

PRIESTLY MATERIALS IN JOSHUA 13–22: A RETURN TO THE HEXATEUCH?

By

JOHN E. PETERSEN

Pacific Lutheran University

THE MODERN INTERPRETATION of the book of Joshua was formulated through the work of Julius Wellhausen (1883; 1885). From his time it was determined that the four documents in the pentateuch extended into Joshua, thus forming a hexateuch.

This theory held sway until the brilliant work of Martin Noth pushed it aside. In his *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien* (1943), he determined that the Former Prophets were a literary unity edited by a very original author, working in the middle of the 6th century under the influence of the earlier Deuteronomic law book. None of the pentateuchal traditions were to be found in Joshua, other than a rare priestly gloss. The Jahwist, Elohist and Priestly traditions were to be found only in the first four books, called a tetrteuch. They were followed by the new Deuteronomistic History (designated DH after this), running from Deuteronomy through 2 Kings.

People were then faced with the alternative of accepting the older theory of the hexateuch or the new one of the tetrteuch+DH. Faced with this option most accepted the new construction of Noth, and Joshua was severed from its previous relationship with the pentateuch. And although Noth's views were challenged by a few, such as Sigmund Mowinckel (1964), they were almost universally accepted.

This study questions the almost universal consensus by presenting evidence to show that priestly materials and editorial work are evident in Joshua 13–22. The role of the priestly material is crucial in considering the alternatives posed

by the two positions, hexateuch vs. tetrateuch+DH. Since the priestly material is commonly dated after the time of the Deuteronomistic law book and the first edition of DH, there could be no explanation for the presence of priestly material in this history other than simple insertion of it into the Deuteronomistic corpus. This was the solution that Noth (1943, pp. 10–15) chose by declaring that many of the materials in Joshua 13–22 were later additions; however, none of these additions were to be connected with the priestly tradition in the tetrateuch. However, the present analysis has found considerable evidence for the existence of priestly material in these chapters. After surveying this evidence I will consider a way of accounting for its presence in Joshua. Finally, I will look at how this may help us resolve the dispute: the hexateuch vs. the tetrateuch+DH.

I

Evidence for the presence of priestly materials in Joshua 13–22 is found in the vocabulary, thematic relationships, literary structures, and theological emphases exhibited by these chapters. In each of these areas there are direct ties with commonly accepted priestly materials in the pentateuch.

A. The vocabulary and literary expressions in priestly material reflect a particular world view, as do those of the Deuteronomistic tradition. S. R. Driver (1897, pp. 99–102, 131–135), in an old but still useful work, compiled lists of the distinctive vocabularies of these two traditions. Von Rad (1953, pp. 37–44) discussed these traditions in terms of distinctive theologies, showing how Deuteronomy expresses a ‘name’ theology and the priestly tradition a ‘*kābôd*’ ‘glory’ theology. Moshe Weinfeld (1972a, pp. 1–6, 320–365) in his study of Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School demonstrated that the basic deuteronomistic theological themes are often expressed in a specific jargon and rhetorical style, as well as in prophetic, liturgical and military orations. This deuteronomistic phraseology is so characteristic that he spells it out in detail in a 46-page appendix. In this book and in his article on the ‘‘Pentateuch’’ in *Encyclopedia Judaica* (1972b, 13:252–253) he also lists some of the distinctive priestly jargon. By following up the work of Driver and Weinfeld and adding a few characteristic priestly terms and expressions that I have isolated, there is a sizable group of priestly terms occurring in Joshua 13–22. The distinctive terminology and expressions are noted in the left-hand column of the following list, with separate grouping of names, verbs and related nouns, additional nouns, and expressions. The two adjoining columns show the relative infrequency of this terminology in JE (or other old materials) and D/DH. The two right-hand columns indicate the numerical frequency of these terms and ex-

pressions in priestly passages (in the pentateuch) and in the chapters under consideration, i.e. Joshua 13–22.

<i>Names</i>	<i>JE</i>	<i>D/DH</i>	<i>P</i>	<i>Joshua 13–22</i>
1. 'ōhel mō'ēd 'meeting tent'	rare	none	130+	18:1; 19:51
2. 'el'āzār 'Eleazar'	none	1/1	50+	7
3. hakkōhēn haggādōl 'the high priest'	none	none	7	20:6
4. midbar šin 'wilderness of Zin'	none	none	7	15:1,3
5. 'arbōt mō'āb 'Plains of Moab'	none	none	11	13:32
6. pinhās 'Phineas'	none	Josh 24:33	4	4
7. šəlophād 'Zelophehad'	none	none	8	17:3
8. qiryat 'arba' 'Kiryath-arba'	none	none/1	2	5
<i>Verbs and related nouns</i>				
9. ne'ēhaz 'possessed'	1 each	none/1	2	22:9,19
'ahuzā 'possession'	none	none	12	5
10. gāva' 'perish'	none	none	11	22:20
11. kābaš 'subdue'	none	none	3	18:1
12. mā'al 'transgress'	none	none	7	3
mā'al 'transgression'	none	none	7	4
13. mārad 'rebel'	1	none	1	4
méred 'rebellion'	none	none	none	22:22
14. hiqdîš 'sanctify'	none	1/none	14	20:7
15. šākan 'dwell' (God subject)	none	1 Kgs 6:13	8	22:9
miškān 'dwelling'	none	2 Sam 7:6	many	22:19,29
<i>Nouns (additional)</i>				
16. gôrāl 'lot'	none	none	12	26
17. migrāš 'pasture land'	none	none	6	52
18. mattē 'tribe'	none	none/3	often	50+
19. mišpāhā 'family'	J: 7	none/3	often	c. 40
20. nāšî 'ruler'	J: 1	none/7	often	5
21. 'ēdā 'congregation'	none	none/5	often	5
22. qinyān 'possessions'	J: 1	none	3	14:4
<i>Expressions</i>				
23. mē'ēber layyardēn 'across the Jordan'	none	none	5	5
The consistent expression in D and DH is bə'ēber hayyardēn 'across the Jordan'				

<i>Section</i>	<i>Occurrences</i>	<i>Priestly Vocabulary</i>
13:1–14 Land remaining, 2½ E tribes	none	
15–32 2½ E tribes	13	'across the Jordan,' 'tribe,' 'ruler,' 'family,' and 'Plains of Moab'
33 Levites	none	
14:1–5 Allocations	10	'across the Jordan,' 'tribe,' 'Eleazar,' 'heads of the fathers,' 'pasture land,' 'possessions'
6–15 Caleb	1	'Kiryath-Arba'
15:1–12 Judah	6	'tribe,' 'lot,' 'family,' 'Wilder- ness of Zin'
13–19 Caleb	1	'Kiryath-Arba'
20–63 Judah	4	'tribe,' 'family,' 'Kiryath-Arba'
16:1–4 Joseph	1	'lot'
5–10 Ephraim	3	'tribe,' 'family'
17:1–2 Manasseh	4	'lot,' 'tribe,' 'family'
3–6 Zel's daughters	4	'Eleazar,' 'Zelophehad,' 'ruler,' 'across the Jordan'
7–13 Manasseh	none	
18:1 Shiloh assembly	3	'tent of meeting,' 'congrega- tion,' 'possessed'
2–10 7 allocations	4	'lot,' 'across the Jordan'
11–28 Benjamin	8	'lot,' 'tribe,' 'family'
19:1–9 Simeon	5	'lot,' 'tribe,' 'family'
10–16 Zebulon	3	'lot,' 'family'
17–23 Issachar	4	'lot,' 'tribe,' 'family'
24–31 Asher	4	'lot,' 'tribe,' 'family'
32–39 Naphtali	4	'lot,' 'tribe,' 'family'
40–50 Joshua	none	
51 Conclusion	5	'Eleazar,' 'tent of meeting,' 'lot,' 'tribe,' 'heads of fathers'
20:1–9 Cities of refuge	11	'the High Priest,' 'Kiryath- Arba,' 'sanctified,' 'tribe,' 'con- gregation,' 'inadvertently'
21:1–42 Levitical cities	98	'Eleazar,' 'possession,' 'lot,' 'pasture land,' 'tribe,' 'family'
21:43–22:8 DH conclusion	2	'possession,' 'tribe'

22:9–34 E altar	35	‘Eleazar,’ ‘Phineas,’ ‘possessed’ and ‘possession,’ ‘perish,’ ‘transgressed’ and ‘transgression,’ ‘rebel’ and ‘rebellion,’ ‘dwelt’ and ‘dwelling,’ ‘ruler,’ ‘congregation’
-----------------	----	--

The distribution pattern of priestly terminology varies in the units according to the number and variety of terms in each. From the pattern that has emerged the units may be divided into three groups: distinctly priestly compositions, lists showing priestly editing, and those showing no priestly elements.

Six units present a distribution pattern that has all the earmarks of priestly composition. These six are:

1. 13:15–32 the inheritance of the 2½ eastern tribes;
2. 18:1; 14:1–5; and 18:51 taken together as a unit. Several commentators suggest that 18:1 has been displaced from its natural position preceding 14:1–5. Together they introduce the tribal allocations, which are concluded by 18:51, forming what we will later describe as a bracket construction which is very typical of priestly editing.
3. 17:3–6 the inheritance of the daughters of Zelophehad;
4. 20:1–9 the cities of refuge;
5. 21:1–42 the Levitical cities; and
6. 22:9–34 the altar of the Eastern tribes.

These six units exhibit priestly vocabulary and style throughout and together constitute the core priestly tradition of the allocation of the land. This conclusion based on linguistic evidence will be supported by thematic, structural, and theological ties between these passages and the priestly tradition in the pentateuch.

The second group is composed of eleven units that have relatively few occurrences of priestly terminology. These are 15:1–12; 15:20–63; 16:5–10; 17:1–2; 18:11–28; 19:1–9; 19:10–16; 19:17–23; 19:24–31; 19:32–39; and 19:40–48. All of these are lists of boundaries or cities which designate tribal allocations. These units may constitute a collection of priestly tribal allocations or a group of early lists which were edited by priestly redactors. The latter seems very possible in light of the consistent marks of priestly editing. Editing was provided through the vocabulary (‘lot,’ ‘tribe’ and ‘family,’ which are utilized throughout these units) and through the structural use of bracket constructions (see below).

18:2–10 has the expressions ‘lot’ and ‘across the Jordan’ with a total of 4 occurrences, thus seemingly related to this second group. However, it is not a list but a narrative of Joshua’s division of the land into seven portions and it has

no priestly bracket constructions. Driver (1897, p. 111) attributes most of the unit to JE. It is obviously non-priestly, the priestly terms being coincidental or priestly glosses.

The remaining nine units have either one or no priestly terms or other signs of a priestly hand and are to be considered non-priestly. The unit 21:43–22:8 has two priestly terms but later on these will be shown to have been editorially taken over from the priestly context.

Linguistic analysis has provided us with six core units of a priestly tradition of the allocation of the land. These are supplemented by eleven units displaying priestly editing of lists mentioning boundaries and cities. However, the linguistic evidence does not stand alone in making a case for the existence of a priestly land allocation tradition.

B. In addition to the distinctive priestly vocabulary in Joshua there are also thematic ties with priestly passages in the pentateuch. The first is the theme of the land itself. It has not always been recognized that the land of Canaan is a basic theme in priestly writings, but several studies state that it is intrinsic to priestly thought. Walter Brueggemann (1975, pp. 101–113) has shown that the promise of the land is one of the basic elements in the priestly formula of blessing made in Gen 1:28 and reiterated to Noah, Jacob, Joseph, and the generation of Moses. He emphasized that the formula is definitely related to land theology and that it provides a thread running through P concerning the promise and gift of the land, thus carrying the P narrative from creation to the promised land.

Joseph Blenkinsopp (1976) has also commented on the existence of the land theme in P:

Several pericopes of undisputed P vintage in the Pentateuch—the promise of land to the fathers, the purchase of a parcel of land by Abraham, the mission of the spies, the census and order of the camp, the rules for the holy war—are unintelligible on the assumption that P had no interest in the occupation of the land. This does not, of course, oblige anyone to conclude that P actually had a conquest and occupation narrative, but it at least puts the onus of proving otherwise on those who deny it. It also justifies us in looking carefully into the book of Joshua for signs of P. (Blenkinsopp, 1976, p. 287)

In addition to these priestly ties with the land mentioned by Blenkinsopp, several priestly laws and the blessings and curses of Leviticus 26 have importance only in relation to the land. From these indications of the importance of the land in passages of undisputed priestly vintage, the evidence leads one to consider the theme of the land integral to the priestly writing.

Other thematic ties are to be noticed between Numbers 26–36 and the chapters in Joshua. Throughout Joshua's distribution of the land there is a precise following of the commands that were given in Numbers. The following points of similarity can be seen:

1. the assembly of the people at the tent of meeting: Num 27:2, 31:54; Josh 18:1, 19:51;
2. the supervision of Eleazar and Joshua in dividing the land: Num 34: 16–17; Josh 14:1, 19:51;
3. special provision for the inheritance of the daughters of Zelophehad: Num 27:1–11; Josh 17:3–6;
4. the listing of the Levites in the last position among the tribes: Num 26:57–62; Josh 20:1–9, 21:1–40;
5. the 2½ eastern tribes go onto the west bank first and then return to their inheritance on the east bank: Num 32:1–42; Josh 22:9; and
6. the Levites receive 48 cities, 6 of them designated as cities of refuge: Num 35:1–15; Josh 20:7–9, 21:4–7.

The detailed execution of the commands given in Numbers leads to considerable repetition. But this is part of the priestly style of separately reporting the commanding and carrying out of God's will, as in the building of the tent of meeting in Exodus. In this case it shows close thematic ties in the occupation and distribution of the land between Numbers and Joshua.

C. There are also two types of structural ties between Joshua 13–22 and priestly material. Blenkinsopp (1976, pp. 275–278) isolated conclusion and execution formulae throughout priestly writings. The conclusion formulae state the successful completion of a work. Only three of these are found in priestly material, but these are located at important moments in Israelite history. The final one appears in Josh 19:51 and states, "so they finished dividing the land." The execution formulae show that a command of God was carried out. This type of formula is found in Josh 14:5 and 21:8, showing that the Israelites had allocated the land to the tribes and the cities and pasture lands to the Levites as God had commanded them. These conclusion and execution formulae link our chapters with earlier priestly materials.

Another type of structural tie was noted by Driver (1897, p. 134). He pointed out that a very methodical form of subscription and superscription is found throughout the priestly writings. I have enlarged his list of these bracketing constructions and list those that occur in the chapters under consideration.

<i>Section</i>	<i>Superscriptions ({} and Subscriptions ({}))</i>
13:1–4 Land remaining	
15–32 2½ E tribes	[15–23b], [24–28], [29–32]
33 Levites	

14:1–5 Allocations	[1–5], [(18:1 +) 1–5 + 19:51]
6–15 Caleb	
15:1–12 Judah	[1a–12b]
13–19 Caleb	
20–63 Judah	[20–
16:1–4 Joseph	
5–10 Ephraim	[5a–8b]
17:1–2 Manasseh	[1a–2b]
3–6 Zelophehad's daughters	–6a]
7–13 Manasseh	
18:1 Shiloh assembly	[1, preceding 14:1–5
2–10 seven allocations	
11–28 Benjamin	[11a–20b], [21a–28aβb]
19:1–9 Simeon	[1a–8b]
10–16 Zebulon	[10a–15b16]
17–23 Issachar	[17–22b23]
24–31 Asher	[24–30b31]
32–39 Naphtali	[32–38b39]
40–48 Dan	[40–48]
49–50 Joshua	
51 Conclusion	–19:51], from 18:1
20:1–9 Cities of refuge	[2b3–9]
21:1–42 Levitical cities	[1,2–39, 40], [3–8], [10–19], [20–26], [27aα-33], [34aα-38]
22:9–34 E altar	

The opening bracket is used to indicate a superscription and the closing bracket a subscription. Most of them occur in pairs to form closed brackets, that enclose a section. These bracket constructions are found in five of the six passages that I have called the core priestly land allocation tradition. The one exception is the narrative of the altar built by the 2½ E tribes. The bracket constructions are found in all eleven lists of boundaries and cities, but none is found in the nine units considered non-priestly. The placement of the brackets thus provides structural evidence of the identification of the seventeen priestly units, six core and eleven edited passages.

These constructions provide internal structuring that was very helpful in organizing lists and other discussions related to tribal allocations. But, especially significant for our consideration, they also provide external ties with other priestly materials. A couple of examples from these chapters can be

compared with priestly bracket constructions found elsewhere.¹ In Joshua 13 we find the following bracket enclosing the inheritance of Reuben: “And Moses gave an inheritance to the tribe of the Reubenites according to their families” (v. 15); “This was the inheritance of the Reubenites, according to their families with their cities and villages” (v. 23b). A similar bracket is found in Joshua 19 describing the allotment of Dan: “The seventh lot came out from the tribe of Dan, according to its families” (v. 40); “This is the inheritance of the tribe of Dan, according to their families—these cities with their villages” (v. 48).

A remarkable similarity can be noted in quoting a couple of brackets in pentateuchal passages. In Genesis 10 the table of nations is enclosed as follows: “These are the generations of the sons of Noah, Shem, Ham, and Japheth; sons were born to them after the flood” (v. 1); “These are the families of the sons of Noah, according to their geneologies, in their nations; and from these the nations spread abroad on the earth after the flood” (v. 32). The list of census and duties of the Gershonites in Numbers 4 is provided with similar bracket enclosures: “Take a census of the sons of Gershon also, by their families and their fathers’ houses” (v. 22); “This is the service of the families of the sons of the Gershonites in the tent of meeting” (v. 28a). The term *mišpāḥôt* ‘families’ commonly occurs in bracket constructions as can be noted in these examples, both from Joshua and elsewhere. And there are occasional references to the fathers in these constructions also. In addition to the boundaries and cities which are the subject of many lists in our chapters in Joshua, the priestly tradition shows much interest in distinguishing and marking off individuals and groups of people, as the examples above indicate.

These bracket constructions thus furnish internal and external ties for Joshua 13–22 in the same style commonly employed in priestly editing. Together with Blenkinsopp’s conclusion and execution formulae the brackets demonstrate structural ties between our materials in Joshua and other priestly materials.

D. Finally, there are theological ties between Joshua 13–22 and priestly thought. Without entering into a debate about the conception of God in the priestly tradition, I will simply note that I accept the views of Weinfeld (1972a, pp. 179–209). As he has demonstrated, the priestly tradition is almost completely absorbed with the realm of the sacred. The great awe that is shown for the supernatural informs its choice of subjects, neglecting many common social and governmental matters, and shapes the ways it describes ordinary happenings, subjecting all things to the divine realm and its officials. This is reflected in Joshua 13–22 in the allocation of the land by Joshua and Eleazar. The

1. Some of these examples together with others from the priestly materials are given in Driver (1897, p. 134), however, the references provided there are by no means exhaustive.

presence of the high priest demonstrates that this is no common secular or political event, but one in which the foremost religious official of the people presides.

This sacred orientation is seen also in setting apart the cities of refuge, as Weinfeld (1972a, pp. 236–237) has shown. Whereas, in Deuteronomy this is a completely secular task, here it is considered a sacred act. In Deut 19: 2ff the cities are simply set apart and determined by geometric division of the land. In Josh 20:7 these cities are sanctified, *wayyaqđîšû* ‘and they sanctified,’ and in this way they are brought into the realm of the sacred. As a result they are made a part of the cities of the Levites which is not the case in Deuteronomy. Also, in Deuteronomy the city serves as a protection for the life of the accidental manslayer. But in Joshua the manslayer remains until the death of the high priest which atones for bloodguilt in the case of manslaughter, a sacred task.

One other theological emphasis is brought out, through the reference to the *miškān* ‘dwelling’ of God in the midst of the people in Joshua 22, as mentioned by Weinfeld (1972a, p. 229). The presence of God with His people is the ultimate numinous presence that is the central focus of the priestly view of life. The complex block of priestly materials connected with the revelation and institution of the cult at Sinai expresses this powerful presence. When they come to the land they are to inherit, only the land west of the Jordan is considered holy, for that is where the presence of God is found. And so as a concession of the 2½ tribes who request to live in Transjordan, they are allowed to do so, but their land is not divided by lot as is the land on the west side. Their land is considered unclean in contrast with the inheritance of God on the west side (Josh 22:19), and their act of building an altar outside the holy land is considered unfaithfulness directly against God (Josh 22:16).

In these passages we see that the theological realities are those of the priestly writings. Analysis of life is made from the perspective of the realm of the sacred.

Arguments have been advanced on the basis of vocabulary, literary themes, structure, and theology that tie portions of Joshua 13–22 in with priestly materials in the pentateuch. Together these ties present evidence strong enough to conclude that the six core passages and the editing of the eleven lists come from the priestly tradition. But the question of how to account for priestly material in these passages in Joshua still remains before us.

II

With the existence of DH well established and accepted, how could priestly material be found in Joshua? Noth (1943, pp. 180–190) answered this question by saying that there is no priestly stratum in the book of Joshua. He did find a

few post-DH accretions which recall the form and content of the priestly writing. This consists of three complete verses, parts of three other verses, scattered references to "at Shiloh" and "congregation," and 22:9–34, this latter section being based on an old but completely revised site etiology. Altogether in these chapters in Joshua there are only scattered and unconnected priestly expansions, which might well be expected, but nothing resembling a priestly layer of tradition.

Frank Cross (1973, pp. 320–321) agreed with Noth in asserting that the material edited by the priestly school ends with the events in the plains of Moab. Joshua is part of DH and did not pass through priestly hands. However, he revises Noth's ideas by saying that the author of DH edited Joshua and in Chapters 13–19 he used "some of the documents handled by the forerunners of the Priestly school in the temple archives" (1973, pp. 320–321). Thus, he limits the material edited by the priest(s) to the present tetrateuch, so that it ends the history of Israel at the end of the desert era. This is considered a fitting conclusion which suited the purpose and theological thrust of the priestly school in exile.

However, I would follow the suggestions of Weinfeld (1972a, pp. 182n), who suggests that Josh 14:1–21:40 was a priestly block of material that the DH editor may have incorporated *en bloc* into his history and edited in the process. This was possible because the priestly material in its basic form was known by the time the Deuteronomic law book was written and DH was compiled.

This theory of pre-exilic dating follows from the work of Yehezkel Kaufmann (1937–56) and a small school that has followed his lead.² Both Weinfeld (1972a, pp. 179–189) and Haran (1978, pp. 140–148) discuss the pre-exilic provenance of the priestly writings. Since this theory of dating is not generally known and is accepted by only a few people, it may help to briefly mention some of its supporting arguments. Its theological base is an immanent view of God in the priestly writings, in contrast with the commonly held transcendent view. This immanence is seen to fit the early Israelite religious scene, rather than the exilic or post-exilic situation. It is based on a literary contrast between the legal collections in JE, P and D in which the laws that show evidence of relative dating are demonstrated to present a JE to P to D chronological sequence. It is based on historical considerations showing that the *sitz-im-leben* reflected in priestly materials are the times of the tribes, monarchy and divided kingdoms and not the exilic or post-exilic situations. Finally, it is based on various comparisons between priestly and deuteronomic materials, demonstrating that both Deuteronomy and DH knew and adapted priestly material for

2. Some of those in this school who have been carrying on the tradition and approach of Kaufmann besides Moshe Weinfeld are Menachem Haran, Avi Hurvitz and Jacob Milgrom.

their usage, but that the priestly materials show no acquaintance with Deuteronomy or DH.

This last argument is important for our consideration. It is worthwhile to recite briefly some of the passages adduced as evidence of this. Priestly idioms and materials are found to have been adapted and used by Deuteronomistic and DH writers in Deuteronomy 1; 4; 10; 12; 14; 32; 34 and 2 Kgs 12 and 16, as presented by Weinfeld.³ Most of these involve the incorporation of priestly terminology. Beyond this, both Weinfeld (1972a, p. 181n) and Moran (1966, pp. 271–277) hold Deut 14:13–18 to be a direct Deuteronomistic adaptation of the priestly listing of unclean animals in Lev 11:13–19. This argument is mentioned in passing to show that the present analysis of Joshua is not a detached argument but part of a larger internally consistent view of the early dating of priestly material.

In this context the evidence of some signs of DH editing of priestly material in the relevant chapters of Joshua is suggested.

1. In Joshua 13, vv. 14 and 33 are deuteronomistic, as Cross (1973, p. 254) has pointed out. They form an inclusio, editorially setting off the brief priestly unit in 15–32, which was inserted and then set off by the simple repetition of the deuteronomistic verse.
2. Verse 18:1 was moved from before 14:1 to 18:1 by the deuteronomistic editor to correspond with his report of a two-stage allocation of the West Jordan land.

3. See Weinfeld (1972a, pp. 180–182, and especially note 3 on pp. 180–181). Priestly materials that he identifies in these chapters are:

Deut 1:8; 4:37; 10:15: 'to their seed after them'

4:16: 'male and female'

4:17: 'winged bird'

4:16, 17, 18: 'likeness'

4:18: 'creep'

4:25: 'beget'

4:32: 'create'

10:3: 'an ark of acacia wood' appears to be from Exod 25:10

10:6–9: appears to be an amalgamation of priestly traditions, with somewhat changed wording, from Num 33:30–39; and 20:22–29

12:23 phraseology and attitudes from Gen 9:4 and Lev 17:11

26:17–18; 27:9; 29:12: the priestly formula, 'I will be your God and you will be my people.'

32:48–52: appears to be a quotation from Num 27:12–14

34:9 'spirit of wisdom' describing Joshua; cf. Exod 28:3; Num 27:12–14

2 Kgs 12:5–17: 'the individual monetary assessment,' 'guilt offering,' and 'sin offering'

2 Kgs 16:10–16: 'model,' 'pattern,' 'burnt offering,' 'cereal offering,' 'drink offering,'

'threw the blood on the altar,' 'before the Lord,' 'the north side of the altar,' and 'the morning burnt offering.'

3. The unit in 18:2–10 is a DH harmonizing section introducing the allocation to the seven remaining tribes. In vv. 6–10 it picks up a few priestly terms from the context to effect the harmonization.
4. In 20:1–9 we have an unmistakable priestly passage, but it has received DH glosses. These are found in v. 3, where *biblî dâ'at* 'unwittingly,' and v. 5 where 'because he killed his neighbor unwittingly, having had no enmity against him in times past' is directly quoted from Deut 19:4,6.
5. The unit in Josh 22:1–8 is a DH introduction to the priestly story that follows in 22:9–34. The story is an appendix to the allocations of the land, but only generally relates to them and thus needs some type of prefatory note which the editor supplied. From the priestly context he picked up a couple of priestly terms, *mattê* 'tribe' in v. 1 and *'ahūzatkem* 'your possession' in v. 4. These passages can be understood only as DH adaptations of previously existing priestly material and they are not understandable as priestly additions. The fourth example is quite revealing. DH glosses are given in Josh 20:1–9 to a priestly text in order to make it understandable to the DH audience unfamiliar with technical priestly terms.

There are also a few indications that DH interpolated this complete and revised section into its own context. The DH editor provided a conclusion to the accounts of the allocations which is to be found in 21:43–45. This conclusion follows up no DH material of the conquest, nor does it summarize the allocation of the Levitical cities in Joshua 21. Rather, it is a deuteronomistic summary of the allocation of the land, as described in the materials incorporated by the editor into his history of the conquest. Also, we have a brief editorial bracket in 13:lab α and 23:1a forming an inclusio around the entire block of interpolated priestly material. As Noth (1953, p. 10) and Mowinckel (1964, p. 61) have stated, the material in 13:1 is probably a repetition of that in 23:1 made at the time of the interpolation. However, this interpolating and editing was not worked out by a priestly editor but rather by the DH editor who inserted the block of priestly material which he had revised. Finally, the book now appears in its finally redacted DH form with chapters 1 and 23 tying together the accounts of the conquest with those of the allocation of the land. The account of the covenant at Schechem was attached to this and this concluded the first period of the history of the people of Israel in the land of Israel, comprising our present book of Joshua.

III

In terms of tradition history, there were lists of boundaries and cities of each of the tribes of Israel as the earliest written stage. At a middle stage these lists

were edited by the priests and included in their history of the people, which included the priestly *Grundschrift* in the pentateuch and the six core priestly units of Joshua 13–22. The priests joined the six core units and the eleven lists of cities and boundaries to form its tradition of the allocation of the land of Canaan to the tribes of Israel. At the last and final stage the editor of DH detached the priestly land allocation tradition from the priestly *Grundschrift* in the pentateuch, edited it (as shown above), and interpolated it into his history of the conquest and settlement, putting it between Josh 13:1 and 23:1.

The accounts of the allocation of the land can now be understood to have come from the priests in the form in which they edited them and in which they were re-edited by the editor of DH. It was the deuteronomistic historian who lacked an account of the allocation of the land. So he picked it up where he could get it, from the priestly tradition. Then he edited it and made it a part of his history of the conquest and settlement.

In the process of the above analysis of these chapters in Joshua, the dilemma of hexateuch vs. tetrateuch + DH has been removed by eliminating one of the horns of the dilemma. Contrary to Noth, Cross and many others, there is a priestly stratum in Joshua. This has been established on the basis of linguistic, thematic, structural, and theological analysis. This is possible because it was already available at the time of compiling the first edition of DH. The editor-historian of DH found it very helpful to use in connection with his account of the conquest and made it one of the main sources of his history of the settlement. And now, in revised form, we may accept both modern views of the two great edited histories of the people of Israel: the hexateuch and the deuteronomistic history.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Blenkinsopp, J. 1976. "The Structure of P." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 38:275–292.
- Brueggemann, W. 1975. "The Kerygma of the Priestly Writers." *The Vitality of Old Testament Traditions*. Atlanta.
- Cross, F. M. 1973. *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic*. Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Driver, S. R. 1897. *An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*. New York.
- Haran, M. 1978. *Temples and Temple Service in Ancient Israel*. Oxford.
- Kaufmann, Y. 1937–56. *Toladot Ha'emuna Hayyisra'elit*. Tel Aviv.
- Moran, W. L. 1966. "The Literary Connection Between Lv 11:13–19 and Dt 14:12–18." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 28:271–277.
- Mowinckel, S. 1964. *Tetrateuch—Pentateuch—Hexateuch*. Berlin.
- Noth, M. 1943. *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien*. Tübingen.
- . 1953. *Das Buch Josua*. Tübingen.
- Rad, G. von 1953. *Studies in Deuteronomy*. London.
- Weinfeld, M. 1972a. *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School*. Oxford.
- . 1972b. "Pentateuch." *Encyclopedia Judaica* 13:231–261. Jerusalem.
- Wellhausen, J. 1883. *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels*. Marburg.
- . 1885. *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten. II, Die Composition des Hexateuchs*. Berlin.