



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE BOOK OF JOSHUA AND THE PENTATEUCH.

THE wide use of the term Hexateuch proves the general currency of the opinion that the first six books of the Bible were at one time a single work. Thus Kuenen¹: "The redaction of the Hexateuch further includes the division of the Tora into five books and its separation from the book of *Joshua* The redaction therefore severed what had previously been regarded as a single whole, and what we too have been perfectly justified in handling as such." Again Driver, somewhat less definitely²: "The Book of Joshua is separated by the Jews from the Pentateuch This distinction is, however, an artificial one, depending on the fact that the book could not be regarded, like the Pentateuch, as containing an authoritative rule of life; its contents, and, still more, its literary structure, show that it is intimately connected with the Pentateuch, and describes the final stage in the history of the *Origines* of the Hebrew nation." Numerous similar statements might be cited, and the grounds upon which they rest are obvious and familiar. The same documents are used in Joshua as in the Pentateuch, and they are combined in much the same way; Josh. i. 1 is the immediate sequel of Deut. xxxiv. 12; Josh. xxiv. 29-33 are a suitable conclusion for the history of the *Origines*.

On the other hand, Holzinger³, holds that the Joshua-sections were separated from the earlier portions of JED and P before the latter were combined. The present writer

¹ The *Hexateuch*, Eng. Tr., 1886, p. 340.

² Introduction, Sixth Ed., p. 103. ³ *Einleitung in den Hexateuch*, p. 502.

has stated¹ a similar conclusion, "Up to a certain point the history of the Book of Joshua is that of the Pentateuch. Its contents are partly taken from the Deuteronomic work (JED), and partly from the Priestly Code. But both the Deuteronomic and the Priestly Joshua were severed from the earlier law and history; and were not dealt with by the priestly editor who combined P and JED. Nevertheless, the Joshua-sections of JED and P were combined, but apparently by another editor." Though this statement was published some time after that of Holzinger, it was arrived at independently on very similar grounds.

One main reason for this conclusion is that the law promulgated by Ezra, usually identified with the Priestly Code, is spoken of as "the book of the law of Moses," Neh. viii. 1, "God's law, which was given by Moses," x. 29, "the book of Moses," xiii. 1. These phrases do not necessarily imply that the literary authorship of the code was expressly assigned to Moses; but it is difficult to understand how a book containing the history of Joshua and the account of his division of the land could be described by the phrases quoted. It is, of course, a little doubtful whether such phrases accurately reproduce the language of Ezra as to his code. The Chronicles give similar descriptions of Josiah's law-book, 2 Chron. xxxiv. 14, xxxv. 6, 12; but 2 Kings xxii, xxiii does not connect the name of Moses with Josiah's law-book. The allusion in the same context to "the law of Moses," xxiii. 25, is a note of the Deuteronomistic editor and not part of the original narrative². In the light, however, of the references in other books and of the contents of the Priestly Code itself, it is difficult to believe that the description of it as the "law of Moses" was not given it by Ezra.

Clearly, too, the Domesday Book in the latter half of the Book of Joshua had no bearing on the practical necessities of the crisis. Even the patience of Orientals must have been strained by listening for several successive days to

¹ *Primer of the Bible*, p. 90.

² So Kautzsch, *Bibel*.

the reading and exposition of the Priestly Code; and Ezra and Nehemiah had sufficient common-sense to refrain from inflicting on their audience a mass of irrelevant geography.

Two explanations may be mentioned which try to reconcile these facts with the existence of the Hexateuch as a single work. It has been supposed that Ezra's law-book was the complete Pentateuch. In that case the Hexateuch might have existed at an earlier date as a single whole and the Book of Joshua might have been severed from it before B.C. 444. This view, however, is shipwrecked on the many serious difficulties in the way of the identification of the law-book and the Pentateuch. Another explanation is that though Ezra may have brought with him the complete Priestly Code and kept it intact, only a selection of its contents were read to the people. But it is clearly the *book* and not an oral selection of its contents which is described as "the law" or "the book of Moses."

Thus these considerations indicate that the Priestly Code, as Ezra promulgated it, no longer contained the Joshua-sections. Hence the combination of the Priestly Code with JED could not contain those sections, or constitute our Hexateuch.

Another main ground for our position is the difference between the redaction of the Book of Joshua and that of the Pentateuch. We may put on one side differences of spelling. In any case the text of the Book of Joshua had an entirely distinct history from that of the Pentateuch after B. C. 300. The interval between that date and the Massoretic Text allows ample room for differentiation as to the use of quiescent consonants and such matters. It is more significant that the Book of Joshua has a characteristic phrase "Yahwê the God of Israel," which occurs fourteen times in Joshua, but only twice in the Pentateuch, Exod. v. 1, xxxii. 27¹. The frequent use of this phrase is generally

¹ Both JE, the phrase in question, however, may be R.

assigned to a redactor; by Kuenen to the final redactor of the Hexateuch, who dealt with Joshua more freely than with the preceding portions; but by Hölzinger to the redactor who combined the JED and the P Joshua's. The latter view is the simpler. More important still is the fact that while P is the basis, *Grundschrift*, and framework of the Pentateuch, it is not so used for the Book of Joshua. The editor has rather attempted to combine his material according to a plan of his own. Again, the simplest explanation is that he is not the redactor of the Pentateuch. A possible, but less probable, suggestion is that the same redactor compiled from Deuteronomic and Priestly sources the Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua; and that the difference of treatment is due to the fact that he found the Joshua-material already separated from the earlier parts of the Hexateuch.

But as we have maintained that the Joshua-sections of P were not part of Ezra's law-book; so there are reasons for believing that in the Deuteronomic documents the Joshua-sections were already separated from the Mosaic and pre-Mosaic portions of JED. The Deuteronomic redaction of JE up to the death of Moses is most conservative, the JE narratives are scarcely touched; but R^D has dealt most freely with the narratives of the conquest and made numerous additions, some of them very extensive. Such difference of treatment would naturally be accompanied by a severance of the Joshua-section from the rest.

Again there is a growing conviction that the combined work JE is found in Judges and Samuel. If this view is correct, the division of the work into sections is at least as old as the Deuteronomic redaction of the historical books. The death of Moses on the eve of the entrance into the Promised Land is so obvious a point of division, that it is natural to suppose that the existing division at that point was made as soon as the editors applied the idea of breaking up the history into sections. If so the editor who combined P with the earlier material found

that material already divided into sections. If P was a solid whole to the death of Joshua, he might take P for his framework throughout, and use the sections of JED as far as the death of Joshua. But we have seen that it is very doubtful whether P was a solid whole, and even if it was, the division in JED at the death of Moses was so consonant with the ideas of the Priestly School, that the Priestly Redactor would almost certainly follow the example of R^p, and compile the Pentateuch, not the Hexateuch. He may also have compiled our Book of Joshua as a separate work, or the latter may be by another hand.

One more consideration may have some little weight. Current views of the redaction of the Hexateuch are pushing its conclusion dangerously near to the limit fixed by the Septuagint and other external evidence. Holzinger's view lessens this difficulty by transferring one stage of the process—the separation of the Joshua-material from the other books, from the period after B. C. 444 to the period before that date.

I do not claim that the extant evidence is conclusive; but that the information at our disposal makes this view the more probable.

W. H. BENNETT.