

## Delegitimizing a Witness: Composition and Revision in Joshua 22

PHILIP Y. YOO



# DELEGITIMIZING A WITNESS: COMPOSITION AND REVISION IN JOSHUA 22\*

PHILIP Y. YOO  
UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS, AUSTIN

This article proposes that Joshua 22 underwent two stages of composition. The base layer consists of a short account of the Transjordanian tribes erecting an altar by the River Jordan. On its own, this account contains resonances to Pentateuchal materials, most notably in Numbers 32. Some of the readers of this account saw its ideological claims as scandalous and revised the original account by reshaping the cultic function of an altar constructed by the Jordan.

## INTRODUCTION: LITERARY AND IDEOLOGICAL TENSIONS IN JOSH 22

Joshua 22 consists of an episode in which Joshua releases the Reubenites, the Gadites, and the half-tribe of Manasseh of their obligations in the Cisjordan and sends them back to the Transjordan.<sup>1</sup> On their outbound journey, they build an altar somewhere near the River

---

\* My thanks to the editors and anonymous reviewers of *JHS* for their valuable comments and suggestions toward improving this article. Earlier portions of this article were presented at the Joshua–Judges section of the Annual Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature in Boston, 2017. My thanks also to the conveners, panelists, and attendees for their remarks. Any faults contained within this paper are my responsibility alone. All English translations are mine.

<sup>1</sup> Whether or not (proto)MT or the Hebrew *Vorlage* of LXX contains the original reading remains an open question. Recognizing that MT and LXX attest to the fluidity of the scroll of Joshua in the late Second Temple period, my main goal in this article is to examine the literary development of Josh 22 and demonstrate that this chapter is the product of multiple hands. While the text-critical issues in Josh 22 are minor when compared to the rest of the book, a comparison of MT Josh 22 and LXX Josh 22 reveals both translational choices and expansions in these texts, and the forthcoming analysis will be on the MT with the exceptional LXX readings noted below.

Jordan, perhaps on the Cisjordanian side.<sup>2</sup> This altar attracts the attention of the Cisjordanian tribes who assemble at Shiloh to wage war against the Transjordanian tribes, but somehow cooler heads prevail and they send an emissary led by Phinehas ben Eleazar to investigate the matter. A civil war is averted when, somewhat astonishingly, the Transjordanian tribes convince their Cisjordanian kin that this altar serves no sacrificial purpose, but rather only as a witness for future generations of their common and everlasting fidelity to Yhwh.

In spite of the apparent continuity and coherency of this episode, most critics agree that Josh 22 contains notable literary-critical and ideological discrepancies. For instance, why does Joshua address the Transjordanian tribes (v. 1), but then does not reemerge at any time after the Transjordanian tribes depart the Cisjordan (v. 8)?<sup>3</sup> Why is Joshua replaced by the priest Phinehas ben Eleazar, who appears halfway through this episode (v. 13)? Is there a literary connection between Josh 22 and any of the accounts of the allotment of the Transjordanian lands in Numbers, Deuteronomy, or elsewhere in the book of Joshua? What exactly is this “altar” (מזבח) by the Jordan,<sup>4</sup> and why all the fuss? Is this altar, according to the Cisjordanian

---

<sup>2</sup> MT Josh 22:10, גלילות הירדן אשר בארץ כנען; LXX v. 10: καὶ ἔλθον εἰς Γαλαλα τοῦ Ἰορδάνου. Although the text contains some difficulties, such as an apparent contradiction between v. 10 (Cisjordan) and v. 15 (Transjordan) (see J. Hackett, “Religious Traditions in Israelite Transjordan” in P. D. Miller, Jr., P. D. Hanson and S. D. McBride [eds.], *Ancient Israelite Religion: Essays in the Honor of Frank Moore Cross* [Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987], 125–36 [129]), a case can be made that the altar is built on the Cisjordanian side (see N. H. Snaith, “The Altar at Gilgal: Joshua XXII 23–29,” *V/T* 28 [1978], 330–35)—which could raise another problem: the Transjordanian tribes appear to have annexed a portion of Cisjordanian land by erecting an altar on land apportioned to their kin—or the Transjordanian side (following LXX vv. 11, 19; see n. 34). In any case, the main issue in vv. 9–34 is that the Transjordanian tribes built a competing, and thus ritualistically unacceptable, altar.

<sup>3</sup> At least in MT. LXX Josh 22:34 alleviates this problem with Joshua’s reappearance at the end of the episode: καὶ ἐπωνόμασεν Ἰησοῦς τὸν βωμὸν. For Ἰησοῦς in LXX v. 34 as a later addition, see E. Assis, “The Position and Function of Jos 22 in the Book of Joshua,” *ZAW* 116 (2004), 528–41 (here, 534 n. 34). On LXX vv. 34 (along with vv. 10, 28) pointing to LXX’s preservation of an older version of Josh 22, one that was sympathetic to the builders, see A. G. Auld, “Re-Telling the Disputed ‘Altar’ in Joshua 22,” in E. Noort (ed.), *The Book of Joshua* (BETL, 250; Leuven: Peeters, 2012), 281–93.

<sup>4</sup> While in MT the subtle use of מזבח יהוה (Josh 22:19, 28, 29) and מזבח on its own (vv. 10 [2x], 11, 16, 19, 23, 26, 32) distinguishes a true altar from a false altar, the lexical variance in LXX suggests that a more explicit attempt is made as the true altar is described as θυσιαστήριον (vv. 19, 28, 29 [2x; on a problem in v. 29, see n. 53]) and the false altar as βωμός (vv. 10 [2x], 11, 16, 19, 23, 26, 32; however, see Auld, “Re-Telling,” 286–88, on the possibility that the LXX Vorlage read במה); see L. J. Greenspoon, *Textual Studies in the Book of Joshua* (HSM, 28; Chico: Scholars, 1983), 109, 295–96.

tribes, one that is Yahvistically illegitimate (v. 16) or does this altar serve, as is the claim by the Transjordanian tribes, as a witness (דע) that Yhwh is indeed their deity (v. 27)?<sup>5</sup> As indicated by these questions, Josh 22 contains inconsistencies with regard to characterization, plot, and its depiction of the Yahvistic cult. It has long been recognized that Josh 22 is the product of multiple hands and this facet explains the observed difficulties in this chapter. Although the precise results diverge to various degrees, most critics see two main sections in Josh 22: a Deuteronomistic section in vv. 1–6 (with some critics including vv. 7–8) and a Priestly section in vv. 9–34.<sup>6</sup> Against this widely accepted view, in this article I aim to offer another solution to the literary problems, one informed by the basic tenets of source and redaction criticism, that are contained throughout this text.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>5</sup> The point is made again in Josh 22:34, yet there is a difficulty as the name for this altar is absent (ויקראו בני ראובן ובני גד למזבח כי עד הוא ביתינו) (כי יהוה האלהים). The same difficulty arises in LXX v. 34, in which Joshua names the βωμός (καὶ ἐπωνόμασεν Ἰησοῦς τὸν βωμόν) but an actual name is not explicitly stated.

<sup>6</sup> A. Kuenen, *An Historico-Critical Inquiry into the Origin and Composition of the Hexateuch (Pentateuch and Book of Joshua)*, trans. P. H. Wicksteed (London: Macmillan, 1886), 339–40; J. Wellhausen, *Die Composition des Hexateuchs und der historischen Bücher des Alten Testaments*, 4<sup>th</sup> ed. (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1963), 132–33; W. E. Addis, *The Documents of the Hexateuch: Translated and Arranged in Chronological Order*, 2 vols. (London: D. Nutt, 1893), 2:163–64, 473–76; J. E. Carpenter and G. Harford-Battersby, *The Hexateuch According to the Revised Version*, 2 vols. (London: Longmans, 1900), 2:354–56; J. E. Petersen, “Priestly Materials in Joshua 13–22: A Return to the Hexateuch?,” *HAR* 4 (1980), 131–46 (141); F. M. Cross, *From Epic to Canon: History and Literature in Ancient Israel* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1998), 62–63; M. A. O’Brien, *The Deuteronomistic History Hypothesis: A Reassessment* (OBO, 92; Freiburg: Universitätsverlag; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989), 75; R. D. Nelson, *Joshua: A Commentary* (OTL; Louisville: Westminster, 1997), 247–48; Auld, “Re-Telling,” 285. Some critics more precisely delineate the developmental stages in each one of vv. 1–8 and (post-P) vv. 9–34, see C. G. den Hertog, “Der geschichtliche Hintergrund der Erzählung Jos 22” in U. Hübner and S. Münger (eds.), *Saxa loquentur: Studien zur Archäologie Palästinas/Israels. Festschrift für Volkmar Fritz zum 65. Geburtstag* (AOAT, 302; Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2003), 61–83.

<sup>7</sup> There is much discussion on the dating and historical setting of Josh 22; see the survey in Assis, “Position and Function,” 528–31. Although some critics uphold Josh 22 as a reflection of premonarchic realities (in Y. Kaufmann, *The Book of Joshua* [Jerusalem: Kiryat Sepher, 1959], 239–40 [in Hebrew]), there continues to be strong support for dating Josh 22 to the Persian period due to a spread of poly yahvism; see, among others, J. G. Vink, “The Date and Origin of the Priestly Code in the Old Testament” in idem, *The Priestly Code and Seven Other Studies* (OtSt, 15; Leiden: Brill, 1969), 1–144 (73–77); D. A. Knight, “Joshua 22 and the Ideology of Space” in D. M. Gunn and P. M. McNutt (eds.), *Imagining Biblical Worlds: Studies in Spatial, Social, and Historical Constructs in Honor of James W. Flanagan* (JSOTSupp, 359; London: T&T Clark, 2002), 51–63; O. Artus, “Numbers 32: The Problem

### THE (IN)COHERENCY OF JOSH 22:1–8

In support of the Deuteronomistic provenance of Josh 22:1–8, critics point to resonances between portions of Joshua’s speech in v. 3, specifically **ושמרתם את משמרת מצות יהוה אלהיכם** (“and you kept the charge of Yhwh your god”; cf. Deut 11:1; 1 Kgs 2:3), and Deuteronomistic-inspired phraseology.<sup>8</sup> Josh 22:5 is also noticeable for its distinct Deuteronomistic style and the promotion of **התורה** (“the Torah;” cf. Deut 1:5; 4:8; 2 Kgs 17:34, 37) as authoritative and unparalleled.<sup>9</sup> There are, however, indications that the entirety of Josh 22:1–8 is not uniformly Deuteronomistic. The matter of the half-tribe of Manasseh will be fully addressed below, but for now it can be noted that the recurring descriptions of the half-tribe of Manasseh throughout Josh 22 have long been recognized as an addition.<sup>10</sup> Words such as **מטה** (“tribe”) in v. 1 and **אחזה** (“possession”) in v. 4 are seen as Priestly,<sup>11</sup> yet the mere appearance of Priestly phraseology does not lead to the conclusion that any of vv. 1–8 were edited by a Priestly hand.<sup>12</sup> Instead, the possibility remains that the appearance of **מטה** and **אחזה** demonstrates a later hand’s familiarity with Priestly materials.

It was noted above that in Josh 22:1–8 Joshua oftentimes speaks deuteronomistically: recall his words **ושמרתם את משמרת מצות יהוה אלהיכם** (v. 3b). Not all of his words in vv. 1–8, however, align well with Deuteronomistic speech. In v. 2b, Joshua’s words that

---

of the Two and a Half Transjordanian Tribes and the Final Composition of the Book of Numbers” in C. Frevel (ed.), *Torah and the Book of Numbers* (FAT II, 62; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), 367–82 (375–78). See also the dating of (Deuteronomistic) Josh 22:1–6 to the exilic period and vv. 9–34 to the post-exilic period in T. Römer, *The So-Called Deuteronomistic History: A Sociological, Historical, and Literary Introduction* (London: T&T Clark, 2005), 134, 136, 176. In proposing a relative dating of the literary strata that underlie Josh 22, I am of the opinion that poly yahvism need not necessarily emerge only in late Persian period Judaism and do not think this criterion, on its own and in combination with others, can lead to an absolute dating of Josh 22.

<sup>8</sup> M. Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1972), 335.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, 333–34, 336, 338.

<sup>10</sup> Carpenter and Harford-Battersby, *Hexateuch*, 2:355; M. Noth, *Das Buch Josua*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. (HAT, 7; Tübingen: Mohr, 1971), 133; K. Möhlenbrink, “Die Landnahmesagen des Buches Josua,” *ZAW* 56 (1938), 238–68 (246). On the problems with the half-tribe of Manasseh, especially in Josh 13–22, see A. G. Auld, *Josua, Moses and the Land: Tetrateuch-Pentateuch-Hexateuch in a Generation since 1938* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1980), 57–59. Although different descriptions of this half-tribe are scattered throughout MT Josh 22 as **חצי שבט מנשה** (v. 1); **ולחצי מטה מנשה** (v. 1); **חצי שבט המנשה** (vv. 7, 9, 10, 11, 21); **חצי שבט מנשה** (vv. 13, 15); and **בני מנשה** (vv. 30, 31), in my mind the variances are of a stylistic nature. The matter of the half-tribe of Manasseh in LXX vv. 32, 33, 34 is discussed below.

<sup>11</sup> Petersen, “Priestly Materials,” 143–44.

<sup>12</sup> As observed in Kuenen, *Hexateuch*, 339.

are directed to the Transjordanian tribes, ותשמעו בקולי, resonate with Deuteronomic-inspired phraseology, but while the idiomatic בקול + שמע (and sometimes followed by an object suffix) expresses obedience, in Deuteronomic parlance this idiom usually has obedience to Yhwh in mind, and not to a human speaker.<sup>13</sup> Aligned with the Deuteronomic claim that the Israelites heard only Yhwh's קול at Horeb,<sup>14</sup> the Deuteronomic Moses never says ותשמעו בקולי to the Israelites to express his desire that the Israelites should obey him. It is outside of the Deuteronomic corpus, in Exod 4:1, in which Moses raises the possibility that the Israelites will not listen to him (ולא ישמעו בקולי). The sense of Joshua's words in Josh 22:2b, ותשמעו בקולי, more closely resembles Jethro's words to Moses (עתה שמע בקולי, Exod 18:19) or Yhwh instructing Abraham to obey Sarah (שמע בקלה, Gen 21:12), which appear in episodes that are neither Deuteronomic nor Priestly.<sup>15</sup> Accordingly, ותשמעו בקולי in Josh 22:2b does not belong to the same literary layer as Deuteronomic-inspired יהוה אלהיכם את משמרת מצות יהוה אלהיכם in v. 3, and belong to a "non-Deuteronomic" literary stratum, which for now I label 'A'. In what surrounds ותשמעו בקולי, all but a small portion of vv. 1–3a reads well together and can also be assigned to 'A'. The exception lies, as it was mentioned above, in the half-tribe of Manasseh (ולחצי מטה מנשה, v. 1b).

A solution to the half-tribe of Manasseh in Josh 22 can be found from the account of the apportioning of the Transjordan in Num 32, which is generally recognized as a composite of Priestly [P] and non-Priestly [P] materials. While the precise delineation of the constituent parts of Num 32 and the relationship between P and non-P continues to be debated, there are strong arguments for a model that envisions two coherent, yet independent, reports.<sup>16</sup> In

<sup>13</sup> Deut 4:30; 13:18; 15:5; 26:14, 17; 27:10; 28:1, 2, 15, 45, 62; 30:2, 8, 10, 20. The exception lies in the case of the insubordinate son in Deut 21:18 (שמע בקלנו), 20 (שמע בקול אביו ובקול אמו).

<sup>14</sup> B. D. Sommer, *Revelation and Authority: Sinai in Jewish Scripture and Tradition* (AYBRL; New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2015), 65–68.

<sup>15</sup> Some readers may identify both Gen 21:12 and Exod 18:19 as non-Priestly [non-P] or Elohist [E], and for readers who adhere to the basic tenets of the four-source theory the discussion will be continued in the notes below. The dating of Genesis–Numbers remains a contentious issue, with some critics adhering to a pre-exilic date and other critics arguing that the non-Priestly portions are of post-exilic origin; furthermore, these portions are upheld as not only post-Priestly but also post-Deuteronomic. While it is my understanding that both Genesis–Numbers and portions of Joshua contain what may be labelled as "protoDeuteronomic" materials, which do not demonstrate an awareness of the Priestly materials, it is my hope that this analysis will be useful for readers who subscribe to the view that the Hexateuch consists of Deuteronomic, Deuteronomistic, and Priestly materials, as well as materials that fit none of these labels.

<sup>16</sup> For the following division of Num 32, see the full treatment and iden-

one of the reports, which is Priestly [P], the Gadites and the Reubenites approach Moses, Eleazar, and the leaders of the community with the request that the Transjordan be given to them as a possession (אחזה), where they will build their towns and sheepfolds. This request is granted but it comes with the stipulation that the Gadites and the Reubenites must accompany their kin into Canaan and fight יהוה לפני יהוה. In the other report, which is non-Priestly [non-P], the cattle-rich Reubenites and Gadites approach Moses with the offer to forego their portion in the Cisjordan as the Transjordan is cattle country. They offer to fight alongside their kin until they have settled in Canaan and Moses accepts this offer. Afterwards, the descendants of Manchir ben Manasseh conquer Gilead and Moses gives them the land. In Num 32, neither P nor non-P mentions the half-tribe of Manasseh, and the redactional insertion of the half-tribe of Manasseh after P and non-P were combined was necessitated by the Deuteronomistic descriptions of this half-tribe.<sup>17</sup> As it is argued below that one of the reports preserved in Num 32 continues into Josh 22, I agree with the view that the notices of the half-tribe of Manasseh in Josh 22 belong, as is the case in Num 32, to a secondary layer; as a result, none of these descriptions can belong to 'A'. In v. 1b, the half-tribe of Manasseh interrupts 'A' and belongs to a redactional layer—here labelled 'B'—that aligns 'A' with other source materials as 'A' is absorbed into an expanding and developing corpus.

As noted before, Josh 22:1\* [minus מטה מנשה]— 3a read well together as a single unit, and belong to non-Deuteronomistic 'A'.<sup>18</sup> There is, however, a subtle break in v. 3b as it was observed above that ושמרתם את משמרת מצות יהוה אלהיכם is consistent with Deuteronomistic phraseology. Accordingly, v. 3b does not belong to 'A' and unlikely belongs to 'B'. On its own, v. 3b stands as an unlikely beginning to a report that parallels or was once independent of 'A'. Instead, v. 3b is supplemental to what precedes it in vv. 1\*–3a and belongs to a later hand, which for now I label 'C'. 'C' can be conceived of as supplemental material, and ושמרתם את משמרת מצות יהוה אלהיכם (v. 3b) suggests that it is aligned with Deuteronomistic thought. Josh 22:3b continues into vv. 4–5 as the claim that Yhwh granted rest (הניח יהוה אלהיכם),<sup>19</sup> Joshua's command for the Israelites to return to their tents (ועתה פנו ולכו לכם לאהליכם),<sup>20</sup> and the invocation of Moses as “servant of Yhwh” (משה עבד יהוה) (v. 4b),<sup>21</sup> contains resonances to Deuteronomistic-inspired texts. On the

---

tification of E, P, and a Deuteronomistic insertion (in vv. 7–15) in L. Feldman Marquis, “The Composition of Numbers 32: A New Proposal,” *VT* 63 (2013), 408–32.

<sup>17</sup> Feldman Marquis, “Numbers 32,” 421–22.

<sup>18</sup> Throughout the remainder of this article, \* denotes portions of a single verse or a group of verses.

<sup>19</sup> Cf. Deut 3:20; 12:10; 25:19; see Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy*, 343.

<sup>20</sup> Cf. the combination of הל"כ + פנ"ה elsewhere in Judg 18:21; 1 Kgs 10:13; 2 Kgs 5:12.

<sup>21</sup> LXX Josh 22:4 lacks ὁ παῖς κυρίου (cf. vv. 2a, 5a). As משה עבד יהוה

observation that v. 4b uses the Priestly term **אחזה** for “holding”—in contrast to **ירשה** in Deuteronomic texts<sup>22</sup>—it is generally thought to be from a Priestly hand, but it appears that v. 4b is a fusion of Priestly and Deuteronomic-inspired phraseology. Due to its emphasis on observing the Torah, the entirety of v. 5 reads well as Deuteronomic-inspired ‘C’ material.<sup>23</sup> When read as a whole, vv. 1–5 demonstrate the manner in which a Deuteronomistic supplement expands upon its received materials; in other words, ‘C’ (vv. 3b–5) expands upon ‘AB’ (vv. 1–3a).

A detected break lies in Josh 22:6. As ‘A’ reports that the Transjordanian tribes have fulfilled their obligations to their kin (vv. 1\*–3a), what remains in ‘A’ is for the Transjordanian tribes to be released, and ‘A’ continues with a brief description of Joshua blessing and sending away the Transjordanian tribes: **ויברכם יהושע וישלחם** (Josh 22:6a). What follows next in v. 6b, **וילכו אל אהליהם**, however, is the fulfillment of the command in v. 4b (**ועתה פנו ולכו**) (לכם לאהליכם), which was assigned to ‘C’. The significance and function of “their tents” in v. 6b to ‘C’ will become apparent, but for now it can be noted that **אהל** also appears in vv. 7, 8, verses that critics suspect actually belong to a secondary layer.<sup>24</sup> Accordingly, vv. 6b–9a\* [only **וישבו**]<sup>25</sup> can be assigned to ‘C’, and the manner in which vv. 6b–9a\* [only **וישבו**] supplements ‘A’ will be discussed below. Although the mention of the half-tribe of Manasseh in v. 1b was assigned to ‘B’, the mention of the half-tribe of Manasseh (**ולחצי שבט המנשה**) in v. 7 is entirely surrounded by ‘C’ materials and as ‘C’

---

also appears in vv. 2a, 5a, I do not assign all the occurrences of **משה עבד יהוה** in Josh 22 to a single layer (‘A’ or ‘C’). Although **משה עבד יהוה** commonly appears in Deuteronomic-inspired literature (see 2 Kgs 18:12), it also appears in the non-Priestly, non-Deuteronomic materials (cf. Num 12:7; and the assignment of Deut 34:5 to E in M. Haran, *The Biblical Collection: Its Consolidation to the End of the Second Temple Times and Changes of Form to the End of the Middle Ages*, 4 vols. [Jerusalem: Magnes, 1996–2014], 2:193 n. 8 [in Hebrew]; D, E, J, and P in P. Y. Yoo, “The Four Moses Death Accounts,” *JBL* 131 [2012], 423–41 [432–33]).

<sup>22</sup> Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy*, 341–42.

<sup>23</sup> On **לשמר מצותיו** in Josh 22:5b as “typisch deuteronomistische Fortschreibung,” see den Hertog, “Erzählung,” 63; as well as E. Assis, “‘For it Shall be a Witness Between Us’: A Literary Reading of Josh 22,” *SJOT* 18 (2004), 208–31 (210–12). Other critics view all of v. 5 as an addition; see O’Brien, *Deuteronomistic History Hypothesis*, 75.

<sup>24</sup> Kuenen (*Hexateuch*, 339) detects late language in Josh 22:7–8, for example, **נכסים** (v. 8; cf. 2 Chr 1:11–12; Qoh 5:18 [ET 19]; Aram. **נכסי**, Ezra 6:8; **נכסין**, 7:26). Other critics see all or portions of vv. 7–8 as a transitional link; see Nelson, *Joshua*, 247; O’Brien, *Deuteronomistic History Hypothesis*, 75 n. 106. Not all critics consider all of vv. 7–8 as late; on v. 8 as Jehovist (JE), see Wellhausen, *Composition*, 133.

<sup>25</sup> Due to the appearance of the imperative **שובו** in v. 8a, I also include the fulfillment of this command, **וישבו**, in v. 9a (absent in LXX v. 9a) as part of ‘C’.

presumes combined ‘A’ and ‘B’ (specifically, ‘AB’) and does not distinguish between ‘A’ and ‘B’, the possibility remains that some of the mentions of “the Reubenites, the Gadites, and half-tribe of Manasseh” belongs to ‘C’.

With the foregoing observations in mind, Josh 22:1–8 can be separated into what has been labelled as a non-Deuteronomistic base layer ‘A’; a redactional layer ‘B’; and Deuteronomistic supplementary material ‘C’. ‘A’ consists of a narrative in which Joshua calls the Reubenites and the Gadites (v. 1\*), acknowledges that they fulfilled their obligations to their kin, and their kin now enjoy a period of rest from hostilities (vv. 2–3a). All that remains for Joshua is to bless the Reubenites and the Gadites and send them on their way (v. 6a). What constitutes ‘A’ in Josh 22:1–8 unlikely stood on its own. As Josh 22:2a suggests, ‘A’ presupposes, if not continues, a narrative that described how Moses established the terms for the Reubenites and the Gadites to settle in the Transjordan. As noted above, Num 32 consists of non-Priestly and Priestly reports of the allocation of the Transjordanian lands to two of the Israelite tribes, and between these two reports, it is the non-P report that is resonated in Josh 22. Not only do Num 32:1 (non-P) and Josh 22:1 (‘A’) share the order of the Transjordanian tribes as the Reubenites and the Gadites—as opposed to the order of the Gadites and the Reubenites in the P portions of Num 32<sup>26</sup>—both non-P in Num 32 and ‘A’ in Josh 22:1–8\* also envision that the Reubenites and the Gadites must fulfill their obligation to their kin as stipulated by a human, and not divine, agent.<sup>27</sup> As such, the ‘A’ base layer in Josh 22:1–8\* continues the narrative strand that began in the non-Priestly portions of Num 32.<sup>28</sup>

<sup>26</sup> Num 32:2, 6, 25, 29, 31. In contrast, throughout Josh 22, the order of the Reubenites and the Gadites (either in the gentilic in Josh 22:1 or preceded by בן in vv. 9, 10, 11, 13, 15, 21, 25, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34) is maintained, which also raises questions concerning the alleged Priestly provenance of any of these descriptions and its surrounding materials.

<sup>27</sup> In contrast to the Priestly report in Num 32, in which it is Yhwh—not Moses—who commands the Gadites and the Reubenites (v. 31), and the Gadites and the Reubenites are to be placed לפני יהוה (v. 20) when the Israelites are in battle; see Feldman Marquis, “Numbers 32,” 427–28.

<sup>28</sup> Further instructions are given to the Transjordanian tribes by Moses in Deut 3:18–20 and Joshua in Josh 1:12–15; 4:12–13, but if any of these accounts are either Deuteronomistic or Deuteronomistic, then it unlikely continues into the ‘A’ portions of Josh 22:1–8\*. Acknowledging that the relationship between Josh 1:12–15 and 22:1–7(9) is contested, as Josh 22:1–7(9) may belong with 1:12–15 to a single source (Carpenter and Harford-Battersby, *Hexateuch*, 2:354–356); or is supplemental to 1:12–15 (Kaufmann, *Joshua*, 237); or *Gegenstück* to 1:12–15 (Noth, *Josua*, 133), I am open to the possibility that Josh 1:12–15\* (I submit, vv. 12\*–14, 15b, with ולחצי שבט מנשה in v. 12 as redactional, and what remains as a Deuteronomistic supplement), as well as the Transjordanian response that follows in vv. 16–18, is not Deuteronomistic. In contrast to the detail of towns in Deut 3:18–20 (ישבו בעריכם אשר נתתי לכם), v. 19b—and, it should be noted, in the mention of building and rebuilding towns in the P portions of Num 32 (see

The ‘A’ base layer that is contained in Josh 22:1–8, even after the slight ‘B’ revision that results in ‘AB’, was considered unsatisfactory by one of its earlier readers for important reasons. Informed by Deuteronomistic ideology and the development of episodes in what is now the book of Joshua, ‘C’ not only preserves ‘AB’ but also contributes its own materials. According to ‘AB’, the Reubenites, the Gadites, and half-tribe Manasseh did not abandon their kin (vv. 1–3a). To this detail, ‘C’ adds that the Transjordanian tribes kept the charge of Yhwh (v. 3b). ‘C’ is also dissatisfied with the report preserved in ‘AB’ that Joshua sent away the Transjordanian tribes with a blessing (v. 6a) as this blessing was apparently bestowed without any conditions. ‘C’ adds material, specifically the imposition of obligations: the Transjordanian tribes are to go back to their tents (v. 4b)—which is what they do (vv. 6b–9a\* [only וישבו])—and they are to observe and fulfill what Moses commanded them, serve Yhwh with their heart and soul, and walk in Yhwh’s ways (v. 5). The manner in which ‘C’ uses Priestly language suggests that the Deuteronomistic supplementary material is post-Priestly as it is familiar with Priestly materials, albeit not in its independent form.<sup>29</sup>

### IS JOSH 22:9–34 PRIESTLY?

Having identified a base layer and its additions in Josh 22:1–8, we turn to what remains in this chapter. Scattered throughout vv. 9–34

---

Feldman Marquis, “Numbers 32,” 422–23)—the rural emphasis in Josh 1:14 (see T. B. Dozeman, *Joshua 1–12: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* [AB, 6B; New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2015], 221) is well aligned with the issue of cattle land in the non-P report in Num 32. Furthermore, in Josh 1:14, Joshua orders the Transjordanian tribes to lead their kin armed (חמשים לפני אחיכם), which is what according to non-P the Reubenites and the Gadites pledged in Num 32:17 (MT חשים לפני בני ישראל; on the emendation of MT חשים to חמשים, see Philip Y. Yoo, “Armed for Battle? On the Meaning of חמשים in Exodus 13,18,” *ZAW* 128 [2016], 42–48 [44]). As Josh 1:12–18\* is consistent with the non-P portions of Num 32, I submit that it is also aligned with what I identify in Josh 22 as ‘A’.

<sup>29</sup> That is, ‘C’ does not know of the Priestly materials as an originally independent source. Weinfeld, however, states “the fact that we meet with Priestly material in D and Dtr rather than the converse clearly demonstrates that the deuteronomistic school was familiar with Priestly composition” (*Deuteronomy*, 182). Weinfeld dates P before D, and does not see P and D as concurrent and independent from each other. Although D does not appear to make any reference to Priestly materials (see J. S. Baden, *The Composition of the Pentateuch: Renewing the Documentary Hypothesis* [AYBRL; New Haven: Yale University Press, 2012], 133), I am of the belief that the case is different for the Deuteronomistic supplementary material in Josh 22 as its use of Priestly materials is not from an independent P document (however imagined) but in its preserved form in a developed or developing Pentateuchal or Hexateuchal corpus.

are Priestly terms such as אחזה (“holding”),<sup>30</sup> עדה (“congregation”),<sup>31</sup> נשיאים (“leaders”),<sup>32</sup> and משכן (“tabernacle”).<sup>33</sup> Phinehas ben Eleazar, a figure traditionally associated with the priestly ranks, first appears in v. 13 and takes over the role of lead actor from Joshua. The mention of sacrifices, including בעלותינו ובזבחינו ובשלמינו (“through our burnt offerings, sacrifices, and well-being offerings,” v. 27) and לעלה למנחה ולזבח (“for burnt offerings, cereal offerings, and sacrifices,” v. 29) suggest some familiarity with the Priestly sacrificial system. The charge of מעל (“sacrilege,” v. 16) hints at a ritualistic concept as expounded upon in the Priestly legislation. Furthermore, the description of the Transjordan as טמאה (“unclean,” v. 19) is consistent with the Priestly view of geography, which does not conceive of the land of Canaan extending beyond the Jordan (Num 34:11–12).<sup>34</sup>

However, the existence of Priestly terminology and language does not necessarily lead to the conclusion that vv. 9–34 are *Priestly*,<sup>35</sup> especially when the context diverges significantly from Priestly ideology. Five examples illustrate this point. One, על פי יהוה (“according to Yhwh,” v. 9) is common throughout P<sup>36</sup> but also appears elsewhere in 2 Kgs 24:3. Although the expression is uncommon outside of P, the example in 2 Kgs 24:3 indicates that at the very least one other composer, one not within the Priestly tradent, was familiar with this expression. Two, the usage of מעל in Josh 22:16 (also vv. 20, 22, 31) follows the use of this word as a Priestly technical term

<sup>30</sup> אחזתם, Josh 22:9; אחזתכם (also v. 4) and אחזת יהוה, v. 19.

<sup>31</sup> עדת בני ישראל, Josh 22:12 (cf. LXX, οἱ υἱοὶ Ἰσραηλ); עדת יהוה, vv. 16, 17; עדת ישראל, vv. 18 (cf. LXX, Ἰσραηλ), 20; ונשיאי העדה, v. 30.

<sup>32</sup> נשיאי העדה, Josh 22:14, 32; נשיא, v. 14 (2x); נשיאי העדה, v. 30.

<sup>33</sup> משכן יהוה, Josh 22:19; משכנו, v. 29.

<sup>34</sup> LXX Josh 22:19 describes the Transjordan not as unclean, but “small” (εἰ μικρὰ ὑμῖν ἡ γῆ τῆς), which allows for not only the construction of this altar in the Transjordan (as made explicit in LXX v. 11: ἐφ’ ὄριων γῆς Χανααν ἐπὶ τοῦ Γαλααδ τοῦ Ἰσραήλου; cf. MT v. 11: אל מול ארץ כנען) but also the inclusion of the Transjordan within the borders of Canaan, a view espoused in Deuteronomistic literature. On the different views concerning the status of the Transjordan in the Priestly and Deuteronomistic sources, see M. Weinfeld, *The Promise of the Land: The Inheritance of the Land of Canaan by the Israelites* (TLJS, 3; Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993), 52–76.

<sup>35</sup> In addition to n. 6, see the focused discussion on Josh 22:9–34 and arguments for its Priestly provenance in Kaufmann, *Joshua*, 239; J. S. Kloppenborg, “Joshua 22: The Priestly Edition of an Ancient Tradition,” *Bib* 62 (1981), 347–71; Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy*, 181; Nelson, *Joshua*, 247; R. Goldstein, “Joshua 22:9–34: A Priestly Narrative from the Second Temple Period,” *Sbnaton* 13 (2002), 43–81 [in Hebrew]; and recently, vv. 9–34 as a Priestly passage integrated into (Deuteronomistic) Joshua in P. Pitkänen, “P/H and D in Joshua 22,9–34,” *BN* n.f. 171 (2016), 27–35.

<sup>36</sup> In P: Exod 17:1; Num 3:16, 39, 51; 4:37, 41, 45, 49; 9:18, 20, 23; 10:13; 13:3; 33:2, 38; 36:5; Deut 34:5\* (on the assignment to P, see n. 21). H is also familiar with this phrase and employs it; see Lev 24:12.

that connotes sacrilege against sancta or the breaking of a covenant oath and is often expressed as a cognate accusative.<sup>37</sup> This technical usage of **מעל** is also aptly employed in the post-exilic episode of the foreign wives in Ezra 9–10, in which some of the Yehudite officials raise the initial charge as **מעל** (Ezra 9:2) and Ezra agrees with the charge: **אתם מעלתם** (10:10).<sup>38</sup> Three, the depiction of Phinehas in Josh 22 recalls his role in the Pe'or affair (Num 25:18) and the Midianite War (31:16), both Priestly accounts. Phinehas's role in Josh 22, however, more closely resembles another account that involves the Israelite confederacy with Phinehas at its forefront in Judg 20, an account that contains few, if any, influences from Priestly materials. The Priestly account of the Pe'or affair in Num 25:6–18 may be one of the accounts that Josh 22:17 draws upon, but it does not require the assignment of this verse to a Priestly hand. Four, as it was observed above, Josh 22 consistently maintains the order of the Reubenites and the Gadites, which is in the non-Priestly—and not the Priestly—report preserved in Num 32. If any of the descriptions of these two Transjordanian tribes in Josh 22 were from a Priestly hand, then we should expect something akin to “the Gadites and the Reubenites” found in the Priestly portions of Num 32. Finally, in Josh 22:27, the Transjordanian tribes insist that this altar was erected “to attend to the service of Yhwh” (**לעבד את עבדת יהוה**). In Priestly parlance, **עבדה** refers to a physical labor; in particular, the physical labor that the Levites perform in dismantling, transporting, and reassembling the wilderness Tabernacle.<sup>39</sup> While the exact phrase **יהוה עבד(ו)דת** is a rare construction, the sense of **עבדה** as physical labor is undetectable in Josh 22:27 and its use here is closer to 2 Chr 35:16 (“service of Yhwh”) rather than Num 8:11 [P] (“labor of Yhwh”).

As much of the detected Priestly language in Josh 22:9–34 is imprecise within a Priestly context,<sup>40</sup> the data does not lead to the conclusion that vv. 9–34 belong to a Priestly hand, either as part of its *Grundschrift* or redaction.<sup>41</sup> The mention of Shiloh in vv. 9, 12

<sup>37</sup> For example, **נפש תמעל מעל** in Lev 5:15; see J. Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB, 3; New York: Doubleday, 1991), 345–56.

<sup>38</sup> P. Y. Yoo, *Ezra and the Second Wilderness* (OTM; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), 177–78.

<sup>39</sup> Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16*, 7; idem, *Numbers = Bē-midbar*, 343–44.

<sup>40</sup> For these reasons, it is difficult to accept the contention that “both Josh 22,9–34 and Num 32 have a priestly character and involve a plot of a conflict and its resolution” in Pitkänen, “P/H and D,” 29.

<sup>41</sup> Although critics generally agree that P is a source (for the classical rebuttal of P as redactor, see K. Koch, “P—kein Redaktor! Erinnerung an zwei Eckdaten der Quellenscheidung,” *VT* 37 [1987], 446–67), there remains wide disagreement on the extent of its *Grundschrift* and its (Priestly and Holiness) additions. Few, if any, critics see P as a Hexateuchal source, yet some critics argue that P concludes with the assembly at Shiloh in Josh 18:1; see P. Guillaume, *Land and Calendar: The Priestly Document from Genesis*

might indicate a Priestly hand, but it may also reflect an understanding of the Priestly portrayal of the Israelite assembly at Shiloh.<sup>42</sup> Although there are detectable traces of Priestly thought in vv. 9–34, there are other literary influences that shape these verses. The mention of Achan ben Zerah in Josh 22:20 alludes to the episode in Josh 7. Phinehas’s reminder of the “guilt of Pe’or” (עון פעור) in Josh 22:17 is unique—nowhere else is an incident at Pe’or labelled as עון. Whereas P refers to an event as the “Pe’or affair” (דבר פעור),<sup>43</sup> other non-Priestly texts allude to Pe’or as a source of the Israelites’ apostasy (בעל פעור).<sup>44</sup> The appeal to the עון—and neither דבר nor בעל—of Pe’or in Josh 22:17 appears to be a harmonization of the different reports of the Israelites’ first wilderness encounter with a foreign deity in the Transjordanian lands, and before their entry into Canaan. The presence of phrases scattered throughout vv. 9–34 such as היום (vv. 16 [2x], 17, 18 [2x], 22, 29, 31), אלהי ישראל (vv. 16, 24), and יהוה אלהינו (vv. 19, 24, 29) suggest that these verses are also influenced by Deuteronomistic materials.<sup>45</sup> Finally, although P uses the word תבנית in its report of the construction of the tabernacle at Sinai, it uses this word in the sense of “pattern” for the tabernacle and its vessels.<sup>46</sup> The sense of תבנית in Josh 22:28 that describes the altar as a “copy” is closer to the sense of the “likeness” of a scandalous object in Deuteronomistic materials.<sup>47</sup> Following the observation above that the materials in vv. 1–8 which presuppose Priestly materials and employ Deuteronom(ist)ic phraseology can be assigned to ‘C’, it appears that vv. 9–34 also contains substantial ‘C’ materials.

The presence of ‘C’ in both Josh 22:1–8 and vv. 9–34 raise the unlikelyhood that vv. 9–34 were originally a self-contained unit. Rather than see a disruption between vv. 1–8 and vv. 9–34, some critics argue that Josh 22 can be read reasonably well as a whole.<sup>48</sup>

---

1 to Joshua 18 (LHBOTS, 391; London: T&T Clark, 2008), 157–63; Petersen, “Priestly Materials,” 136. For Josh 18:1 as part of a Priestly redaction, see, for example, E. Cortese, *Josua 13–21: Ein priesterschriftlicher Abschnitt im deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerk* (OBO, 94; Freiburg: Universitätsverlag, 1989), 94–96.

<sup>42</sup> On Josh 18:1 as a reference point for Josh 22, see Assis, “Position and Function,” 532.

<sup>43</sup> Num 25:18; 31:16.

<sup>44</sup> לבעל פעור, Num 25:3, 5. The attribution of בבעל פעור in Deut 4:3 [D] appears to localize the event, rather than speak of a rival deity.

<sup>45</sup> For this reason, J. Dus argues that Josh 22:9–34\*, which are upheld as Priestly, were reworked by a Deuteronomistic hand (“Die Lösung des Rätsels von Jos. 22. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte Altisraels,” *ArOr* 32 [1964], 529–46 [544–46]).

<sup>46</sup> וראה ועשה בתבניתם אשר אתה מראה בהר; Exod 25:9; תבנית המשכן, v. 40.

<sup>47</sup> As explicitly stated by תבנית זכר או נקבה, Deut 4:16; תבנית כל בהמה, v. 17; תבנית כל צפור כנף, v. 18.

<sup>48</sup> For a synchronic analysis of the final form of Josh 22, see Assis, “For it Shall be a Witness,” 208–31. On the entirety of Josh 22 belonging to a

To a certain extent, I agree. The presence of ‘C’ supplementary materials in vv. 9–34 suggests that these verses also contain ‘A’ materials, specifically the continuation of the ‘A’ narrative detected in vv. 1–8 (specifically, vv. 1\*–3a, 6a). After Joshua sends the Reubenites and the Gadites back to the Transjordan, the continuation of this narrative requires a report of the departure, which appears in v. 9a\* [minus *וישבו* and *והצוי שבט המנשה*],<sup>49</sup> and includes a detail of a layover at the River Jordan where the Reubenites and the Gadites built an altar in v. 10. After the lengthy (Deuteronomistic-inspired) interpolation in vv. 11–33, the ‘A’ narrative strand continues in v. 34, in which the Reubenites and the Gadites declare that this altar is a witness of sorts.<sup>50</sup> With the ‘A’ portions of Josh 22 now identified, ‘A’ may be reconstructed as follows:

1 אז יקרא יהושע לראובני ולגדי 2 ויאמר אליהם אתם שמרתם את כל  
 אשר צוה אתכם משה עבד יהוה ותשמעו בקולי לכל אשר צויתי אתכם  
 3 לא עזבתם את אחיכם זה ימים רבים עד היום הזה 6 ויברכם יהושע  
 וישלחם 9 וילכו בני ראובן ובני גד מאת בני ישראל 10 ויבאו אל גלילות  
 הירדן אשר בארץ כנען ויבנו בני ראובן ובני גד שם מזבח על  
 הירדן 34 ויקראו בני ראובן ובני גד למזבח כי עד הוא בינתינו כי יהוה  
 האלהים

<sup>1</sup> Then Joshua called the Reubenites and the Gadites. <sup>2</sup> He said to them, “You kept all that Moses the servant of Yhwh commanded you and you obeyed all that I commanded you. <sup>3</sup> You did not abandon your kin these many days—up to this day.” <sup>6</sup> So Joshua blessed them and he sent them away. <sup>9</sup> The Reubenites and the Gadites departed from the Israelites. <sup>10</sup> They came to the region of the Jordan that is in the land of Canaan and they, the Reubenites and the Gadites, built there an altar alongside the Jordan. <sup>34</sup> The Reubenites and the Gadites called the altar [“Witness” as] “it is a witness among us that Yhwh is god.”

According to ‘A’, this altar was built in open space and, informed by a particular understanding of the Yahvistic cult, is ritually acceptable.<sup>51</sup> This report recalls other non-Deuteronomistic, non-Priestly

---

secondary Deuteronomistic supplement, see R. G. Kratz, *The Composition of the Narrative Books of the Old Testament*, trans. John Bowden (London: T&T Clark, 2005), 188–89. Although I do not fully follow Kratz on this reconstruction, I agree that substantial portions of Josh 22 (identified as ‘C’) can be upheld as Deuteronomistic expansions.

<sup>49</sup> LXX v. 9a contains a plus: *καὶ τὸ ἡμίσιον φυλῆς υἰῶν Μανασση*. The mention of Gilead, specifically *ללכת אל ארץ הגלעד*, in Josh 22:9b may belong to ‘A’. On this point, Num 32 offers a clue. Although *ארץ גלעד* appears in Num 32:1 [non-P], the description of *את ארץ הגלעד לאחזה* in v. 29, a Priestly verse, contains clearer resonances to Josh 22:9b.

<sup>50</sup> LXX Josh 22:34 includes *καὶ τοῦ ἡμίσιου φυλῆς Μανασση*.

<sup>51</sup> Nelson, *Joshua*, 247; Assis, “Position and Function,” 539–40.

reports of an open altar built by Lot and Jacob (Gen 31:43–54), another one by Jacob at Bethel (Gen 35:7), and Moses (Exod 24:4) without any disapproval. Likewise, the Covenant Code envisions the presence and function of multiple altars not enclosed in a sacred precinct but erected outdoors (Exod 20:24–26). In short, ‘A’ does not anticipate a problem with the construction of an open-air altar as its report of the Reubenites and the Gadites building an altar is consistent with narratives and legislation that are neither Deuteronomic nor Priestly.<sup>52</sup>

After a slight revision of ‘A’ by ‘B’, one of the earliest readers of ‘AB’ was dissatisfied with the construction of an altar by the Reubenites, the Gadites, and half-tribe of Manasseh, one that potentially possessed a substantial threat to the centralized cult. ‘C’ goes to great lengths to discredit this altar by the Jordan since it is a rival to what it considers as the sole legitimate altar, the *מזבח יהוה* (Josh 22:19, 29).<sup>53</sup> ‘C’ finds fault in the Reubenites, the Gadites, and half-tribe of Manasseh<sup>54</sup> and adds material to achieve its goal of discrediting this altar: the Transjordanian tribes not only disobey Joshua by *not* directly going back to their tents across the Jordan as they were initially commanded, but also had the audacity to build an outrageous altar somewhere by the Jordan, what ‘C’ describes as *מזבח גדול למראה* (“a great altar in appearance,” v. 10b). ‘C’ diverges into a lengthy expansion in vv. 11–33 that draws attention to this altar and, in replacing Joshua with the priest Phinehas ben Eleazar as the lead prosecutor, raises the alarm that this altar will be used for sacrificial purposes. While it appears that ‘C’ acknowledges the presence of multiple altars, it certainly does not support the legitimacy of any competing altar, especially the one erected by the Transjordanian tribes. To emphasize the dubious nature of this altar by the Jordan, ‘C’ labels it as *תבנית מזבח יהוה* (“copy of the altar of Yhwh,” v. 28).<sup>55</sup>

<sup>52</sup> Source critically, Gen 31:43–54; 35:7; Exod 20:24–26; 24:4 may all be assigned to non-P or E.

<sup>53</sup> In MT Josh 22:19, the false altar (*מזבח*) is placed in opposition to the true altar (*מזבח יהוה*). There is little doubt that in LXX v. 19 the altar built by the Transjordanian tribes is illegitimate, as the lexical distinction between a false altar and a true altar is maintained (see n. 4; underlined here for emphasis), *καὶ μὴ ἀπόστητε ἀπὸ κυρίου διὰ τὸ οἰκοδομησαὶ ὑμᾶς βωμὸν ἔξω τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν*. In LXX v. 29a, the description of the false altar as *θυσιαστήριον*—in contrast to the true altar called *τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου κυρίου* in v. 29b—appears to be an error in translation; see Greenspoon, *Textual Studies*, 296.

<sup>54</sup> Following Josh 22:7, the mentions of the half-tribe of Manasseh that are completely surrounded by ‘C’, in vv. 11, 13, 15, 21, 30, 31, can also be recognized as ‘C’ material. To this, *καὶ (ἀπο) τοῦ ἡμίσεως φυλῆς Μανασσῆ* in LXX vv. 32, 33 can be included.

<sup>55</sup> As stated by LXX Josh 22:28, *ὁμοίωμα τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου* (“likeness of the [true] altar”), LXX-Joshua also demonstrates a high concern for cult centralization; see M. Rösel, “The Septuagint-Version of the Book of Joshua,” *SJOT* 16 (2002), 5–23 [19–20].

### DE-LEGITIMIZATION THROUGH EXPANSION IN JOSHUA 22

From the foregoing analysis, the composition of Josh 22 can be described as follows. The base layer, ‘A’, continues the narrative thread of the Reubenites and the Gadites receiving land in the Transjordan, as commanded by Moses in the non-P portions of Num 32. Having fulfilled their obligations to their kin, the Reubenites and the Gadites are released by Joshua and they depart for the Transjordan. On their way back, and somewhere near the River Jordan, the Reubenites and the Gadites build an altar. This altar marks their fidelity to the Israelite deity and, aligned with a view that accepted the existence of multiple altars, it consequently does not present a significant problem. As to the identity of this base layer, it is certainly not Priestly. It is also neither Deuteronomistic nor Deuteronomic. This material may be upheld as “non-Deuteronomic,” but as a continuation of the non-Priestly report in Num 32, what was labelled as ‘A’ in Josh 22 can be identified by the more common nomenclature of “non-P.”<sup>56</sup>

The next layer, ‘B’, is sparse in Josh 22 yet it reflects the stage at which the non-Priestly materials were combined with Priestly materials. As was the case with non-P in Num 32, the non-P base layer in Josh 22 only mentions the Reubenites and the Gadites. Due to the prominent inclusion of the half-tribe of Manasseh among the Transjordanian tribes in Deuteronomy, as the non-P materials are combined with Deuteronomic materials in the process by which the Pentateuch/Hexateuch is formed, the half-tribe of Manasseh is inserted into the relevant non-P materials. In Josh 22, the difference between the non-P base layer and its revised form in ‘AB’ lies in the mention of the half-tribe of Manasseh, and it is apparent that ‘B’ does not drastically alter the text. ‘B’ harmonizes their source materials by inserting the occasional and minor, yet necessary, insertions in their own final product. Hence ‘B’ can be identified as a redactor, one who combines “non-P,” Priestly, and Deuteronomic materials.

---

<sup>56</sup> Here, non-P may be conceived of as a source or as fragmentary. For critics who subscribe to the classical four-source theory, what I have identified as ‘non-P’ can also be identified as Elohist [E]. This is, in some ways, a partial return to classical expressions of source criticism, which envisioned sources running through Genesis–Joshua; for the view that Josh 22:1–8 consisted of a J or E report of the Reubenites and the Gadites building an altar, see O. Eissfeldt, *Hexateuch-Synopse. Die Erzählung der fünf Bücher Mose und des Buches Josua mit dem Anfange des Richterbuches, in ihre vier Quellen zerlegt und in deutscher Übersetzung dargeboten samt einer in Einleitung und Anmerkungen gegebenen Begründung* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1922), 79. E demonstrates a neutral attitude towards open-air altars and, in E’s own vision of the Israelite cult, sacrifice is popularly performed at multiple altars; within the framework of a renewed discussion on the Elohist see J. Stackert, *A Prophet Like Moses: Prophecy, Law, and Israelite Religion* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2014), 124.

‘C’ consists of a considerable Deuteronomistic expansion of its received materials, ‘AB’.<sup>57</sup> While there are traces of Priestly thought in this supplementary material, it is unlikely that any of ‘C’ is the work of a Priestly hand.<sup>58</sup> Dissatisfied with the lack of any condemnation of the altar by the Jordan, as preserved and presented in ‘AB’, this Deuteronomistic supplement promotes the centralized cult by inserting material that first disparages the Transjordanian tribes for not following Joshua’s commands which then leads into the Cisjordanian tribes and the priest Phinehas ben Eleazar questioning the legitimacy of the altar the Transjordanian tribes erected by the River Jordan. It is somewhat remarkable that this Deuteronomistic supplement elected not to expunge its received material from the final product and, as a result, allowed this altar by the Jordan to stand at all. The conservation of the received source materials by ‘C’ may reflect a contemporary reality of multiple altars in the Cisjordan and possibly the Transjordan, and this Deuteronomistic supplement not only expands upon but also corrects the received source materials. Rather than strike out any of their source materials entirely, the Deuteronomistic supplement salvaged these source materials and reoriented the base layer while writing away what was upheld as the unorthodoxy of a received tradition.

Utilizing insights from both redaction and source criticism, this analysis divides Josh 22 into a non-Priestly base layer, redactional insertions (specifically, the half-tribe of Manasseh), and Deuteronomistic supplementary materials. This chapter also preserves two different views of Israelite open-air altars: one that does not presume cult centralization and another that upholds the centralized cult. Rather than erase the report of an open altar from its source materials, the Deuteronomistic supplement reflects the reality that multiple altars existed alongside its preferred cult center and uses the oppor-

---

<sup>57</sup> In the preceding notes, many of the variant readings between MT Josh 22 and LXX Josh 22 emerge in verses that were identified as ‘C’. Accordingly, I am open to the possibility that ‘C’ is not from a single hand, but reflects an expansion that took shape in different stages in (proto)MT and the Hebrew *Vorlage* reflected in LXX Joshua.

<sup>58</sup> The question arises for critics who subscribe to the existence of P materials beyond Leviticus or Numbers: if there is no Priestly material in Josh 22, then where is the completion of P’s version of the allocation of the Transjordan, one that continues from Num 32\* [P]? In Josh 18:1–10, which some critics uphold as P’s report of the allocation of the Transjordanian lands (see, in addition to n. 41, M. Haran, *Temples and Temple Service in Ancient Israel: An Inquiry into the Character of Cult Phenomena and the Historical Setting of the Priestly School* [Oxford: Clarendon, 1978], 198), v. 7 contains the notice that the Transjordanian tribes received their portions: **וּגַד וְרֵאוּבֵן וְחֻצֵי שֶׁבֶט הַמְּנַשֶּׁה לָקְחוּ נַחֲלָתָם מֵעֵבֶר לִירְדֵן מִזְרַחָה אֲשֶׁר נָתַן לָהֶם מֹשֶׁה עֶבֶד יְהוָה**. Other critics assign Josh 18:2–10 to JE, see for example Petersen, “Priestly Materials,” 136–137; however, overlooked is the order of Gad before Reuben in v. 7—which appears only in the Priestly portions of Num 32.

tunity to delegitimize these competing altars. Ultimately, this Deuteronomistic supplement has the final word on the matter and makes the point that one, and only one, of these altars—and it is certainly not the one the Transjordanian tribes built by the Jordan—is legitimate.

## APPENDIX: THE LITERARY DEVELOPMENT OF JOSHUA 22

Key: 'A' <regular>; 'B' <bold>; 'C' <italic>

<sup>1</sup> Then Joshua called the Reubenites, the Gadites, **and half-tribe of Manasseh**. <sup>2</sup> He said to them, "You kept all that Moses the servant of Yhwh commanded you and you obeyed all that I commanded you. <sup>3</sup> You did not abandon your kin these many days—up to this day—and you kept the charge of Yhwh your god. <sup>4</sup> *And now Yhwh your god has given rest to your kin just as he told them. Now turn and go to your tents, to the land of your possession, that Moses the servant of Yhwh gave you across the Jordan.* <sup>5</sup> Take great care to fulfill the commandment and the instruction Moses the servant of Yhwh commanded you to love Yhwh your god, to walk in all his ways, to keep his commandments, to cleave to him, and to serve him with all your heart and all your soul."<sup>6</sup> So Joshua blessed them and he sent them away. They went toward their tents.

<sup>7</sup> *To the half-tribe of Manasseh Moses had given [a portion in] Bashan. Now to the other half Joshua gave [a portion] alongside their kin across the Jordan towards the west. Joshua sent them to their tents and blessed them.*

<sup>8</sup> He said to them, "Return to your tents with many riches—abundant cattle, silver, gold, bronze, iron, and many garments—and divide the spoils of your enemies with your kin."

<sup>9</sup> The Reubenites, Gadites, **and half-tribe of Manasseh** turned and departed from the Israelites at Shiloh, which is in the land of Canaan, to go to the land of Gilead, to the land of their possession, which was allocated according to Yhwh through Moses. <sup>10</sup> They came to the region of the Jordan that is in the land of Canaan and they, the Reubenites, Gadites, **and half-tribe of Manasseh**, built there an altar alongside the Jordan—a great altar in appearance.

<sup>11</sup> *The Israelites heard [a report]: "The Reubenites, the Gadites, and half-tribe of Manasseh built an altar by the edge of the land of Canaan—the region of the Jordan, the Israelite side."*<sup>12</sup> *And when the Israelites heard it, the entire Israelite congregation assembled at Shiloh to wage war against them.* <sup>13</sup> They sent the priest Phinehas ben Eleazar to the Reubenites, the Gadites, and half-tribe of Manasseh in the land of Gilead, <sup>14</sup> and with him ten chieftains, one from each ancestral house—of all the tribes of Israel—each one a leader of their ancestral houses among the companies of Israel. <sup>15</sup> They went to the Reubenites, the Gadites, and the half-tribe of Manasseh in the land of Gilead and spoke to them: <sup>16</sup> "Thus says the congregation of Yhwh: 'What is this iniquity that you have committed against the God of Israel to turn away today from following Yhwh, by building for yourselves an altar today, and rebelling against Yhwh?' <sup>17</sup> Is the guilt of Pe'or which we have not yet been cleansed of this day such a small thing upon us? It will be a blow upon the congregation of Yhwh <sup>18</sup> that you have turned away from following Yhwh. If you rebel against Yhwh today, then he will be angry with the entire congregation of Israel tomorrow. <sup>19</sup> But if the land of your possession is unclean, then cross over to the land of Yhwh's possession in which

*Yhwh's tabernacle stands and acquire a hold among us. But do not rebel against Yhwh and against us. Do not rebel by building for yourselves an altar apart from the altar of Yhwh our god.* <sup>20</sup> *Did not Achan ben Zerab commit an iniquity with devoted things and there was then wrath over the entire congregation of Israel? And did he alone not perish for his guilt?"*

<sup>21</sup> *The Reubenites, the Gadites, and half-tribe of Manasseh responded. They spoke to the leaders of the companies of Israel:* <sup>22</sup> *"Yhwh, god of gods! Yhwh, god of gods! He knows and Israel knows! If it is through rebellion and if it is through iniquity against Yhwh then do not spare us this day.* <sup>23</sup> *If we built for ourselves an altar to turn away from Yhwh, and if burnt offerings and cereal offerings are offered upon it, or well-being sacrifices are offered upon it, then may Yhwh seek [retribution].* <sup>24</sup> *We did, out of anxiety from this affair, this thing thinking: tomorrow your children may say to our children, 'What have you to do with Yhwh the God of Israel?'* <sup>25</sup> *Yhwh set as a border between us and you—the Reubenites and the Gadites—the Jordan. You have no share in Yhwh!* *Thus, your children will prevent our children from worshipping Yhwh.* <sup>26</sup> *We thought: Let us act and build an altar, not for offerings and not for sacrifices.* <sup>27</sup> *Instead, it will be a witness between us and between you and between the descendants after us to attend to the service of Yhwh before him through our burnt offerings, sacrifices, and well-being offerings so that tomorrow your children will not say to our children, 'You have no share in Yhwh!'* <sup>28</sup> *We reasoned: Should they speak tomorrow to us and to our descendants then we will say, 'See the copy of Yhwh's altar which our ancestors made? It is not for burnt offerings and not for sacrifices but instead it is a witness between us and you!'* <sup>29</sup> *Far be it for us to rebel against Yhwh and to turn away today from following Yhwh by building an altar for burnt offerings, cereal offerings, and sacrifices other than the altar of Yhwh our god which stands before his tabernacle!"*

<sup>30</sup> *The priest Phinehas heard—along with the chieftains of the congregation and the leaders of the assembly of Israel who were with him—the words which the Reubenites, the Gadites, and Manassites spoke and they approved them.* <sup>31</sup> *The priest Phinehas ben Eleazar said to the Reubenites, the Gadites, and the Manassites, "Today we know that Yhwh is among us for you have not committed this iniquity against Yhwh. Thus, you have delivered the Israelites from Yhwh's power."* <sup>32</sup> *The priest Phinehas ben Eleazar returned, along with the chieftains, from the Reubenites and the Gadites in the land of Gilead to the land of Canaan, to the Israelites, with a report.* <sup>33</sup> *The report was accepted by the Israelites and they blessed God. They no longer considered raising an army against them, to destroy the land in which the Reubenites and the Gadites dwelled.* <sup>34</sup> *The Reubenites and the Gadites called the altar ["Witness" as] "it is a witness among us that Yhwh is god."*

<sup>1</sup> אז יקרא יהושע לראובני ולגדי ולחצי מטה מנשה <sup>2</sup> ויאמר אליהם אתם שמרתם את כל אשר צוה אתכם משה עבד יהוה ותשמעו בקולי לכל אשר צויתי אתכם <sup>3</sup> לא עזבתם את אחיכם זה ימים רבים עד היום הזה ושמרתם את משמרת מצות יהוה אלהיכם <sup>4</sup> ועתה הניח יהוה אלהיכם לאחיכם כאשר דבר להם ועתה פנו ולכו לכם לאהליכם אל ארץ אחזתכם אשר נתן לכם משה עבד יהוה בעבר הירדן <sup>5</sup> רק שמרו מאד לעשות את המצוה ואת התורה אשר צוה אתכם משה עבד יהוה לאהבה את יהוה אלהיכם וללכת בכל דרכיו ולשמר מצותיו ולדבקה בו ולעבדו בכל לבבכם ובכל נפשכם: <sup>6</sup> ויברכם יהושע וישלחם וילכו אל אהליהם

<sup>7</sup> ולחצי שבט המנשה נתן משה בבשן ולחציו נתן יהושע עם אחיהם מעבר [ק: בעבר] הירדן ימה וגם כי שלחם יהושע אל אהליהם ויברכם <sup>8</sup> ויאמר אליהם לאמר בנכסים רבים שובו אל אהליכם ובמקנה רב מאד בכסף ובזהב ובנחשת ובברזל ובשלמות הרבה מאד חלקו שלל איביכם עם אחיכם

<sup>9</sup> וישבו וילכו בני ראובן ובני גד וחצי שבט המנשה מאת בני ישראל משלה אשר בארץ כנען ללכת אל ארץ הגלעד אל ארץ אחזתם אשר נאחזו בה על פי יהוה ביד משה <sup>10</sup> ויבאו אל גלילות הירדן אשר בארץ כנען ויבנו בני ראובן ובני גד וחצי שבט המנשה שם מזבח על הירדן מזבח גדול למראה

<sup>11</sup> וישמעו בני ישראל לאמר הנה בנו בני ראובן ובני גד וחצי שבט המנשה את המזבח אל מול ארץ כנען אל גלילות הירדן אל עבר בני ישראל <sup>12</sup> וישמעו בני ישראל ויקהלזו כל עדת בני ישראל שלה לעלות עליהם לצבא <sup>13</sup> וישלחו בני ישראל אל בני ראובן ואל בני גד ואל חצי שבט מנשה אל ארץ הגלעד את פינחס בן אלעזר הכהן <sup>14</sup> ועשרה נשאים עמו נשיא אחד נשיא אחד לבית אב לכל מטות ישראל ואיש ראש בית אבותם המה לאלפי ישראל <sup>15</sup> ויבאו אל בני ראובן ואל בני גד ואל חצי שבט מנשה אל ארץ הגלעד וידברו אתם לאמר <sup>16</sup> כה אמרו כל עדת יהוה מה המעל הזה אשר מעלתם באלהי ישראל לשוב היום מאחרי יהוה בבנותכם לכם מזבח למרדכם היום ביהוה <sup>17</sup> המעט לנו את עון פעור אשר לא הטהרנו ממנו עד היום הזה והיה הנגף בעדת יהוה <sup>18</sup> ואתם תשבנו היום מאחרי יהוה והיה אתם תמרדו היום ביהוה ומחר אל כל עדת ישראל יקצף <sup>19</sup> ואך אם טמאה ארץ אחזתכם עברו לכם אל ארץ אחזת יהוה אשר שכן שם משכן יהוה והאחוזו בתוכנו וביהוה אל תמרדו ואתנו אל תמרדו בבנותכם לכם מזבח מבלעדי מזבח יהוה אלהינו <sup>20</sup> הלוא עכן בן זרח מעל מעל בחרם ועל כל עדת ישראל

היה קצף והוא איש אחד לא גוע בעונו

<sup>21</sup> ויענו בני ראובן ובני גד וחצי שבט המנשה וידברו את ראשי אלפי ישראל <sup>22</sup> אל אלהים יהוה אל אלהים יהוה הוא ידע וישראל הוא ידע אם במרד ואם במעל ביהוה אל תושיענו היום הזה <sup>23</sup> לבנות לנו מזבח לשוב מאחרי יהוה ואם להעלות עליו עולה ומנחה ואם לעשות עליו זבחי שלמים יהוה הוא יבקש <sup>24</sup> ואם לא מדאגה מדבר עשינו את זאת לאמר מחר יאמרו בניכם לבנינו לאמר מה לכם וליהוה אלהי ישראל <sup>25</sup> וגבול נתן יהוה בינו ובניכם בני ראובן ובני גד את הירדן אין לכם חלק ביהוה והשביתו בניכם את בנינו לבלתי ירא את יהוה <sup>26</sup> ונאמר נעשה נא לנו לבנות את המזבח לא לעולה ולא לזבח <sup>27</sup> כי עד הוא בינינו ובניכם ובין דרותינו אחרינו לעבד את עבדת יהוה לפנינו בעלותינו ובזכותינו ובשלמינו ולא יאמרו בניכם מחר לבנינו אין לכם חלק ביהוה <sup>28</sup> ונאמר והיה כי יאמרו אלינו ואל דרתינו מחר ואמרנו ראו את תבנית מזבח יהוה אשר עשו אבותינו לא לעולה ולא לזבח כי עד הוא בינינו ובניכם <sup>29</sup> חלילה לנו ממנו למרד ביהוה ולשוב היום מאחרי יהוה לבנות מזבח לעלה למנחה ולזבח מלבד מזבח יהוה אלהינו אשר לפני משכנו

<sup>30</sup> וישמע פינחס הכהן ונשיאי העדה וראשי אלפי ישראל אשר אתו את הדברים אשר דברו בני ראובן ובני גד ובני מנשה וייטב בעיניהם <sup>31</sup> ויאמר פינחס בן אלעזר הכהן אל בני ראובן ואל בני גד ואל בני מנשה היום ידענו כי בתוכנו יהוה אשר לא מעלתם ביהוה המעל הזה אז הצלתם את בני ישראל מיד יהוה <sup>32</sup> וישב פינחס בן אלעזר הכהן והנשיאים מאת בני ראובן ומאת בני גד מארץ הגלעד אל ארץ כנען אל בני ישראל וישבו אותם דבר <sup>33</sup> וייטב הדבר בעיני בני ישראל ויברכו אלהים בני ישראל ולא אמרו לעלות עליהם לצבא לשחת את הארץ אשר בני ראובן ובני גד ישבים בה <sup>34</sup> ויקראו בני ראובן ובני גד למזבח כי עד הוא בינתינו כי יהוה האלהים