.

#### B. RECOMMENDED RESOURCES

Block, Daniel I. *Judges, Ruth*, The New American Commentary. Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman, 1999.

Goldingay, John. *Joshua*. Baker Commentary on the Old Testament: Historical Books. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2023.

Lynch, Matthew J. [\*Flood and Fury: Old Testament Violence and the Shalom of God\*](#). Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2023.

Trimm, Charlie. [\*The Destruction of the Canaanites: God, Genocide, and Biblical Interpretation\*](#). Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2022.

Walton, John H. [\*The Lost World of the Israelite Conquest: Covenant, Retribution, and the Fate of the Canaanites\*](#). Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2017.

Webb, William J. and Gordon K. Oest. [\*Bloody, Brutal, and Barbaric?: Wrestling With Troubling War Texts\*](#). Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2019.

### C. GUIDELINES FOR INTERACTIONS

Tyndale University prides itself in being a trans-denominational community. We anticipate our students to have varied viewpoints which will enrich the discussions in our learning community. Therefore, we ask our students to be charitable and respectful in their interactions with each other, and to remain focused on the topic of discussion, out of respect to others who have committed to being a part of this learning community. Please refer to “Guidelines for Interactions” on your course resource page at [classes.tyndale.ca](https://classes.tyndale.ca)

### D. ASSIGNMENTS AND GRADING

#### 1. Warfare and Violence in Joshua, Judges – Research Paper (40%), Due February 27, 2025

Successful completion of this assignment fulfills Learning Outcomes A 2, A 3, A 4, B1

Students will write a 15-page paper (double spaced, 12-point type, 1-inch margins, using at least 12 sources). Students will summarize two or three key approaches to understanding the hermeneutical and ethical implications of warfare in the OT, focusing particularly on the books of Joshua and Judges. Students will evaluate each approach by setting out the strengths and weaknesses/shortcomings of the works they have chosen to evaluate (providing supporting examples).

After evaluating the strengths and weaknesses of each approach, students will then set out arguments in support of their own position (supplying supporting evidence and rationale for their approach).

If you have completed assignments on the topic of warfare and violence in another course, please speak with the instructor to arrange for an alternative assignment.

### Rubric for the Warfare and Violence Paper

	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>
<b>Accuracy</b>	Demonstrates a clear and deep understanding of the exegetical, ethical, and hermeneutical difficulties or tensions inherent in the topic; accurately and fairly represents the various viewpoints of all the positions examined; does not omit key elements of the positions.	Demonstrates a good understanding of the exegetical, ethical, and hermeneutical issues related to the topic; represents the various positions accurately with some small inaccuracies or omissions.	Demonstrates an unclear understanding of the exegetical, ethical, or hermeneutical issues related to the topic; misrepresents the various positions with some inaccuracies or some unfair characterizations; omits key aspects of a position.	Does not demonstrate an understanding of the exegetical, ethical or hermeneutical issues related to the topic; badly misrepresents a position; omits significant aspects of a position.
<b>Strength of Argument</b>	Uses strongly persuasive, logical, contextually supported arguments to support his/her position; provides ample supporting evidence; uses high quality sources.	Uses persuasive, logical arguments to support his/her position; provides some supporting evidence; the original context is accounted for; uses quality sources.	Uses few logical arguments to support his/her position; the original context is not well incorporated; provides only some supporting evidence; uses low quality sources.	Does not use persuasive, logical arguments to support his/her position; the original context is not incorporated; provides little supporting evidence; uses low quality sources.
<b>Writing Quality</b>	Ability to write clearly and cogently using proper style (SBL Format/Turabian); provides support for positions from the biblical text; writing	Ability to write clearly and cogently using proper style (SBL Format/Turabian); provides some support for positions from the biblical	Ability to write coherently using proper style (some use of SBL Format/Turabian); provides some support for positions from the biblical text;	Exhibits an inability to write clearly; does not provide support for positions from the biblical text; writing not well organized and has no definite

	is well organized and builds to a definite conclusion; exhibits excellent spelling, grammar and syntax.	text; writing is generally organized and builds to a conclusion; exhibits good spelling, grammar and syntax with a few errors.	writing not well organized but has a conclusion; exhibits adequate spelling, grammar and syntax.	conclusion; exhibits poor spelling, grammar and syntax.
<b>Bibliography &amp; Footnotes</b>	Uses more than the minimum number of sources; uses excellent quality of scholarly sources; correctly footnotes source materials using correct SBL/Turabian form; accurately constructs bibliography	Uses slightly more than the minimum number of sources; uses excellent quality of scholarly sources; generally correct footnoting of source materials using SBL/Turabian form; bibliography has some mistakes	Uses the minimum number of sources; uses some good quality scholarly sources; spotty footnoting of source materials using SBL/Turabian form; bibliography has some mistakes	Uses less than the minimum number of sources; does not use quality scholarly sources; incorrect footnoting of source materials; does not use proper SBL/Turabian form; bibliography has many mistakes
<b>Deductive reasoning / evaluation of sources</b>	Shows clear evidence of deductive reasoning; clear definition of issue and reasoning clearly grounded in the biblical text; critically evaluates sources, always giving rationale for pros/cons	Shows evidence of deductive reasoning; definition of problem and response linked to the biblical text; evaluates sources, usually giving rationale for pros/cons	Shows some evidence of deductive reasoning; reverts to inductive thinking unrelated to the topic; rarely evaluates sources; makes value judgments without supplying rationale	Shows little evidence of deductive reasoning; indicates incoherent link with the biblical text; resorts mostly to inductive thinking unrelated to the topic; does not evaluate sources; makes value judgments without supplying rationale

## 2. Reflective Journal (30%) – Due: April 10, 2025

Successful completion of this assignment fulfills Learning Outcomes A 1, A 4, B 2, C 2

Students will read the assigned Bible readings (see the course outline) in a modern translation (Not the KJV or a paraphrase like the Living Bible or The Message). Students will indicate the date of the completion of the readings, and the thoroughness with which the readings were completed in a reflective journal. Thus, each week students will indicate: 1) the percentage of assigned Bible reading completed as well as, 2) whether the text was read: i) very carefully and thoughtfully, ii) carefully, iii) focusing on the main ideas, iv) skimming the text.

As part of this journal, students will also write a 200-250-word reflective journal entry on the assigned article to be read for that week. Each week, students will journal about the role that the assigned reading or commentary reading (when no article reading is assigned) may have on their understanding of the biblical text (questions raised, questions answered, things better understood, insights into the biblical text, a theological aspect of the text addressed in the article, or interaction with the hermeneutical stance of the reading), as well as what implication this may have for how we read/teach the biblical text in the church.

### Rubric for Reflective Journal

	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>
<b>Writing Quality</b>	Ability to write clearly and cogently. Provides adequate personal examples. Writing is well organized and builds to a definite conclusion. Answers questions from syllabus	Ability to write cogently. Provides some personal examples. Writing is organized and leads to a conclusion. Answers questions from syllabus	Provides generalized examples. Writing is not well organized and lacks a concise conclusion. Only occasionally reflects upon questions from syllabus	Writing difficult to follow. Lacks specific examples. Work it is not organized and lacks a conclusion or clear point. Does not reflect upon questions from syllabus
<b>Insights, Understanding and Deductive reasoning</b>	Conveys clear theological/hermeneutical reflection with a clear awareness of interpretive principles utilized; consistent ability to connect issues and insights with correct genre and interpretive principles	Conveys theological/hermeneutical reflection with some awareness of interpretive principles utilized; generally able to connect issues and insights with correct genre and interpretive principles	Work conveys some theological/hermeneutical reflection with some awareness of interpretive principles utilized; makes little mention of appropriate genres or interpretive principles; some connection between work reviewed during the course and reflections.	Work conveys little direct theological/hermeneutical reflection with no awareness of interpretive principles utilized; reflection appears unconnected to concepts reviewed during the course.
<b>Theological / Exegetical / Hermeneutical Awareness</b>	Work always connects reflection topic with the text of Joshua/Judges; appropriately draws connections between	Work consistently connects reflection topic with Joshua/Judges; usually draws connections between	Work sometimes connects with Joshua/Judges; appropriately draws connections between theologically related	Work does not connect reflection topic with Joshua/Judges; does not draw connections between theologically related passages.

	theologically related passages.	theologically related passages.	passages only occasionally	
<b>Appropriateness of application</b>	Reflection contains clear explanation of how the topic is relevant for 21 <sup>st</sup> century believers; effectively evaluates the issues at stake considering genre; draws applications/implications which are consistent with the original meaning of the passage(s) examined	Reflection contains an explanation of how the topic is relevant for 21 <sup>st</sup> century believers; identifies the issues at stake considering genre; draws applications which are generally consistent with the original meaning of the passage(s) examined	Reflection contains little explanation of how the topic is relevant for 21 <sup>st</sup> century believers; Infrequently interprets issues at stake considering genre; draws applications which are only occasionally consistent with the original meaning of the passage(s) examined	Reflection contains no explanation of how the topic is relevant for 21 <sup>st</sup> century believers; no evaluation of issues at stake considering genre; draws applications which are not consistent with the original meaning of the passage(s) examined
<b>Thoroughness of Bible Reading</b>	Student indicates that the percentage of Bible Reading was always 100% complete; student indicates that they read the text very carefully and thoughtfully	Student indicates percentage of Bible Reading was 90-99% complete; student indicates that they read the text carefully	Students indicates that the percentage of Bible Reading was mostly (80-89%) complete; student indicates that they read focusing on the main ideas	Student indicates that the percentage of Bible Reading less than 80% complete; student indicates that they read the text skimming the text

### 3. Commentary Reading Evaluations (10 %), Due April 10, 2025

Students will examine portions of Wray Beal and Younger that correspond with the week’s lecture focus, and then submit a 1-sentence assessment of the percentage of reading completed, as well as 4-page evaluation of the strengths and weaknesses of each commentary’s approach (2-pages/commentary).

Successful completion of this assignment fulfills Learning Outcomes A 1, A 4, B 2, C 2

#### Rubric for the Commentary Reading Evaluations

	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>
<b>Completion</b>	100%	90-99%	80-89%	Less than 80%
<b>Identification and accuracy of summary</b>	Accurately and clearly identifies the commentary’s	Accurately identifies aspects of the commentary’s	Accurately identifies some (but not many) aspects of the	Fails to accurately identify the commentary’s

<b>strengths / weaknesses</b>	approach; succinctly and persuasively argues for why the identified component is a strength/weakness.	approach; clearly argues for why the identified component is a strength/weakness.	commentary's approach; fails to fully explain why the identified component is a strength/weakness.	approach; omits explanations for why the identified component is a strength/weakness.
<b>Writing Quality</b>	Ability to write clearly and cogently using proper style; provides supporting examples; writing is well organized; exhibits excellent spelling, grammar, and syntax.	Ability to write clearly and cogently using proper style; provides some supporting examples; writing is generally organized; exhibits good spelling, grammar and syntax with a few errors.	Ability to write coherently using proper style; provides some support for points; writing not well organized; exhibits adequate spelling, grammar and syntax.	An inability to write clearly; does not provide support for points; writing not well organized; exhibits poor spelling, grammar and syntax.

**4. Biblical Warfare Presentation (20%), Due April 3, 2025**

Students will develop a brief (10-15 minute) presentation on the topic of understanding warfare in the Bible designed to be used in church settings. Students will build upon the foundation of their Warfare and Violence paper, developing the things they've learned into a presentation (with visuals) that could be used in a sermon, as part of Bible Study, or in a church seminar evening.

The presentation will 1) set out the tensions in the biblical text connected to warfare and violence, 2) offer potential explanations to these tensions (highlighting a number of solutions that have been proposed by several authors), and 3) their own conclusions. The presentation should not use technical jargon, should not presume that their audience is familiar with any proposed solutions, and should exhibit exegetical humility and charity in its proposed way forward.

Successful completion of this assignment fulfills Learning Outcomes A 1, B 3, C 1, C 2

**Rubric for the Warfare and Violence Presentation**

	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>
<b>Accuracy</b>	Presents a clear summary and understanding of the difficulties and tensions inherent in	Presentation is mostly clear in its summary and understanding of the difficulties and tensions inherent in	Presentation is not clear in its summary and understanding of the difficulties and tensions	Presentation is confusing and difficult to follow; is not accurate or fair in summarizing



	the topic; accurately and fairly depicts the viewpoints of various positions.	the topic; is mostly accurate and fair in summarizing the viewpoints the various positions.	inherent in the topic; is not accurate or fair in summarizing the viewpoints the various positions.	the viewpoints the various positions.
<b>Strength of Argument</b>	Uses strongly persuasive, logical, contextually supported arguments to support his/her position; provides ample supporting evidence; uses high quality sources.	Uses persuasive, logical arguments to support his/her position; provides some supporting evidence; the original context is accounted for; uses quality sources.	Uses few logical arguments to support his/her position; the original context is not well incorporated; provides only some supporting evidence; uses low quality sources.	Does not use persuasive, logical arguments to support his/her position; the original context is not incorporated; provides little supporting evidence; uses low quality sources.
<b>Presentation Quality</b>	The presentation is visually stimulating and aesthetically excellent; the content is correctly relayed (no spelling errors); the oral explanations are relayed with clarity, conviction, and confidence.	The presentation is visually pleasing; the content is correctly conveyed with only some spelling errors; the content of the oral explanations are relayed with conviction and confidence.	The presentation is visually muddled, including spelling errors; the content of the oral explanations are relayed hesitantly and haltingly.	The presentation is very confusing with many spelling errors; the content of the oral explanations are confusing and difficult to follow.

## E. EQUITY OF ACCESS

Students with permanent or temporary disabilities who need academic accommodations must [contact](#) the [Accessibility Services](#) at the [Centre for Academic Excellence](#) to [register](#) and discuss their specific needs. *New students* must self-identify and register with the Accessibility Office at the beginning of the semester or as early as possible to access appropriate services. *Current students* must renew their plans as early as possible to have active accommodations in place.

## F. SUMMARY OF ASSIGNMENTS AND GRADING

Evaluation is based upon the completion of the following assignments:

Warfare and Violence in Joshua, Judges Paper	40 %
Reflective Journal	30 %
Commentary Reading Evaluations	10 %

Warfare and Violence Presentation	20 %
Total	100 %

## G. GENERAL GUIDELINES FOR THE SUBMISSION OF WRITTEN WORK

Your work should demonstrate the following characteristics:

### 1. General Characteristics

In general, your work should exhibit the following characteristics:

- Clarity – your work should be well organized and should make sense
- Accuracy – your work should follow the instructions given and accurately represent the works consulted
- Thoughtfulness – your work should reflect the mature fruit of your critical reflection upon the assigned topics/issues
- Thoroughness – your work should reflect proper grammar, spelling and style
- Conciseness – your work should be presented in a clear and succinct manner, following the guidelines given for the length of the assignment

### 2. E-Mail Submissions and Late Policy

Papers should be e-mailed to the professor (see e-mail address on p.1) no later than 11:59 PM on the due date. Paper should be submitted as a **doc (or docx) file** (please do not submit your paper as a PDF file). Presentations should be submitted as **ppt (or pptx) files**.

The assumption is, of course, that all written work will be submitted on or before the corresponding due dates. An assignment will be considered late if it has not been received by the professor by 11:59 PM on the due date. Should this fail to occur, the following policy will govern the evaluation of your work:

**For each day late (or part thereof), the assignment grade will be reduced by 2 %.**

Extensions are not readily available. Requests must be submitted and arranged beforehand with the instructor (at least **72 hours in advance**). Please note that extensions will only be granted for situations out of the student's control, and which could not knowingly be planned for in advance. As a result, extensions will NOT be granted for things like church ministry responsibilities, mission trips, heavy workload, computer or server problems. Extensions will only be granted for exceptional circumstances (e.g. a family death, hospitalization, etc.). Thus, it is best to have your work completed and ready to submit 24 hours before it is due.

### 3. Marking Standards: General Principles

Marking standards follow the stated Tyndale academic policies. Generally speaking, assignments which satisfactorily meet the professor's expectations will receive a B/75% (i.e. a B is a good grade – students have completed the assigned work well).

Excellence or deficiency in the following areas will increase or decrease the mark assigned:

- 1) Form and Presentation – thus, correct bibliographic form must be used
- 2) Number and quality of primary and secondary sources cited. A good general rule for a research paper is that the number of sources should at least equal the number of assigned pages for the paper (unless otherwise stated).
- 3) Thoroughness of historical, grammatical, syntactical, exegetical, and theological investigation. This could include, though not be limited to things like: doing your own word studies, research into background materials, examination of archaeological data, synthesizing your own research on a theological theme, etc.
- 4) Logical and methodological accuracy and consistency.
- 5) Use of foundational tools like: ANE texts and inscriptions; Hebrew grammar and syntax; specialized studies in ANE history, archaeology, culture, and sociology; specialized scholarly articles and monographs; interaction with major commentaries.
- 6) Quality and Clarity of written English.
- 7) Ability to carefully follow the assignment instructions.

### 4. Matters of Style

You should submit written work in a style consistent with the model set out Turabian and the [Chicago Manual of Style Online](#) (especially [ch. 14](#); for citing scripture texts, refer to sections 10.44 to 10.48 and 14.238 to 14.241 from the Chicago Manual of Style or reference the [tip sheet, "How to Cite Sources in Theology"](#)). You may also consult the [tip sheet, "Documenting Chicago Style"](#) (Tyndale e-resource). Written work ought to be free of spelling mistakes, punctuated correctly, and adhere to the basic rules of grammar. It is expected that written work will be submitted in a clear, straight-forward style of academic prose, and should be clearly organized, argued, and presented.

### 5. Academic Integrity

Integrity in academic work is required of all our students. Academic dishonesty is any breach of this integrity and includes such practices as cheating (the use of unauthorized material on tests and examinations), submitting the same work for different classes without permission of the instructors; using false information (including false references to secondary sources) in an assignment; improper or unacknowledged collaboration with other students, and plagiarism (including improper use of artificial intelligence programs). Tyndale University takes seriously its responsibility to uphold academic integrity, and to penalize academic dishonesty.

[Statement on the Use of AI](#)

In this course, we will be developing skills and knowledge that are important to discover and practice on your own. The assignments in this class have been designed to challenge you to develop creativity, critical-thinking, and problem-solving skills. Using AI technology will limit your capacity to develop these skills and to meet the learning goals of this course.

As a result, students are not allowed to use any AI tools, such as ChatGPT or Dall- E 2, in this course. Students are expected to only submit work that is their own without assistance from others, including automated tools. Using AI tools in this course will violate the Seminary's academic integrity policy.

If you are unclear if something is an AI tool, please check with your instructor. Students are also encouraged to consult [Writing Services](#) for writing and citation helps, as well as [tip sheets](#).

Students should also consult the current [Academic Calendar](#) for academic polices on Academic Honesty, Gender Inclusive Language in Written Assignments, Late Papers and Extensions, Return of Assignments, and Grading System.

### **Research Ethics**

All course-based assignments involving human participants requires ethical review and may require approval by the [Tyndale Research Ethics Board \(REB\)](#). Check with the Seminary Dean's Office ([aa@tyndale.ca](mailto:aa@tyndale.ca)) before proceeding.

## **H. COURSE EVALUATION**

Tyndale Seminary values quality in the courses it offers its students. End-of-course evaluations provide valuable student feedback and are one of the ways that Tyndale Seminary works towards maintaining and improving the quality of courses and the student's learning experience. Student involvement in this process is critical to enhance the general quality of teaching and learning.

Before the end of the course, students will receive a MyTyndale email with a link to the online course evaluation. The link can also be found in the left column on the course page. The evaluation period is 2 weeks; after the evaluation period has ended, it cannot be reopened.

Course Evaluation results will not be disclosed to the instructor before final grades in the course have been submitted and processed. Student names will be kept confidential, and the instructor will only see the aggregated results of the class.

#### IV. COURSE SCHEDULE, CONTENT AND REQUIRED READINGS

Date	Content	Reading	Assignments
Jan 16	Introduction to Joshua; Joshua 1-2		
Jan 23	Joshua 3-8	Pitkänen, "Ethnicity, Assimilation and the Israelite Settlement"	
Jan 30	Joshua 9-12	Hom, "A Day Like No Other: A Discussion of Joshua 10:12-14"	
Feb 6	Joshua 13-24	Nogalski "Preaching Joshua in Canonical Contexts"	
Feb 13	Introduction to Judges; Judges 1-2	Wenham, "The Rhetoric of the Book of Judges"	
Feb 20	Reading Week – No Class		
Feb 27	Judges 3-5	Wong, "Song of Deborah as Polemic"	Warfare & Violence Paper
Mar 6	Judges 6-9	Block, "Will the Real Gideon Please Stand Up?"	
Mar 13	Judges 10-12		
Mar 20	Judges 13-16	Oeste, "Butchered Brothers and Betrayed Families"	
Mar 27	Judges 17-21	Trible "An Unnamed Woman"	
April 3	Joshua, Judges in History, Archaeology	Stone, "Early Israel and its Appearance in Canaan"	Warfare Presentations
April 10	Warfare Presentations		1) Commentary Evaluation 2) Reflective Journal

## V. SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Amit, Yairah. "Literature in the Service of Politics: Studies in Judges 19-21." Pages 28-40 in *Politics and Theopolitics in the Bible and Postbiblical Literature*. Eds. H. G. Reventlow, Y. Hoffman, and B. Uffenheimer. JSOTSup 171. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Book of Judges: The Art of Editing*. Biblical Interpretation Series, Vol. 38. Trans. Jonathan Chipman. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Reading Biblical Narratives: Literary Criticism and the Hebrew Bible*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2001.

Assis, Elie. *Self-Interest or Communal Interest: An Ideology of Leadership in the Gideon, Abimelech and Jephthah Narratives (Judg. 6-12)*. VTSup, 106. Leiden: Brill, 2005.

Bal, Mieke. *Death & Dissymmetry: The Politics of Coherence in the Book of Judges*. Chicago Studies in the History of Judaism. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1988.

Beale, Gregory K. *The Morality of God in the Old Testament*. Phillipsburg, NJ: P & R Publishing, 2013.

Bergmann, Michael, Michael C. Rea, and Michael J. Murray. *Divine Evil?: The Moral Character of the God of Abraham*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Bienkowski, P. "Jericho was destroyed in the Middle Bronze Age, not the Late Bronze Age." *Biblical Archaeology Review* 16/5 (1990): 45-69.

Billings, Rachel M. *"Israel Served the Lord": The Book of Joshua as Paradoxical Portrait of Faithful Israel*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2021.

Bloch-Smith, Elizabeth. "Israelite Ethnicity in Iron I: Archaeology Preserves What is Remembered and What is Forgotten in Israel's History." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 122 (2003): 401-25.

Block, Daniel I. "The Period of the Judges: Religious Disintegration Under Tribal Rule." Pages 41-57 in *Israel's Apostasy and Restoration: Essays in Honor of Roland K. Harrison*. Edited by A. Gileadi. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1988.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Will the Real Gideon Please Stand Up? Narrative Style and Intention in Judges 6-9." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 40 (1997): 353-66.

- \_\_\_\_\_. *Judges, Ruth*. NAC. Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman, 1999.
- Boling, Robert. *Judges: Introduction, Translation and Commentary*. AB. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1975.
- Boyd, Gregory A. *The Crucifixion of the Warrior God: Interpreting the Old Testament's Violent Portraits of God in Light of the Cross*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2017.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Cross Vision: How the Crucifixion of Jesus Makes Sense of Old Testament Violence*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2017.
- Boogaart, T. A. "Stone for Stone: Retribution in the Story of Abimelech and Shechem." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 32 (1985): 45-56.
- Butler, Trent C. *Judges*. WBC. Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson, 2009.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Joshua 1-12*. Second edition. Word Biblical Commentary. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2014.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Joshua 13-24*. Second edition. Word Biblical Commentary. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2014.
- Cezula, Ntozakhe Simon. "Two Poles of the Exodus: Conquest as the Oppressive Pole in Joshua 6:21." Pages 177–89 in *Violence in the Hebrew Bible: Between Text and Reception*. Edited by J. van Ruiten and K. van Bekkum. Oudtestamentische Studiën / Old Testament Studies volume 79. Leiden: Brill, 2020.
- Chavalas, Marc W. and Murray R. Adamthwaite. "Archaeological Light on the Old Testament." Pages 59-96 in David W. Baker and Bill T. Arnold, eds. *The Face of Old Testament Studies*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker/Apollos, 1999.
- J. Cornelis, de Vos. "Violence in the Book of Joshua." Pages 161–76 in *Violence in the Hebrew Bible: Between Text and Reception*. Edited by J. van Ruiten and K. van Bekkum. Oudtestamentische Studiën / Old Testament Studies volume 79. Leiden: Brill, 2020.
- Creach, J. F. D. *Joshua*. Interpretation. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2003.
- Dever, William G. *Who Were the Early Israelites and Where Did They Come From?* Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2003.
- Dozeman, Thomas B. *Joshua 1-12*. AB. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2015.

- \_\_\_\_\_. *Joshua 13-24*. AB. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2023.
- Earl, Douglas S. *The Joshua Delusion? Rethinking Genocide in the Bible*. Eugene, OR: Cascade, 2010.
- Ebeling, Jennie R., J. Edward Wright, Mark W. Elliott, Paul Virgil McCracken Flesher, and Mark Adam Elliott, eds. *The Old Testament in Archaeology and History*. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2017.
- Exum, J. C. "The Centre Cannot Hold: Thematic and Textual Instability in Judges." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 52 (1990): 410-31.
- Faust, Avraham. *Israel's Ethnogenesis: Settlement, Interaction, Expansion and Resistance*. London: Equinox, 2006.
- Firth, David G. *Joshua: Evangelical Biblical Theology Commentary*. Evangelical Biblical Theology Commentary. Bellingham, WA: Lexham Academic, 2021.
- Goswell, Greg. "The Attitude to Kingship in the Book of Judges." *Trinity Journal* 40.1 (2019): 3-18.
- Gundry, Stanley N. *Show Them No Mercy: Four Views on God and Canaanite Genocide*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2003.
- Hall, Sarah Leihar. *Conquering Character: The Characterization of Joshua in Joshua 1-11*. LHBOTS 512. New York: T & T Clark, 2010.
- Halpern, Baruch. *The First Historians: The Hebrew Bible and History*. University Park, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1996. Reprint, San Francisco, CA: Harper & Row, 1988.
- Harris, J. Gordon, Cheryl A. Brown, and Michael S. Moore. *Joshua, Judges, Ruth*. New International Biblical Commentary. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2000.
- Hassel, Michael G. "Mereneptah's Reference to Israel: Critical Issues for the Origin of Israel." Pages 47-59 in *Critical Issues in Early Israelite History*. BBR 3. Eds. Richard S. Hess, Gerald A. Klingbeil, and Paul J. Ray Jr. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2008.
- Hawk, L. Daniel. *Joshua*. Berit Olam. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2000.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The God of the Conquest: The Theological Problem of the Book of Joshua." *The Bible Today* 46.3 (2008): 141-47.



\_\_\_\_\_. *Every Promise Fulfilled: Contesting Plots in Joshua*. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2009.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Truth about Conquest: Joshua as History, Narrative, and Scripture." *Interpretation* 66.2 (2012): 129–40.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Violence of the Biblical God*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2019.

Hawkins, Ralph. *How Israel Became a People*. Nashville, TN: Abingdon, 2013.

Hess, Richard S. "Asking Historical Questions of Joshua 13-19: Recent Discussion Concerning the Date of the Boundary Lists." Pages 191-205 in Allan R. Millard, James K. Hoffmeier, and David W. Baker, eds. *Faith, Tradition and History: Old Testament Historiography in its Ancient Near Eastern Context*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1994.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Joshua*. TOTC. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1996.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Jericho and Ai of the Book of Joshua." Pages 33-46 in *Critical Issues in Early Israelite History*. BBRS 3. Eds. Richard S. Hess, Gerald A. Klingbeil, and Paul J. Ray Jr. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2008.

Hom, Mary Katherine. "A Day Like No Other: A Discussion of Joshua 10:12-14." In *The Expository Times* 115/7 (2004): 217-23.

Howard, David M. *Joshua*. NAC. Nashville, TN: Broadman and Holman, 1998.

Hubbard, Robert L. *Joshua*. NIVAC. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2009.

King, Philip, and Lawrence E. Stager. "Of Fathers, Kings and the Deity: The Nested Households of Ancient Israel," *Biblical Archaeology Review* 28/2 (2002): 42–45, 62.

Kitchen, Kenneth A. *On the Reliability of the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2003.

Lilley, J. P. U. "A Literary Appreciation of the Book of Judges." *Tyndale Bulletin* 17 (1967): 94-102.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Judgment of God: The Problem of the Canaanites." *Themelios* 22/2 (1997): 3-12.

Matthews, Victor H. *Judges and Ruth*. NCBC. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

- Mazar, Amihai. *Archaeology of the Land of the Bible 10,000-586 B.C.E.* New York: Doubleday, 1990.
- Mendenhall, George E. "The Hebrew Conquest of Palestine." *Biblical Archaeologist* 25 (1962): 66-87.
- Millard, Alan R. "Were the Israelites Really Canaanites?" Pages 156-68 in *Israel: Ancient Kingdom or Late Invention?* Ed. Daniel I. Block. Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman, 2008.
- Mobley, Gregory. *The Empty Men: The Heroic Tradition of Ancient Israel.* ABRL. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 2005.
- Moore, George F. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Judges.* ICC. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1895.
- Nelson, Richard D. *Joshua.* OTL. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1997.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Josiah in the Book of Joshua." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 100 (1981): 531-40.
- Niditch, Susan. *Judges.* OTL. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2008.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Historiography, 'Hazards,' and the Study of Ancient Israel." *Interpretation* 57 (2003): 138-150.
- O'Connell, Robert H. *The Rhetoric of the Book of Judges.* VTSup Vol. 63. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- Oeste, Gordon K. "Butchered Brothers and Betrayed Families: Degenerating Kinship Structures in the Book of Judges." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 35 (2011): 295-316.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Legitimacy, Illegitimacy, and the Right to Rule: Windows on Abimelech's Rise and Demise in Judges 9.* LHBOTS 546. New York: T & T Clark, 2011.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Shaping of a Prophet: Joshua in the Deuteronomistic History." Pages 23-41 in *Prophets and Prophecy in Ancient Israelite Historiography.* Edited by Mark J. Boda and Lissa M. Wray Beal. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2013.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "'A Day like No Other' in the Context of Yahweh War: Joshua 10:14 and the Characterization of Joshua." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 57.4 (2014): 689-702.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "Feasting with the Enemy: Redemptive Readings of Biblical War Texts." *Canadian-American Theological Review* 8.1 (2019): 79–95.
- Olyan, Saul M. *Ritual Violence in the Hebrew Bible: New Perspectives*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2016.
- Pitkänen, Pekka. "Ethnicity, Assimilation and the Israelite Settlement." *Tyndale Bulletin* 55.2 (2004): 161-82.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Memory, Witnesses and Genocide in the Book of Joshua." Pages 267–82 in *Reading the Law: Studies in Honour of Gordon J. Wenham*. Edited by J. Gordon McConville and Karl Möller. Vol. 461 of *Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies*. New York: T & T Clark, 2007.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Joshua*. AOTC. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2010.
- Provan, Iaian W., V. Philips Long, and Tremper Longman III. *A Biblical History of Israel*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2003.
- Polzin, Robert M. *Moses and the Deuteronomist: A Literary Study of the Deuteronomistic History, Part One: Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges*. New York: Seabury, 1980.
- Rainey, Anson. "Inside, Outside: Where Did the Early Israelites Come From?" *Biblical Archaeology Review* 34/6 (2008): 45-50, 84.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Shasu or Habiru: Who Were the Early Israelites?" *Biblical Archaeology Review* 34/6 (2008): 51-55.
- Ray, Paul J., Jr. "Classical Models for the Appearance of Israel in Palestine." Pages 79-93 in *Critical Issues in Early Israelite History*. BBR 3. Eds. Richard S. Hess, Gerald A. Klingbeil, and Paul J. Ray Jr. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2008.
- Rofé, Alexander. "Clan Sagas as a Source in Settlement Traditions." Pages 191-203 in "A Wise and Discerning Mind": *Essays in Honor of Burke O. Long*. Brown Judaic Studies 325. Eds. Saul M. Olyan and Robert C. Culley. Providence, RI: Brown University, 2000.
- Rowlett, Lori. *Joshua and the Rhetoric of Violence: A New Historicist Analysis*. JSOTSup 226. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994.
- Sasson, Jack Murad. *Judges 1-12: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2014.

- Satterthwaite, Philip. "‘No king in Israel’: Narrative Criticism and Judges 17-21." *Tyndale Bulletin* 44 (1993): 75-88.
- Schneider, Tammi J. *Judges*. Berit Olam. Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press/Michael Glazier, 2000.
- Seibert, Eric A. *Disturbing Divine Behavior: Troubling Old Testament Images of God*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2009.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Violence of Scripture: Overcoming the Old Testament’s Troubling Legacy*. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress, 2012.
- Smith, Mark S., Elizabeth Bloch-Smith, and Sidnie White Crawford. *Judges 1: A Commentary on Judges 1:1-10:5*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 2021.
- Soggin, J. Alberto. *Judges: A Commentary*. Trans. J. Bowden. OTL. Philadelphia, PA: Westminster, 1981.
- Stager, Lawrence E. "The Archaeology of the Family." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 260 (1985): 1-35.
- Steinberg, Naomi. "Social Scientific Criticism: Judges 9 and Issues of Kinship." Pages 45-64 in *Judges and Method: New Approaches in Biblical Studies*. Ed. Gale A. Yee. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1995.
- Stern, Philip D. *The Biblical Ḥerem: A Window on Israel’s Religious Experience*. Brown Judaic Studies; No. 211. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1990.
- Stone, Lawson G. "Ethical and Apologetic Tendencies in the Redaction of the Book of Joshua." *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 53.1 (1991): 25–36.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Early Israel and Its Appearance in Canaan." Pages 127–64 in *Ancient Israel’s History: An Introduction to Issues and Sources*. Edited by Bill T. Arnold and Richard S. Hess. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2014.
- Sweeney, Marvin A. "Davidic Polemics in the Book of Judges." *Vetus Testamentum* 47 (1997): 517-29.
- Trible, Phyllis. *Texts of Terror: Literary-Feminist Readings of Biblical Narratives*. OBT. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1984.

- Walton, John H. *The Lost World of the Israelite Conquest: Covenant, Retribution, and the Fate of the Canaanites*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2017.
- Webb, William J. and Gordon K. Oest. *Bloody, Brutal, and Barbaric?: Wrestling With Troubling War Texts*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2019.
- Weinfeld, Moshe. *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1972. Reprint, Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1992.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Judges 1:1-2:5: The Conquest Under the Leadership of the House of Judah." Pages 388-400 in *Understanding Poets and Prophets: Essays in Honour of George Wishart Anderson*. JSOTSup 152. Ed. A. Graeme Auld. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993.
- Weippert, Manfred. *The Settlement of the Israelite Tribes in Palestine*. SBT 21. London: SCM Press, 1971.
- Wenham, Gordon. "The Deuteronomistic Theology of Joshua." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 90 (1971): 140-48.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Rhetorical Function of Judges." Pages 45-71 in *Story as Torah: Reading Old Testament Narrative Ethically*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 2000.
- Wong, Gregory T. K. *Compositional Strategy of the Book of Judges: An Inductive, Rhetorical Study*. VTSup, 111. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Song of Deborah as Polemic" *Biblica* 88 (2007): 1-22.
- Wood, Bryant G. "Did the Israelites Conquer Jericho? A New Look at the Archaeological Evidence." *Biblical Archaeology Review* 16/2 (1990): 55-68.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Search for Joshua's Ai." Pages 205-40 in *Critical Issues in Early Israelite History*. BBRS 3. Eds. Richard S. Hess, Gerald A. Klingbeil, and Paul J. Ray Jr. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2008.
- Wray Beal, Lissa M. *Joshua*. The Story of God Bible Commentary. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2019.
- Wright, Christopher J. H. "What about the Canaanites?" Pages 73-108 in *The God I Don't Understand: Reflections on Tough Questions of Faith*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2008.

Yee, Gale, ed. *Judges and Method: New Approaches in Biblical Studies*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 2007.

Younger, K. Lawson. *Ancient Conquest Accounts: A Study of Ancient Near Eastern and Biblical History Writing*. JSOTSup 98. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Rhetorical Structuring of the Joshua Conquest Narratives." Pages 3-32 in *Critical Issues in Early Israelite History*. BBRS 3. Eds. Richard S. Hess, Gerald A. Klingbeil, and Paul J. Ray Jr. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2008.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Judges and Ruth*. Revised ed. NIVAC. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2021.

### **Helpful OT Websites**

Make sure to check out the resources that can be accessed through the Tyndale website, in particular through the EBSCO and J-STOR sites.

[Online Periodical Database](#)

[Old Testament Reading Room](#)

### **General Theological Websites**

[Old Testament Theology](#)

[Theology on the Web](#)

[Yale Biblical Studies Guide](#)

### **Biblical Archaeology**

[Research at the Oriental Institute](#)

[Biblical Archaeological Society](#)

[Biblical Archaeology – Useful Links](#)

[Archaeology and the Bible](#)

### **Ancient Near Eastern Resources**

[Mesopotamian Texts Archive](#)

(Tyndale Library supports this course with [e-journals](#), [e-books](#), and the [mail delivery of books](#) and circulating materials. See the [Library FAQ page](#).)