THE ALLEGED SECONDARY DEUTERONOMIC PASSAGES IN THE BOOK OF JOSHUA[1]

IN the book of Joshua there are a number of passages which the late Dr. Driver in his *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament* has classified with the designation D 2.[2] By this symbol he would denote an editor who was imbued with the spirit of Deuteronomy, and who expanded the alleged JE portions of the book of Joshua before they were finally combined with P.

It is the purpose of the present paper to examine briefly the principal passages in Joshua which Dr. Driver has labelled D 2. An examination of this kind is necessarily attended with certain difficulties. To determine whether or not a certain passage is an ancient Semitic document is an interpolation is by no means an easy thing. The Semitic style does not always follow the logical patterns which are so natural to the Occidental mind. Thus, for example, one reads the flowing narratives of Sennacherib's various campaigns until he comes to the end and finds the passage about the *êkal ku-tal-li*. In tone this passage differs entirely from what has preceded. In fact, it does not even fit in well with what has gone before. Why, after detailing his various campaigns, should Sennacherib proceed to relate, in a totally diverse style, the rebuilding of a certain structure? Should not this account, therefore, be regarded as an interpolation, composed by a different author? If it had appeared in the Bible, it would certainly have been treated thus. And yet, on the Taylor Prism, it appears as an integral part of Sennacherib's account.[3] Evidently therefore, even though the precise connection between the *êkal ku-tal-li* account and the military campaigns may not be perfectly clear, they both were the work of one author who desired them both to be on one stele.

This example is sufficient to remind us that extreme caution must be employed in categorizing a certain passage as an interpolation. We may not always be able to explain the presence of a certain passage or verse, but in itself, this does not furnish sufficient warrant for considering such a passage to be interpolated.

Several further points must be noted. Whenever it is claimed that a certain verse or section is D 2 we must ask why D 2 would have made this particular insertion at this particular place. Is the insertion of such a nature that it clearly betrays certain " Deuteronomistic " aims? Most of the alleged D 2 insertions do not stand up well in the light of such questioning. In other words, there is not always a self-evident reason why they should have been inserted precisely at the point where they appear.

Again, even where the language of the alleged interpolation is said to be Deuteronomic, it is very rarely exclusively so. Very rarely, if ever, is the style of the alleged insertion so incompatible with the style of " JE " that we must assume the passage in question to be the work of a man with specifically " Deuteronomic " aims.

In certain cases it is claimed that the insertion really interrupts the thought or breaks the connection of thought in a particular context. But if this were actually the case, why did the Deuteronomic editor do such a thing? Why was he not more thoughtful and careful about his work?

That there are Deuteronomic influences in the book of Joshua is a fact which cannot be denied. But how are such influences to be explained? Are they to be explained merely as the work of a Deuteronomic editor? We think not, for such an explanation does not satisfy. We think that there is a far better and more satisfying explanation. Suppose after all that the book of Joshua presents true history! Suppose that its author had before him the entire Pentateuch! Suppose that Joshua had actually been present when Moses delivered the great addresses contained in Deuteronomy and that he had actually played the part which he is represented as playing in the book of Joshua!

If this were the case, would he not most naturally have employed Deuteronomic language in his speeches? And would not the author of the book of Joshua, a man who obviously was steeped in the language of the Pentateuch, have done the same? Would not this also account for the many references to and reminiscences upon other parts of the Pentateuch as well? It is in this way, we think, that the character of the book of Joshua is to be understood.

The book of Deuteronomy has a hortatory, parenetic style. It is, in a certain sense, a summary of Pentateuchal legislation. It presents the last words of Israel's great lawgiver. Should we not rightly expect, therefore, that if the book of Joshua is a true history, it would contain a very strong Deuteronomic influence? It is in this manner, we believe, that the alleged D 2 passages are to be explained. A consideration of most of these individual passages will support this contention.

(1) Joshua i. According to Pfeiffer, the first chapter of Joshua is a " freely composed Deuteronomic introduction " which was provided for the book.[1] This judgment implies, of course, that the first chapter cannot be regarded as serious history. Driver thinks that the chapter is based upon " an earlier and shorter narrative ", but that in its present form it belongs to D 2.[2]

As the chapter stands, it forms a remarkable unity which will impress itself upon the reader if he will take the trouble to read the chapter aloud several times slowly and thoughtfully and at one sitting.[3] There is something else which will also impress itself upon the reader. It is the tremendous earnestness and moral tone of the chapter. Here are the words of one who has meditated long and deep in the Pentateuch, and it is very difficult to regard such a sublime production as the work of an epigone who was merely trying to carry out a " program ".

The opening words which mention the death of Moses bring to mind the closing chapter of Deuteronomy. Indeed, the intention of the verse seems to be to continue where Deuteronomy ended, and it is quite possible that the writer of the two chapters may have been the same person.

Such a connection is natural and expected, if the book of Joshua is a record of historical fact. And the fact that Moses is described as the servant of the Lord connects well with Deut. xxxiv. 5. Attention is immediately focused upon Joshua, who is described as the minister of Moses (*meshareth Mosheh*). This

description, however, is not taken from Deuteronomy, but from Exodus and Numbers.[1]

In verse 2 the Lord speaks of " Moses my servant ". This is not from Deuteronomy. For, although in Deuteronomy Moses is often called the servant of the Lord, the designation of Moses as " my servant " appears only in Num. xii. 7.[2] The phrase appears to have been deliberately chosen. A new order has now arrived. Moses, who stood in unparalleled relationship with the Lord, is dead. Therefore, since he is dead, the people should no longer delay, but arise and cross over the Jordan.[3]

The latter part of the verse evidently reflects Deut. xxxii. 52.[4] However, it is by no means a slavish dependence. Joshua, for example, employs *'anokhi* whereas Deuteronomy has *'ani*. He also adds the phrase " to the children of Israel ".[5] These phenomena make it clear that the writer of Joshua i was a man steeped in the Scripture. He wrote in a style that was replete with the thoughts and language of earlier Scripture. But he did not copy slavishly. He had no hesitation in making minor alterations when they suited his purpose. And, although he often referred to Deuteronomy, he also referred to other parts of the Pentateuch.[6]

Verses 3–5a reflect Deut. xi. 24, 25 a. The reason, however, is perfectly obvious. The writer is about to describe the land which the people are to possess, and this possession is to be in accordance with the promise which the Lord had made to Moses. Hence, the language of the promise forms the basis for the description of the land about to be possessed. Is not this what we might expect? In fact, how else could the matter have

---

[1] Robert H. Pfeiffer: *Introduction to the Old Testament* (New York, 1941), p. 304.

[2] Driver, op. cit., p. 105.

[3] This unity will be apparent even to one who reads a translation; it will appear stronger to him who reads the Hebrew. Only let the reading be aloud and thoughtful. What is needed to-day is a more careful reading of the Bible itself. There is a danger that in trying to keep abreast of the latest books about the Bible we shall neglect the Bible itself.

[1] Ex. xxiv. 13; xxxiii. 11, Num. xi. 28 (JE-Driver). In Deut. i. 38 a synonymous expression is used, *ha 'omedh lephanekha*. Why, if Joshua i be Deuteronomic, was not this phrase employed to designate Moses?

[2] Num. xii. 7.

[3] " This Jordan." The *hazzeh* should not be omitted with the LXX. It is probable that Jordan is the Homeric ὁ Ἰάρδανος. If so, the Hebrew has taken over the demonstrative pronoun also.

[4] This phrase is omitted in the LXX.

[5] This phrase is also omitted in the LXX. It appears that the LXX is simply trying to smooth out a rough spot. The retention of the words " to the children of Israel " constitutes the more difficult reading, and hence it should be retained.

[6] Thus, *qûm* followed by an imperative is common Hebrew idiom. It occurs, in fact, more frequently in the remainder of the Pentateuch than in Deuteronomy. The one passage in Deuteronomy which is somewhat similar to Joshua i. 2 is ii. 13, but note that here the connecting Waw is used. Likewise, the designation *ha'am hazzeh* has nothing particularly Deuteronomic about it.

been handled? If there were no reflections upon the promise in Deuteronomy, the passage would be devoid of meaning, since the one place where this particular promise had been made is found in Deuteronomy.

Nevertheless, here again, there is no slavish copying. Certain differences appear.

Deut. xi		Joshua i
24. hammaqom	3.	maqom
yihyeh		nethattiw
min-hammidhbar	4.	mehammidhbar
		add hazzeh
min-hannahar		we'adh hannahar haggadhol
		kol-'ereç hachittim
we'adh hayyam ha'acharon		we'adh hayyam haggadhol
		mebhô hashshemesh
biphnêkhem	5.	lephanekha
		kol yemê chayyekha

In Joshua i. 4 the word 'adh is evidently taken from Gen. xv. 18. The phrase " all the land of the Hittites " is a succinct description of the entire land to be possessed, and there is no reason whatsoever for omitting it.[1] In describing the Mediterranean Joshua calls it " the great sea " a phrase which is taken from Num. xxxiv. 6. Why would an alleged D 2 author have done this, when there was before him the perfectly satisfactory language of Deut. xi?

The answer is that the author of Joshua was not seeking to propagate the ideas of Deuteronomy in preference to those of the other books of the Pentateuch. He employed Deuteronomy when it suited his purpose, but he did the same also with the other Mosaic writings. In this present instance he made Deuteronomy the basis of his language, but he borrowed also from Genesis and Numbers and even added some words of his own.

This procedure may be compared with that of James at the Apostolic Council. James, in order to support his argument that God had visited the Gentiles to take from them a people for His Name, appealed to the Old Testament.[2] His words are based for the most part upon the prophecy of Amos in the

---

[1] It is omitted in the LXX. However, these words are necessary to serve as a succinct designation of the land of Canaan. In his third campaign Sennacherib uses the term similarly: i-na sal-si ger-ri-ia a-na mât Ha-at-ti lu al-lik.

[2] Acts xv. 15.

Septuagint version. However, he gives no slavish quotation. His language also shows reflection upon Jeremiah and probably upon Isaiah.[1] James was no particular protagonist of Amos above other prophets. He merely used Amos as the basis of his quotation, because Amos suited his purpose. So also with Joshua's use of Deuteronomy in this present instance. When there is a perfectly satisfactory explanation of such usage at hand, why should we adopt an explanation that is not satisfactory?

Joshua i. 5 a is similar to Deut. xi. 25 a, except that Joshua substitutes lephanekha for biphnêkhem, also employing a singular instead of a plural suffix and adding the words " all the days of thy life ". It is this latter phrase which shows the singular to be correct. The Lord is here speaking to Joshua directly. The word which, in Deuteronomy, had been addressed to the entire nation, is now spoken to the leader himself.

The reason for the appeal to Deuteronomy's language is stated in the words, " even as I was with Moses, I will be with thee." The further statement of assurance, " I will not fail thee nor forsake thee " is taken from Deut. xxxi. 6.

Verse 6 amounts to a repetition of what had already been said to Joshua in Deut. xxxi. 7 and 23. It thus serves as a further encouragement to Joshua, by its very language recalling to his mind the solemn commission which had been given to him while Moses was yet alive. This is precisely what we might expect if Joshua is a record of true history. Even here, however, there are minor variations in the language.[2]

In verse 7 the Lord states the conditions which Joshua is to meet. Again, the language of Deuteronomy is in evidence, but there is a notable exception. It is the designation of Moses as " My Servant ", which words have already been discussed (see supra, p. 145). And this designation is particularly appropriate when employed immediately after the statement that Moses had commanded the Law ".[3]

---

[1] The μετὰ ταῦτα, etc., of verse 16 seems to be based upon the language of Jer. xii. 15a (cf. LXX, καὶ ἔσται μετὰ τὸ ἐκβαλεῖν με αὐτοὺς ἐπιστρέψω καὶ ἐλεήσω αὐτούς). Verse 17 is reminiscent of Isa. xlv. 21.

[2] Deut. xxxi. 7 includes ki 'attah tabhô, etc., which is omitted in Joshua, Deut. xxxi. 23 uses the Hiph'il of bô instead of the Qal, as in verse 7. It also includes the promise of God's presence which is omitted in Joshua.

[3] This usage appears to have a theological purpose. In Num. xii. 7 God had designated Moses as " my servant " in order to show his superiority over the prophets. Moses was faithful as a servant in the divine economy. Through him the Law was given. The book of Joshua, in speaking of the Law which Moses had commanded, and in designating Moses as " my servant ", stresses the uniqueness of Moses' position in accord with the book of Numbers.

The first thing that strikes the eye in reading verse 8 is the similarity in thought between this verse and the first Psalm. The first phrases clearly recall Ex. xii. 22, and the idiomatic expression *yomam wa-laylah* may reflect Lev. viii. 35 and Num. ix. 21, since it does not occur in Deuteronomy. Nor is it necessarily a thought that must have appeared late in Israel's history. It was a most natural expression to be used in precisely the situation in which Joshua found himself. If the first chapter of Joshua is recording accurately (as the present writer believes that it is) the words which the Lord actually spoke to Joshua, then this verse is filled with rich meaning. It is difficult to see how a passage so full of profound truth as is this one could have been the product of a supposed secondary Deuteronomic school.

Lastly we may remark that there is surely nothing specifically Deuteronomic in the word *taçliach*. The Hiph'il of *çalach* occurs in Deuteronomy, but it appears elsewhere in the Pentateuch also.[1]

Verse 9 obviously reflects Deut, xxxi. 6. The variations, however, are quite striking, as appears when they are listed.

Joshua i. 9	Deut. xxxi. 6
'al-ta'aroç[2] we'al-techath	'al-tire'u we'al-ta'areçu mippenêhem
ki 'immekha yihyeh 'elohekha	ki yhwh 'elohekha hû haholekh 'immakh
bekhol 'asher telekh.	lô yarpekha welô ya'azebhekha.

The differences make clear that there is no mere imitation here but that Joshua used the Deuteronomic material as it suited his purpose. The purpose is perfectly obvious. Deuteronomic language is employed because in Deuteronomy the commandment had been given to which appeal is here made.

In response to the remarkable revelation which had just been given him Joshua gives commands to the officers of the people concerning the crossing of the Jordan. In the charge he employs Deuteronomic language. For example, although there are differences, verse 11 b brings to mind Deut. xi. 31. The command " prepare your victuals ", however, is in no sense strictly Deuteronomic.[3]

---

[1] Gen. xxiv. 21, 40, 42, 56; xxxix. 2, 3, 23; Deut. xxviii. 29.

[2] Deut. vii. 21 (*lô tha'aroç*); i. 29; xx. 3 (*'al ta'areçu*).

[3] The Hiph'il of *kûn* is found in Gen. xliii. 16, 25; Ex. xvi. 5; xxiii. 20; Num. xxiii. 1, 29; Deut. xix. 3; *çedhah* occurs in Gen. xxvii. 3; xlii. 25; xlv. 21; Ex. xii. 39 and not at all in Deuteronomy.

Likewise the mention of the two and one-half tribes is not a distinctly Deuteronomic touch. In Num. xxxii 17 ff. these tribes had promised to help in the conquest of Canaan if Moses would give them the rich land of Gilead. It is this condition of which Joshua is now reminding them. The passage clearly presupposes Num. xxxii.[1]

With the command " remember " Joshua calls to mind the words of Moses uttered in Deut. iii. 18–20. It is for this reason that Joshua's words bear a closer resemblance to the words of Moses in Deut. iii. 18–20 than to the original law as given in Num. xxxii.

Very interesting, however, is the use of the phrase *gibbôrê hachayil* in verse 14. This designation does not occur at all in the Pentateuch, which uses *bnê chayil* instead. Now, if the writer of Joshua i were merely an epigone, is it likely that he would have made such a change? The change shows a certain amount of independence of procedure. It indeed supports the position that the author of Joshua i was not carrying out a specifically " Deuteronomic " programme.

The two and one-half tribes then answered Joshua, expressing their willingness to support him to the utmost. In the circumstances there is no reason whatsoever why these tribes may not have employed precisely this language. The tribes had already heard Moses give his charge to Joshua.[2] Without doubt Joshua had also told the people the words which the Lord had spoken unto him. It is but natural that the reply of the tribes would contain reflections upon the language which Joshua himself had used. As God had said to Joshua, " Be strong and of good courage ", so now would the two and one-half tribes speak to him. It would be the sign of their deep devotion to him as leader.

In concluding this brief survey of the first chapter of Joshua we see that there are indeed present in the chapter reflections upon the language of Deuteronomy. The reasons for such reflections, however, are perfectly apparent and understandable. In fact, if the chapter be a true historical record, and there is no weighty reason for doubting this, these reflections upon Deuteronomic language are precisely what is to be expected.

---

[1] Driver partitions this chapter as follows: JE 1–17 (in the main), 20–27 (in the main), 34–42; P 18–19, 28–32 (33).

[2] Deut. xxxi.

(2) Joshua ii. 10, 11. Because of their supposedly Deuteronomic language, these two verses are ascribed by Driver to D 2. However, even a cursory reading reveals that they do not disturb the context. In verse 9 Rahab has just explained how the terror of Israel has fallen upon the nation.[1] In verse 10 the reason for this terror is stated. The people have heard of the two great miracles which God has done for His own, and their hearts have melted. This is in fulfilment of the prophecy in Ex. xv. 14, 15.

Rahab's confession of faith, if such it may be called, is based upon Deut. iv. 39. The promises and warnings which Moses had previously uttered had doubtless been repeated many times by the people. It is quite possible that someone had recited these promises in the presence of Rahab, and that she was now repeating the language which the great law-giver had once used.[2]

Rahab, however, does not quote exactly. In speaking of God, she does not employ the definite article and she also omits the phrase " and there is no other ". These omissions are simply inconceivable if these verses are the work of someone who was merely seeking to carry out a Deuteronomic programme. It is as a polytheist that Rahab here speaks. She has not yet risen to true faith.

(3) Joshua iii–iv. In chapter iii the following verses are assigned by Driver to D 2: verses 2–4, 6–9, 11 b–12. The order of events in this chapter is generally regarded by critics as confused. The basic unity of the chapter can perhaps best be brought out by a brief survey of its contents.

At the end of three days (to be distinguished from the three days of i. 11) the people are given preliminary instructions for crossing the Jordan. This instruction is given by the officers, and then Joshua commanded the people to sanctify themselves, and the priests to take up the ark (iii. 1–6).

At first sight it may appear that this section is somewhat rough. It might appear that verses 2–4 disturb the connection

---

[1] Incidentally, this also is a Deuteronomic touch. Cf. Deut. ii. 25; xi. 25. Yet the secondary Deuteronomic hand is denied to this verse.

[2] Must we be entirely unrealistic in studying the Old Testament? Is it not likely that individual Israelites may already have been to Jericho and boasted about what had occurred in the wilderness wanderings and also have quoted Moses' language? Rahab could easily have heard such reports and adopted their language to her own ends. She herself said, " We have heard. . . ."

and that verse 5 should follow immediately after verse 1. This very roughness, however, is an evidence of genuineness. For, if verses 2–4 are so clearly out of place, why should anyone wish to insert them at this particular point? Furthermore, there is nothing in the language of these verses which demands for them an author different from the author of the context.

After Joshua's command to the priests the Lord declares His intention of magnifying Joshua. He is to command the priests that, when they come to the bank of the Jordan, they are to stand in the Jordan. Thus the priests did until the people had passed over (iv. 11).[1]

Joshua then announces the wonder that is to be performed and commands twelve men to be chosen as witnesses. These twelve are to act as representatives of the people. The command is not out of place here (iii. 12). It was uttered by Joshua as a preview of what was about to take place. Later, Joshua repeats the command (iv. 2) which is far more effective than a mere allusion (such as iv. 4) would have been. Incidentally, the fact that no fulfilment of the command is here given is strong evidence for its genuineness.

Our next interest is iv. 14 which relates how God magnified Joshua. This is in fulfilment of the promise previously made (iii. 7), a verse which Driver also ascribed to D 2. This passage, however, in no way disturbs the sense. Rather, it complements what has preceded, and serves as a remarkable summary.

It is very difficult to understand why anyone would have inserted such a verse. How could the insertion really have aided a Deuteronomic reform? How, too, could a " devout " editor have dared tamper with a text which he regarded as sacred?[2]

The final verses of chapter iv (i.e. 21–24) also call for brief comment. Their purpose is to explain the erection of the twelve stones, and if they be omitted, a satisfactory explanation is lacking. Hence, we may first of all note that these verses are really necessary to the context.

---

[1] Cf. E. J. Young, *Introduction to the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids, 1949), p. 161.

[2] The leading emphasis of the verse (*giddal*) is not Deuteronomic, but rather calls to mind Gen. xii. 2.

It is true that in form there is a similarity with Deut. vi. 20, but there are also striking differences.[1] The thought, moreover, reflects the book of Exodus. This appears in the purpose of the miracles, that the nations may know the mighty hand of God—a thought which calls to mind Ex. xiv. 4, 18; ix. 16. It also appears in the purpose that Israel herself is to fear the Lord, which purpose has indeed been expressed in Deut. vi. 2, but the language also reflects Ex. xiv. 31.

In conclusion we may assert that this passage forms an integral part of the context in which it is found, and to sever it from that context would indeed leave a gap.

(4) Joshua v. 1. The language of this verse is similar in part to that of ii. 10, 11. It should be noted, however, that the verse claims to be the work of an eye-witness ('obhrenu). If, therefore any credence is to be given the passage, we cannot regard it as the addition of a later author, who had not himself crossed the Jordan.

(5) Joshua v. 4-7. These verses are explanatory, and state the reason why Joshua had the people circumcised. Why they should be attributed to a " Deuteronomist " is difficult to see. The final editor of the book may easily have inserted them.[2] They are in keeping with the spirit of the remainder of the book, and are similar to the rest in their appeal to different parts of the Pentateuch.

(6) Joshua viii. 30-35. This brief section has been the object of much criticism. Driver suggests that the narrative has either been misplaced or curtailed.[3] The reason for this is that in verse 30 Ebal is named, whereas there is no mention of the conquest of the intervening territory.

However, the section does not bear the marks of an interpolation, and is written in the style of the remainder of the book. Furthermore, the obstacles raised to its genuineness are by no means insuperable. Ebal lay about twenty miles to the north

---

[1] E.g., the unusual use of 'asher for the very common " Deuteronomic " ki in the sense of " when ".

[2] While Joshua himself cannot have been the author of the entire book, it nevertheless is very ancient and was probably written by a divinely-inspired prophet who had witnessed most of the events recorded. Cf. my *Introduction*, pp. 159-160.

[3] Op. cit., p. 107.

---

of Ai, and since Joshua had already been north of Ai (viii. 11) the news of the defeat of Jericho and Ai may have made possible his travel to Ebal without difficulty.

It is true enough that this passage records the fulfilment of Deut. xxvii. 2 ff., but at the same time its language is reminiscent of the Book of the Covenant.[1] If the law in Deuteronomy had actually been spoken by Moses, and if the account in Joshua is historical fact, the dependences upon Deuteronomy explain themselves and the difficulties disappear.

(7) Joshua ix. 1, 2. These two verses serve a purpose in their present setting. On the one hand, they make it clear that Joshua's victories were alarming the land, and on the other they lend force to the description of the stratagem of the Gibeonites. Having heard what Joshua had done, the Gibeonites decided that their best course would lie in strategy rather than in armed forces. Because of what has been stated in verses 1 and 2 their action stands out in bolder relief.

(8) Joshua ix. 9 b, 10. If these verses are a secondary Deuteronomic addition it is difficult to explain the use of shom'ô instead of the Deuteronomic shēma' (Deut. ii. 25). In fact, shōma' does not occur at all in the Pentateuch. It should be noted that 9 b is a fulfilment of Ex. xv. 14 a, and verse 10 reflects Num. xxi. 21-33. This great victory must have been widely reported. Moses himself had called it to mind before the Israelites (Deut. ii. 24; iii. 17). It is difficult to see what other language the Gibeonites would have used if they had wished to make an impression upon the Israelites.

(9) Joshua ix. 24, 25. If these verses are removed from their context, a gap remains, for they present the reaction of the Gibeonites to Joshua's intention to make them hewers of wood. They first explain (verse 24) why they have acted as they have, and then submit to Joshua by declaring that they are in his hand. Furthermore, the opening words of verse 26 (" and he did so to them ") follow the closing words of verse 25 more suitably than they do the words of verse 23.

---

[1] Indeed, this entire passage is most instructive. In Deut. xxvii. 3, 4, Moses commanded the Israelites to set up great stones, write the law upon them and plaster them with plaster. In Joshua viii. 30 we are told simply that Joshua built an altar unto the Lord (a phrase reminiscent of Exodus xx. 24). There is no mention of plaster in the Joshua passage.

D

(10) Joshua ix. 27 b. Despite the fact that the phrase " in the place which he should choose " also appears in Deut. xii. 5, it is difficult to see why there is a secondary Deuteronomic influence here. Why should a Deuteronomic editor have desired to add precisely these words? If his purpose had been to stress centralization of worship, he would have accomplished the purpose better if he had written at greater length and made his purpose clearer.

(11) Joshua x. 8. If verse 8 be removed from its place, verse 9 loses much of its force. It is because Joshua has been encouraged by the Lord that he now comes upon Gilgal suddenly.[1]

(12) Joshua x. 12 a. The first half of verse 12 is an integral part of the verse and forms both a general heading and satisfactory background for the remarkable utterance of 12 b. Its removal greatly lessens the effectiveness of the verse, it is difficult to believe that such an effective and suitable introduction is not original.

(13) Joshua x. 14 b. Why this phrase should be regarded as the peculiar property of Deuteronomy is not clear, for it occurs also in Exodus xiv. 14.

(14) Joshua x. 25. See the discussion of Joshua i. 9. It is to be expected that in his speeches Joshua would use Deuteronomic language. Furthermore, this particular verse does not have the characteristics of an interpolation. It is an encouragement to the nation that as God has delivered these particular kings into their hands, so will He do with all their enemies.

(15) Joshua x. 28–43. The detail given in this section is an evidence of its genuineness, nor does it conflict with what is related of the conquest of the South in Judges i. If such a conflict really existed, it is difficult to see why the final edition of the Old Testament would have permitted the conflict to persist.

(16) Joshua xi. 10–23. The remarks upon x. 28–43 apply here also. The verses form an admirable summary of the conquest.

---

[1] In this verse we have *lô ya'amodh 'ish mehem bephanekha*, whereas in Joshua i. 5 (also thought to be D 2) we have *lô yithyaççebh 'ish lephanekha*. See the remarks upon Joshua i. 5 supra.

(17) Joshua xii. 1–24. The detail given in this chapter is an evidence of genuineness. It is interesting to note that in verse 9 Jericho is spelled *Yerîchô*, whereas in Deuteronomy the spelling is *Yerêchô*. This spelling is peculiar to Joshua, and is particularly difficult to explain, if the present chapter, to use Driver's language, is merely " another generalizing review by D 2 " (*op. cit.*, p. 101).

(18) Joshua xiii. 1–12. This section does not bear the marks of an interpolation. Rather, it is precisely what might be expected after a statement of the territory which Joshua had conquered. If there are reasons for regarding these verses as interpolated, they are not evident.

(19) Joshua xiii. 14. This verse, to be sure, reflects Deut. x. 9, but it also reflects Num. xviii. 20. Furthermore, the same thought is also developed in xiv. 3, 4 and this fact is an argument against xiii. 14 being an interpolation. For, since xiv. 3, 4 explains the situation of the Levites, what purpose would there be in adding such a verse as xiii. 14? The presence of the verse, therefore, argues for its originality.[1]

(20) Joshua xiii. 33. The remarks upon xiii. 14 apply here also.

(21) Joshua xx. 4, 5. It is difficult to see why these verses should be regarded as a peculiarly Deuteronomic addition. True enough they are omitted in Codex B of the LXX, but this does not prove that they are not original in the Hebrew.[2] The passage is obviously based upon the law in Num. xxxv and there are also some additions from Deuteronomy.[3] If, however, the book of Joshua was written after the completion of the entire Pentateuch, would we not expect the writer to draw from the entire Pentateuch to support his statements? The combination of alleged Priestly and Deuteronomic elements in

---

[1] Concerning the uses of *shebhet* and *matteh*, O. T. Allis (*The Five Books of Moses*, Philadelphia, 1949) says: " *Matteh* is the usual word in P. But *shebet* also occurs: e.g., *matteh* occurs 35 times in Num. i–x. (P), but *shebet* is used in iv. 18; *matteh* occurs 25 times in Joshua xxi. 1–42, but *shebet* appears in verse 16. In Num. xviii. 2, xxxvi. 3, Joshua xiii. 29 (all P), both words appear in the same verse " (p. 313).

[2] The verses are found in some manuscripts of the LXX.

[3] E.g. *beli da'ath*.

these verses simply shows that the entire Pentateuch lay before the author of Joshua.

(22) Joshua xx. 6 b. This section is omitted in some manuscripts of the LXX, but this is not evidence that it is a Deuteronomic addition. What the section states concerning the death of the high priest is taken from Numbers.[1]

(23) Joshua xxi. 43–xxii. 6. Driver believes (*op. cit.*, p. 105) that xxi. 43–45 form a subscription, not to xxi. 1–42, but rather to D 2's account of the partition of the land. P has such a subscription, he thinks, in xix. 51 and JE in xix. 49 f. However, xix. 49 f. is not a subscription, but merely a statement to the effect that after the land had been divided Joshua was given Timnath-serah, and xix. 51 merely serves to state the inheritance of Eleazar and Joshua. The words of verse 51, " so they made an end of dividing the country ", do not identify the verse as from a different hand from verses 40 and 50.[2]

Verses 43–45 of chapter xxi sum up the history of the division of the land, and have direct reference to i, 2–6. Thus, they serve to connect the two portions of the book, namely chapters xiii–xxi and i–xii. In this summary there is thought and language of a Deuteronomic character, but the promise herein mentioned was given in Genesis xii. 7 and xv. 18.

Joshua xxii. 1–6 must be understood in connection with i. 12–15. In blessing the two and one-half tribes Joshua uses language of a hortatory nature as in chapter i, and this explains the alleged Deuteronomic character of the section. It is interesting to note also that he employs the word *matteh* instead of the usual *shebhet*.[3]

(24) Joshua xxiii. Joshua xxiii is thought by Driver (*op. cit.*, p. 106) to be predominantly D 2, whereas Joshua xxiv is supposedly E with a few additions from D 2. If this were really the case, we might justifiably ask why D 2, since he evidently wished to accomplish a specific purpose, did not place his own chapter last and thus make it form a climax?

[1] Num. xxxv. 25.

[2] If D 2 knew that there was already a JE conclusion, why did he feel it necessary to add another?

[3] See footnote 1, p. 155.

Driver's analysis, however, is entirely too superficial. In chapter xxiii Joshua warns the people against alliances with the Canaanites. In his address he takes words from the Pentateuch and principally from Deuteronomy and uses largely the same thought which Moses had earlier employed. Indeed, in some respects his address may be regarded as an abridgement of the latter's.

Chapter xxiii is thus preparatory to chapter xxiv which treats of God's gracious acts of mercy in times past. In verse 11 Joshua mentions Jericho as the starting point of the conquest of Canaan, and then lists the other nations who opposed him. There is no reason for assuming that the list of nations is a later addition, nor does it interrupt the connection.

If verse 13 be a Deuteronomic addition, it is difficult to see why it was made. It certainly fits in well where it stands, and there is no objective reason for assuming that it is not original. The same may be said for verse 31. The similarity of this verse with Deut. xi. 7 is not sufficient reason for regarding it as an interpolation.

Conclusion. That the book of Joshua is influenced by Deuteronomy is a fact which cannot be doubted. This influence, however, is to be explained in the same manner as the influence of other parts of the Pentateuch. The author of Joshua had before him the completed Pentateuch, and in the language of the completed Pentateuch he was well versed. He drew from it as need arose. In this way, it seems to me, we are to understand the Deuteronomic influence in Joshua.

Westminster Theological Seminary,
Philadelphia, U.S.A.   EDWARD J. YOUNG.