

Joshua 1 as a Beginning or Continuation?

Perspectives from the History of Research

Erasmus Gaß

Joshua 1 can be regarded either as an introduction to an independent book or as a literary continuation of the Pentateuch, since the conquest of the Promised Land fulfilled the promises to the ancestors. The answer to this alternative is dependent on one's assumptions regarding the composition of an independent book of Joshua, a Deuteronomistic History (DtrH, Deuteronomy–2 Kings), Deuteronomistic sub-compositions (e.g., a “DtrL” from Deuteronomy to Joshua), a Hexateuch (from Genesis to Joshua), or other concepts like an Exodus-Conquest story (from Exodus to Joshua).

The relationship of Josh 1 to Deuteronomy was already established early on, since Josh 1 takes up some issues that are related to Deuteronomy: the reference to *Torah*, the transfer of leadership from Moses to Joshua, and certain literary repetitions (e.g., v. 2//Deut 2:13, 24; v. 3//Deut 11:24; vv. 6, 9//Deut 31:7; v. 8//Deut 17:19).¹ These quotations or allusions might refer either to just one Dtr author or to distinct authors – one copying the other. Moreover, inner-biblical quotations could signal either one or several redactional strata. All in all, the Dtr character of Josh 1 is obvious, since most expressions betray their theological origin in the book of Deuteronomy. However, it is far from certain whether the Dtr elements in the chapter go back to one or more hands, since there are some tensions which could indicate secondary additions.

As already stated, different options are available for the literary-critical analysis of Josh 1. The following overview arranges the solutions according to content-related issues. This derives from the fact that some earlier options, like the Hexateuch, have enjoyed a revival in the current debate. Thus, an exclusively chronological portrayal is not advisable here.

In section 1 of this essay, the book of Joshua is considered as part of a Hexateuch or an early Exodus-Conquest story, with Josh 1 as a marked continuation of the Pentateuch. In section 2, the arguments for a largely unified and coherent Dtr composition will be outlined, which could even explain the tensions within Josh 1. This Dtr composition could be linked with

¹ For the use of Dtr vocabulary in Josh 1:1–9, see BUTLER, *Joshua 1–12*, 198. For the intertextual relationship to Deut 11, see GEORGE, ‘Yahweh’s Speech,’ 358–364.

other books to form a larger narrative. Section 3 will consider Josh 1 as a bridge from Deuteronomy to Joshua within the concept of a Dtr “Conquest Narrative” (DtrL). Section 4 will address the question of different Dtr redactions within Josh 1 that might be related to a DtrH spanning from Deuteronomy to 2 Kings. Finally, section 5 will consider how Josh 1 might be regarded as the beginning of an independent book. In light of these different approaches, it is not surprising that a broad consensus remains far away.

1. Joshua as Part of a Hexateuch or an Exodus-Conquest Story

In the time of early source-critical exegesis, the pentateuchal Yahwist (J) and Elohist (E) sources were identified in the book of Joshua as well. The theory of the Hexateuch is based on the assumption that the literary strata of the Pentateuch find their conclusion in the giving of the Promised Land as narrated in the book of Joshua. Thus, the pentateuchal sources might be detected in Joshua as well. In contrast to several Dtr redactions behind Josh 1, scholars like Albers, Smend Sr., Gressmann, Eissfeldt, Weimar, and Görg thought that a pre-Dtr source might be found in vv. 1–2 and perhaps also in vv. 10–11. This source was labeled “Elohistic” or “Jehowistic,”² while the rest of Josh 1 was seen as Dtr interpolations.³ Thus, a Dtr redactor was mainly responsible for Josh 1 except for vv. 1–2 and perhaps also vv. 10–11.⁴

Slightly deviating from this early consensus, Knobel attributed Josh 1:1–2 and 10–16 to a separate source (“*Kriegsbuch*”) used by the Jehowist (JE) and enlarged by a Dtr redaction in vv. 3–9 and 17–18 (“*Deuteronomiker*”).⁵ According to Albers, vv. 1–2 and 10–11 were written by the Elohist and enlarged by a few Deuteronomic comments. A Dtr hand who connected the book of Joshua with Deuteronomy added vv. 3–6, 9, 12–17a, 18a. Later,

² ALBERS, *Quellenberichte*, 29 (vv. 1–2, 10–11: E, but with Deuteronomic additions in v. 11); SMEND, *Erzählung*, 279 (vv. 1–2, 10–11: JE); GRESSMANN, *Anfänge*, 127 (vv. 1–2, 10–11: JE); EISSFELDT, *Hexateuch-Synopse*, 67 (vv. 1–2, 10–11: E); IDEM, *Einleitung*, 282, 285 (vv. 1–2, 10–11: E; vv. 3–9, 12–18: Dtr); WEIMAR, *Meerwundererzählung*, 111 n. 7 (vv. 1–2: JE); GÖRG, *Josua*, 11 (vv. 1–2, 10–11 pre-Dtr), with the pre-Dtr core labelled JE, *ibid.*, 6. In contrast, KRAUSE, *Exodus und Eisodus*, 74 rejects pre-Dtr material in Josh 1 altogether and labels his conviction a broad consensus.

³ SMEND, *Erzählung*, 280; GRESSMANN, *Anfänge*, 127; EISSFELDT, *Einleitung*, 285; GÖRG, *Josua*, 11. According to HOLLENBERG, ‘Bestandtheile,’ 476–477, at least vv. 3–9 and 12–18 were added by a Deuteronomic redactor, whereas vv. 1–2 and 10–11 might be part of the original unit. However, it is also possible that the whole chapter stems from one or several Deuteronomic redactors.

⁴ HOLLENBERG, ‘Bestandtheile,’ 473–478.

⁵ KNOBEL, *Numeri, Deuteronomium und Josua*, 361–362, 605.

another Dtr redactor inserted vv. 7–8, 17b, 18b.⁶ Holzinger supposes that vv. 1–2* might belong to E, since the epithet “Moses’ assistant” allegedly refers to the Elohist source.⁷ Afterwards, Josh 1:1–2 was expanded by two Deuteronomic redactions (D^a: 5–6, 10–11, 12–16*, 17a, 18a; D^b: 3–4*, 7–9, 14*, 15*, 17b, 18b). Dtr glosses have been added in vv. 2, 4, 11, 14, and 15.⁸ Görg thinks that the expansions in Josh 1 might have been added by several Dtr redactors who cannot be linked to clear redactional strata. Thus, the pre-Dtr core (vv. 1–2 and 10–11) might have been enlarged by different Dtr redactions in vv. 3–4, 9; vv. 5–6; vv. 7–8; v. 12; and vv. 13–15, 16–18.⁹

Similarly, Tengström finds a core within Josh 1 that belongs to a comprehensive pre-Dtr narrative. In this respect, Tengström maintains that the core of Josh 1 belongs to a pre-Dtr *Hexateuch-Grunderzählung* which was later expanded in v. 1a, v. 4, and vv. 7–9.¹⁰ Whereas vv. 7–9 are clearly Dtr and lack any connection to the previous narrative, v. 1a replaces Deut 34:8b after the expansion in Deut 34:9–12. Additionally, v. 4 is a further interpolation straining the literary connection and maintaining later territorial demands.¹¹

However, since the style of Josh 1 is mainly Dtr, the assignment of parts of Josh 1 to one of the early sources of the Pentateuch is rather futile. Thus, other scholars like Ewald, Kuenen, Dillmann, Oettli, and Steuernagel regarded Josh 1 as a Dtr addition to the book of Joshua. Consequently, Josh 1 was not regarded as an original part of a larger literary work that begins in Genesis. Instead, Josh 1 was added later by a Dtr hand in the seventh century B.C.E., either in the time of Manasseh (Ewald)¹² or Josiah (Kuenen).¹³

In this respect, Josh 1 might be seen as the Dtr introduction of Joshua within the Hexateuch, whereby the Pentateuchal sources J and E resume again in Josh 2 (so, e.g., Oettli).¹⁴ Similarly, Steuernagel thinks that the basic core of Josh 1 might already be a Dtr text (D²: vv. 1–2, 10–18*) which was enlarged by later Dtr expansions (R^D).¹⁵ The basic text in D² was a speech by

⁶ ALBERS, *Quellenberichte*, 34.

⁷ HOLZINGER, *Buch Josua*, 1. In contrast, BUTLER, *Joshua 1–12*, 198, thinks that the use of “Moses’ assistant” in the earlier literary sources is doubtful.

⁸ HOLZINGER, *Buch Josua*, XVII.

⁹ GÖRG, *Josua*, 11–14. Likewise, *ibid.*, 6, assumes different Dtr redactional work but questions the assumption of clear redactional strata like DtrH, DtrP, or DtrN.

¹⁰ TENGSTRÖM, *Hexateucherzählung*, 165.

¹¹ TENGSTRÖM, *Hexateucherzählung*, 143–144.

¹² EWALD, *Geschichte* I, 146 (on the dating of the *Deuteronomiker*); EWALD, *Geschichte* II, 231 (on the attribution of Josh 1 to the *Deuteronomiker*).

¹³ KUENEN, *Historio-Critical Inquiry*, 220 (on the dating of “D”), 131 (on the attribution of Josh 1 almost entirely to “D”).

¹⁴ OETTLI, *Deuteronomium*, 125–126.

¹⁵ STEUERNAGEL, *Übersetzung und Erklärung*, 137, 145. DILLMANN, *Bücher*, 442, likewise attributes Josh 1 to D and R^D.

Joshua to the Israelites, whereas the divine commission in between (R^D: vv. 3–9) might be composed of Dtr (vv. 5–6, 9) and later parts (vv. 3–4, 7–8).¹⁶ These additions cannot be traced back to just one redactional hand, since they stress different motifs: passages of encouragement (vv. 5–6, 9, 17b, 18b), admonition to *torah* observance (vv. 7–8), and quotations from Deuteronomy (vv. 3–4). All in all, the book of Joshua might be the natural sequel of Deuteronomy using the former pentateuchal sources.¹⁷

However, the literary composition of the Hexateuch was abandoned due to the lack of Pentateuchal sources in Joshua, and an Exodus-Conquest story spanning from Exodus to Joshua was reconstructed. In that respect, Knauf maintains that Josh 1:1–6*, 16–18* already belonged to a Dtr redaction which extended from Exod 2 to Josh 11, which is a Dtr version of a literary context comparable to the Hexateuch. Afterwards, vv. 12–15 might have been added by a hexateuchal redaction and vv. 7–9 by a prophetic redaction. Finally, the sentence in v. 5a stemmed from a Joshua-Judges redaction, since the phrase “as long as you live” already referred to the failures in the period of the Judges.¹⁸

According to the analysis of Germany, only Josh 1:1–2 could have been part of a pre-Priestly and pre-Dtr Exodus-Conquest story spanning from Exod 2 to Josh 10.¹⁹ Thus, there might have been a connection between a pre-form of the Pentateuch and the book of Joshua at a relatively early level.²⁰ All in all, vv. 1–2 might be the pre-Dtr core of Josh 1, whereas vv. 6 and 10–11 have been added by a Dtr redactor. All other verses (vv. 3–5, 7–9, 12–18) belong to an even later stage of the redactional history of Josh 1.²¹

Similarly, Kratz thinks that there might have been a pre-deuteronomic Hexateuch (spanning from Exodus to Joshua!), which initially lacked Josh 1. The narrative core of the Hexateuch was expanded by Dtr^S in vv. 1–2, 5–6. Afterwards, vv. 3–4 added a territorial description in line with Deut 34:1b–4. Furthermore, vv. 7–9 connected the promise of assistance with *torah* observance in agreement with Deut 31:3–6, 9–10. Finally, vv. 10–18 included the Transjordanian tribes like in Deut 3:18–20.²² Thus, the pre-Deuteronomic

¹⁶ STEUERNAGEL, *Übersetzung und Erklärung*, 153–155.

¹⁷ STEUERNAGEL, *Übersetzung und Erklärung*, 131.

¹⁸ KNAUF, *Josua*, 42.

¹⁹ GERMANY, *Exodus-Conquest Narrative*, 448.

²⁰ The change of address from Joshua to the people and back to Joshua attests to vv. 3–4 being a later addition, with v. 4a as a redactional expansion enlarging the territory; see GERMANY, *Exodus-Conquest Narrative*, 314–315.

²¹ GERMANY, *Exodus-Conquest Narrative*, 317.

²² KRATZ, *Komposition*, 198–199.

Hexateuch was enlarged by Josh 1*, which underwent several Dtr redactions thereafter.²³

However, the theory of the Hexateuch – in all its forms – has not gone undisputed.²⁴ Though the promises to the patriarchs are fulfilled only in Joshua, Deuteronomy ends at a logical place with the last words of Moses and his subsequent death. Thus, there are good reasons for the canonical division between Deuteronomy and Joshua.²⁵ Moreover, the theory of a Hexateuch is mainly based on sources which extend from the Pentateuch to the book of Joshua. But it is difficult to reconstruct the Pentateuchal sources in Joshua.²⁶ Finally, it is questionable whether there was ever a pre-Dtr core behind the narrative spanning from Genesis/Exodus to Joshua.

2. Joshua 1 as a Coherent Dtr Unit within DtrH

According to this approach, Josh 1 – apart from some smaller glosses – is judged as a largely unified composition that serves as a Dtr transition to the Joshua narrative. Scholars who adopt this approach include Noth, Soggin, Miller / Tucker, Schäfer-Lichtenberger, Hess, Nelson, Rösel, and Krause.²⁷

According to Noth, the Dtr introduction in Josh 1 characterizes the following text as the story of Joshua.²⁸ However, there are minor indications that the Dtr shape of Josh 1 was enlarged in a second step. Verse 9b might be a secondary addition, since YHWH is used in the third person, whereas vv. 7–9a are first-person speech by YHWH to Joshua. By adding v. 9b, vv. 7aβ–9a

²³ Recently, the book of Joshua is thought to be the logical continuation of the book of Numbers, such that an early Hexateuch only covers the books of Genesis/Exodus to Numbers and Joshua without Deuteronomy; see BECKER, 'Kontextvernetzungen,' 155–156. In that respect, the scope of the former Hexateuch is redefined as an Exodus-Conquest story.

²⁴ For the Hexateuch as a secondary literary combination, see BLUM, 'Überlegungen,' 138–148. Moreover, the Hexateuch might be a late alternative to the Torah; see RÖMER, 'Problem,' 826.

²⁵ HOWARD, 'Israel's Response,' 52.

²⁶ RÖMER, 'Problem,' 820.

²⁷ NOTH, *Josua* (3rd ed.), 27; SOGGIN, *Joshua*, 3; MILLER/TUCKER, *Book of Joshua*, 21; SCHÄFER-LICHTENBERGER, *Josua und Salomo*, 196–209; HESS, *Joshua*, 81–82 n. 9; NELSON, *Joshua*, 28–36. According to RÖSEL, *Josua bis Jojachin*, 47, Josh 1 is a unified Dtr speech introducing the book of Joshua. HESS, *Joshua*, 81–82 n. 9, regards Josh 1 a coherent unit which is an implementation of the Deuteronomic program outlined in the book of Deuteronomy. For Josh 1 as a Dtr composition, see already WELLHAUSEN, *Composition*, 117. For the book of Joshua as a unified text written by one of the elders after Joshua's death see KEIL, *Commentar*, XLVII, who rejects the literary-critical theories of his time.

²⁸ NOTH, *Josua* (3rd ed.), 27.

can be read as Mosaic speech.²⁹ Furthermore, according to Noth, vv. 17b–18 are oversaturated.³⁰ However, there is no clear syntactic indication that one part within vv. 17–18 might have been added secondarily.

In the time after the seminal study of Noth, Josh 1 was mainly regarded as the Dtr introduction to the book of Joshua within the literary complex of DtrH. Several arguments support this assessment: On the one hand, Josh 1 provides a Dtr commentary on the following narrative and unites its diverse literary traits. On the other hand, Josh 1 is written in the second person, which is similar to the book of Deuteronomy itself. Moreover, the promise of land in vv. 3–4 is a parallel to Deut 11:24–25. Furthermore, success depends on *torah* observance, and the “book of the law” (v. 8) is a reference to the central part of Deuteronomy. Finally, many idioms are taken from Deuteronomic phraseology.³¹ All in all, Josh 1 might be a Dtr composition to introduce the era of the conquest under Joshua.

According to Nelson, Josh 1 seems to be a coherent Dtr unit consisting of four speeches (vv. 2–9, 10–11, 12–15, 16–18).³² This clear structure might support the unity of Josh 1. Especially the first speech anticipates the main themes of the book of Joshua.³³ Furthermore, vv. 1–9 have been composed on the basis of certain passages in Deuteronomy.³⁴ This is followed by two speeches by Joshua focusing on provisions for the campaign and the participation of the eastern tribes in the subsequent conquest. Finally, the eastern tribes indicate their consent to follow Joshua.³⁵

According to Krause, who adheres to the basic concept developed by Noth, the basic Dtr stratum of Josh 1:1–18 lacked only the marginal expansion of the Euphratic land concept in v. 4a.³⁶ The arguments for attributing vv. 7–8, (9) to a later nomistic redaction are also dubious.³⁷ Thus, for Krause, Josh 1 is a rather coherent text.³⁸ Though Josh 1:7–9 or only Josh 1:8 were often

²⁹ NOTH, *Josua* (3rd ed.), 29.

³⁰ Thus, either v. 17b or v. 18 might be a redactional supplement, see NOTH, *Josua* (3rd ed.), 29.

³¹ For these arguments see MILLER/TUCKER, *Book of Joshua*, 21; BUTLER, *Joshua 1–12*, 198.

³² NELSON, *Joshua*, 28.

³³ NELSON, *Joshua*, 30.

³⁴ On these passages, see NELSON, *Joshua*, 32–34. Already Josh 1:1–9 alone constitutes an adequate introduction, incorporating themes like warfare, land, leadership, the people’s unity, and God’s faithfulness; see BUTLER, *Joshua 1–12*, 199.

³⁵ NELSON, *Joshua*, 34–36. According to HOWARD, ‘Israel’s Response,’ 83–91, vv. 16–18 are the answer by representatives of all Israel, not just the Transjordan tribes. Thus, there is no tension within vv. 10–18. In contrast HALL, *Character*, 16–17, thinks that the eastern tribes are in view.

³⁶ KRAUSE, *Exodus und Eisodus*, 80–81.

³⁷ KRAUSE, *Exodus und Eisodus*, 89–94.

³⁸ KRAUSE, *Exodus und Eisodus*, 132–133.

regarded as secondary additions due to dissenting conceptions, the change from an unconditional to a conditional promise in v. 7 might have been a deliberate expression of Dtr theology, such that this change is not necessarily a sign of redactional activity. Furthermore, the reference to the book of the *torah* in v. 8 might be part of the original text as well, since Josh 23:6 uses idioms from v. 7 and v. 8 alike.³⁹ Therefore, due to Dtr language and its inherent structure, it seems that Josh 1 could be a literary unity.⁴⁰

However, the tensions within Josh 1 cannot be explained so easily, such that it is necessary to evaluate the mainly Dtr inspired redaction history of Josh 1. Apparently, several Dtr hands were at work in shaping the present form of Josh 1. Nevertheless, the broader literary context of these Dtr redactions is disputed (this will be discussed in more detail below). Since Josh 1:1 cannot stand on its own, the whole chapter Josh 1 is related to the previous narrative. Josh 1 seems to be a retrospective to the book of Deuteronomy for the following reasons:⁴¹ Joshua's appointment as successor to Moses connects both books. In line with the prevalence of speeches in Deuteronomy, Josh 1 has four speeches and few narrative comments. Moreover, the figure of Moses is mentioned repeatedly in Josh 1. The epithet "servant of YHWH" is used in both Deut 34:5 and Josh 1. The speech in Josh 1 echoes the language of Deuteronomy and even quotes several passages. All in all, Josh 1 is clearly related to Deuteronomy. Therefore, Deuteronomy and Joshua are intrinsically linked and form a Dtr "Conquest Narrative."

3. Joshua as Part of a Dtr "Conquest Narrative" (DtrL)

Sometimes the close literary connection of Deuteronomy and Joshua is interpreted within the redactional horizon of a Dtr "Conquest Narrative" (DtrL "*Landeroberungserzählung*").⁴² Regarding Josh 1, this approach is followed mainly by Wenham, Otto, Achenbach, Braulik, and Bieberstein.⁴³

³⁹ KRAUSE, 'Book of the Torah,' 419.

⁴⁰ WOODSTRA, *Book of Joshua*, 13–16, emphasizes elements that indicate the unity of composition. But these observations might be also used within a redaction-critical model. For an explanation of the literary tensions, see also SCHÄFER-LICHTENBERGER, *Josua und Salomo*, 196–209.

⁴¹ HALL, *Character*, 10–13.

⁴² Early on, TUNYOGI 'Book of the Conquest,' 374 postulated a "book of the conquest" made up of a primitive form of Deuteronomy and Josh 1–11. However, he dated this narrative as early as the end of the Omride period. Thus, it is not surprising that his theory was not adopted in subsequent studies.

⁴³ WENHAM, 'Deuteronomie Theology,' 141, 148; ACHENBACH, 'Pentateuch,' 235–236 n. 22; BRAULIK, 'Landeroberungserzählung'; BIEBERSTEIN, 'Buch Josua,' 161–167. According to OTTO, *Das Deuteronomium im Pentateuch*, 178, vv. 1–2 belong to his DtrL.

Wenham stressed the fact that Josh 1 introduces the five main themes of the book of Joshua which are already present in Deuteronomy: Holy war, the Promised Land, the unity of Israel, Joshua's role, and the covenant.⁴⁴ Thus, both books are bound together by Dtr language and common themes.⁴⁵

Since there are tensions within Josh 1, only a basic core might have originally connected to Deuteronomy. In this respect, the first edition of Josh 1 might be found in vv. 1–2, 5a, (9aßb*), linking Deuteronomy to a Mosaic narrative of origins and conquest (DtrL), according to Achenbach. Later, a Hexateuchal redaction added Josh 1:5b, 6, 9aα, 12, 18. In the late Persian period, additions in vv. 3–4 and vv. 7–8 were made within the context of a theocratic administration.⁴⁶ However, the literary place of vv. 10–11 and vv. 13–17 remains open in this redactional approach, since only part of Josh 1 is discussed by Achenbach. Moreover, Achenbach explains the network of texts mentioning the succession of Moses to Joshua diachronically, although this is not in itself proof for different redactions, since the same idiomatic field is used throughout.

When seen through the lens of a DtrL, it is not surprising that Josh 1 used the same verbal chains as Deut 1 when describing the wandering and the conquest of Israel, as Braulik notes.⁴⁷ However, Josh 1 is not a coherent narrative. Josh 1:2–9* might be part of an “installation genre” enlarged by secondary additions like the unusual wording in v. 9, “do not fear or be dismayed”. Moreover, v. 9 might be secondary in light of some further anomalies (encouragement/assistance formula voiced by God, prepositional phrase before subject in the assistance formula). Since vv. 7–9 are seen as a digression, these verses as a whole might be a later expansion.⁴⁸ Furthermore, vv. 3–4 are another redactional expansion to DtrL, since the Euphratic land concept does not match Josh 11:15–20, which purportedly represents DtrL.⁴⁹ Thus, the original DtrL was later enlarged by Dtr additions (vv. 3–4, 7–9).

According to Bieberstein, the redaction history of Josh 1 proceeded in three Dtr stages (DtrA, DtrR, and finally DtrN). The basic Dtr layer, DtrA, can be found in vv. 1–2, 5b–6, 9aß–11, 16–17, 18*. The basic layer in Josh 1:2, 5b–6, 9aßb has three elements (encouragement formula, description of the task, assistance formula) and can be labeled an “installation genre.”⁵⁰

⁴⁴ WENHAM, ‘Deuteronomie Theology,’ 141.

⁴⁵ WENHAM, ‘Deuteronomie Theology,’ 148.

⁴⁶ ACHENBACH, ‘Pentateuch,’ 235–236 n. 22.

⁴⁷ BRAULIK, ‘Landeroberungserzählung,’ 109–111.

⁴⁸ BRAULIK, ‘Landeroberungserzählung,’ 125–127.130.

⁴⁹ BRAULIK, ‘Landeroberungserzählung,’ 139.

⁵⁰ BIEBERSTEIN, ‘Buch Josua,’ 162–163. See MCCARTHY, ‘Installation Genre,’ 31–41. This genre has three elements: 1) exhortation, 2) statement of the task, and 3) assurance of divine presence and help; see PORTER, ‘Succession,’ 104–105; LOHFINK, ‘Darstellung,’ 90–91. For the “encouragement formula,” see NOGALSKI, ‘Joshua 1:1–9,’ 429–430.

These basic texts have two further parallels in the book of Deuteronomy (Deut 3:23–28; 31:1–8), such that the succession from Moses to Joshua unfolded in three distinct steps.⁵¹ Later, a “Transjordan redactor” (DtrR) might have added vv. 12–15.⁵² This redaction was linked to Deut 3:18–20.⁵³ Finally, a nomistic redactor (DtrN) expanded the passage with vv. 3–5a and 7–9a.⁵⁴ Independent additions can be found in v. 18. At least, DtrA indicates that there is a close connection between Deuteronomy and Joshua.⁵⁵ This redactional horizon could also be termed DtrL.

However, it is far from certain whether this is the first connection between the Pentateuch and Joshua, since there could already be a pre-Dtr Moses-Joshua narrative forming kind of a Hexateuch or an Exodus-Conquest story.⁵⁶ It is not surprising that some current studies stress the connection to the whole of the Pentateuch. Moreover, the observation that the book of Joshua is closely linked to Deuteronomy does not rule out the possibility that Josh 1 has to be seen in light of a broader literary context as well. It is not surprising that Josh 1 is often analyzed with Deuteronomy and other neighboring books in mind. Though being mainly Dtr in style and content, some dissenting notions are voiced in Josh 1 that finally led to the conjecture of different Dtr redactions.

4. Joshua 1 as a Blend of Several Dtr Redactions within DtrH

Since there are obvious tensions within Josh 1, this chapter might be regarded as an inconsistent Dtr text within the DtrH spanning from Deuteronomy to 2 Kings. Therefore, several Dtr authors/redactors might have contributed to Josh 1 to adjust this introduction to different theological concepts related to Deuteronomy.

After Noth had established his theory of the DtrH (as an alternative to the Hexateuch), the tensions in Josh 1 were explained in two different ways. On

⁵¹ BIEBERSTEIN, ‘Buch Josua,’ 161–163.

⁵² BIEBERSTEIN, *Josua*, 338–341. However, it is debatable whether vv. 12–15 were really added by a later redactor; see BIEBERSTEIN, ‘Buch Josua,’ 161 n. 38, who regards vv. 12–15 as belonging to the same horizon as DtrA. See the critical remarks by VAN DER MEER, *Formation and Reformulation*, 174 n. 26.

⁵³ BIEBERSTEIN, ‘Buch Josua,’ 163–165.

⁵⁴ BIEBERSTEIN, *Josua*, 100–101. Contrary to GERMANY, *Exodus-Conquest Narrative*, 314 n. 2, who notes that v. 9b refers to YHWH in the third person whereas v. 6 has YHWH in the first person. Therefore, v. 9b cannot be the continuation of v. 6, but might have been added later. According to ROWLETT, *Joshua and the Rhetoric*, 139, the change of YHWH to the third person in v. 9b is due to borrowing from Deut 31:7.

⁵⁵ BIEBERSTEIN, ‘Buch Josua,’ 165–167.

⁵⁶ NENTEL, *Trägerschaft*, 31–32, also argues against a DtrL.

the one hand, incongruences were attributed to the sources used by the Dtr redactors. It is thus not surprising that some scholars look for pre-Dtr sources that were expanded by Dtr redactions.⁵⁷ For example, Otto thinks that vv. 1–2, 5, and 10–11 might be part of a pre-Dtr source that was expanded by a Dtr redaction (vv. 3–4, 6–9, 12–17a, 18) in light of syntactic tensions and the use of quotations from Deuteronomy. This redaction is in the horizon of DtrH.⁵⁸ Similarly, according to Gray, a Dtr compiler expanded an older tradition to form the opening chapter of Joshua. Whereas the book of Joshua, recounting the occupation of the Promised Land, was introduced by a Dtr redactor with the divine command (vv. 1–9), Joshua’s address to the eastern tribes (vv. 12–15), and their response (vv. 16–18), in vv. 1–2 and 10–11a the Dtr compiler adapted an older tradition deriving previously from the cult in Gilgal.⁵⁹ Moreover, vv. 12–18 extended the territory of the Promised Land to Transjordan and revised the notion of the Jordan as its boundary as described in vv. 2 and 11.

On the other hand, the Dtr edition of Josh 1 does not appear to be uniform, such that different Dtr redactors might have reworked the text.⁶⁰ Scholars such as Robert Boling, Brian Peckham, and Kari Latvus have proposed that initial Dtr editing of Josh 1 might have taken place already in the preexilic period. Thus, Boling thinks that a first Dtr edition (Dtr¹) might encompass Joshua’s travel orders for the conquest of the Promised Land (vv. 1–11), whereas Dtr² has added material that is known from other sources.⁶¹ According to Peckham, only Josh 1:1abα, 2–5abβ stem from Dtr¹, whereas the rest of the chapter is attributed to Dtr².⁶² The first Dtr narrative (Dtr¹) ends with the deliverance of Jerusalem from Sennacherib and might have been composed in the time of Hezekiah.⁶³ However, Peckham’s study is rather thesis-driven and lacks concrete evidence in support of the thesis. Lori Rowlett used the form-critical method to support her literary critical decisions. According to this approach, vv. 1–6, 9 might originally be a “war

⁵⁷ Perhaps the most basic material can be found in vv. 1–2 and 10–11, since vv. 3–6 are not necessary for the continuation in vv. 10–11, and vv. 7–9 might have been added secondarily. At least the opening verses (vv. 1–2), which are less marked by Dtr vocabulary, might be part of an underlying source, see GÖRG, *Josua*, 11, who also assumes Deuteronomistic inspiration or Dtr comment.

⁵⁸ OTTO, *Mazzotfest*, 86–87.

⁵⁹ GRAY, *Joshua, Judges, Ruth*, 58.

⁶⁰ According to BOLING, *Joshua*, 138, Josh 1 might even have replaced a former epic introduction to Joshua.

⁶¹ BOLING, *Joshua*, 136.

⁶² PECKHAM, *Composition*, fig. 7.

⁶³ PECKHAM, *Composition*, 7–9.

oracle” and not an “installation genre” as previously assumed.⁶⁴ This “war oracle” is interrupted in vv. 7–8 by a brief excursus on *torah* obedience. This Dtr redaction repeated the phrase “be strong and courageous” in v. 7 in order to reinterpret the former military meaning of that idiom. In this way, the promise of success became conditional. From the perspective of redaction history, the “war oracle” of Josh 1:1–6, 9 is part of the pre-exilic DtrH, with vv. 7–8 being a later expansion.⁶⁵

Other redactional approaches – especially from Europe – operate with a basic exilic DtrH and later Dtr redactions. In this regard, Smend especially thinks that vv. 7–9 might be due to a later nomistic redaction (DtrN), since the focus shifted to *torah* observance.⁶⁶ Instead of regarding Josh 1:1–9 as a unified text, Sacchi likewise attributed vv. 1–6 to an author pursuing a theology of promise, whereas vv. 7–9 were added by a later redactor following a covenantal theology.⁶⁷ However, according to Noort, clear redactional strata like DtrN are difficult to identify with confidence. Nevertheless, Noort also admits that there might be a basic Dtr text within Josh 1:1–9*, which was redactionally expanded in vv. 3–4 (Euphratic land concept), v. 7 (nomistic redactor), and v. 8 (late hand).⁶⁸

According to Fritz, the basic narrative is restricted to vv. 1–6 (DtrH) with subsequent postexilic redactions in vv. 7–9, 10–11, and 12–18.⁶⁹ The theme of the conquest is abandoned in vv. 7–9 and *torah* observance is stressed instead. Thus, vv. 7–9 might be added by a later Dtr redactor (RedD). Furthermore, vv. 10–11 prepare for the entry in the Promised Land. This might be a literary addition. Finally, vv. 12–18 emphasize the notion that the conquest should be seen as an all-Israel enterprise, since the eastern tribes are obliged to take part in the conquest as well. All in all, according to Fritz, Josh 1 is a Dtr bridge connecting Deuteronomy and the conquest narrative, but there are different Dtr hands at work. Similarly, Latvus thinks that vv. 1–2, 10–11 belong to the earliest Dtr layer (DtrH) that was enlarged with quotations from Deut 11:24–25 and 31:6–7 in vv. 3–6 and later with v. 7 by a law-oriented hand (DtrN).⁷⁰ After that, vv. 8–9 were added as part of a *torah*-

⁶⁴ ROWLETT, *Joshua and the Rhetoric*, 121–155. However, according to PORTER, ‘Succession,’ 109–117, vv. 7–8 belong to the “installation genre,” since obedience to the law has to be connected to the enthronement of a new king. For criticism of the term “installation genre,” see also NENTEL, *Trägerschaft*, 38–39.

⁶⁵ ROWLETT, *Joshua and the Rhetoric*, 139.

⁶⁶ SMEND, ‘Gesetz,’ 494–497.

⁶⁷ SACCHI, ‘Giosuè,’ 244–246.

⁶⁸ NOORT, ‘Josua und seine Aufgabe,’ 72–85.

⁶⁹ FRITZ, *Josua*, 26–31.

⁷⁰ But see VAN DER MEER, *Formation and Reformulation*, 176, who refers to the LXX’s lack of distinctive words in v. 7, which makes it likely that v. 7 underwent a post-DtrN redaction.

piety redaction, whereas vv. 12–18 are a post-Dtr addition. According to Latvus, most redactions except for the post-Dtr expansion used the technique of *Wiederaufnahme* to introduce their modifications.⁷¹ According to Nentel, one has to differentiate between a basic DtrH (vv. 1–2, 5–6, 10–11, 16–18) and a redactional DtrS (vv. 3–4, 7–9, 12–15).⁷² However, the redactional stratum DtrS is not uniform, but there might be different redactional hands adding further material, like vv. 8–9 within vv. 7–9.⁷³

Contrary to earlier studies, Soggin, Noort, Rofé, and Römer regard v. 8 to be post-Dtr, using language dating to the Persian or Hellenistic period. Moreover, Josh 23 draws on v. 7 but not on v. 8, such that v. 8 might be a late addition. Furthermore, v. 8b is a *Wiederaufnahme* of v. 7b, which might indicate that v. 8 is a later clarification of v. 7 that turned Joshua into a *torah* scholar. In addition, the concept described in v. 8 is not really Dtr, since Dtr texts demand only *torah* observance, not its study. Therefore, a later Jewish ideal seems to be incorporated here at the final stages of the compilation of the canon.⁷⁴ Perhaps even vv. 3–4 are another late expansion, since vv. 2–9* (without the two additions in vv. 3–4 and v. 8) might be structured in concentric form.⁷⁵

Occasionally, research on the redaction history of Josh 1 is linked to textual criticism, like in the work of Emanuel Tov. In this approach, MT pluses are compared to the shorter LXX and regarded as possible redactional glosses. Some smaller expansions might be secondary due to their formulation (v. 7: “all the Torah”⁷⁶; v. 15: “and you may possess it”).⁷⁷ Other changes are small elucidations (vv. 2, 4: “this”; v. 2: “to the Israelites”; v. 11: “for yourself”), contextual additions (vv. 13–14), or have been added for emphasis (v. 7: “very”).⁷⁸ Some additions are influenced by Deuteronomy (vv. 1, 15: “servant of YHWH”; v. 11: “as a possession”).⁷⁹ All in all, MT and LXX might reflect two different editions of Joshua, with MT expanding the

⁷¹ LATVUS, *God*, 28 n. 1.

⁷² NENTEL, *Trägerschaft*, 21–47.

⁷³ NENTEL, *Trägerschaft*, 26–27. For DtrN stemming from subsequent nomistic hands, see already SMEND, *Entstehung*, 115; NOORT, ‘Josua und seine Aufgabe,’ 85 n. 21; VAN DER MEER, *Formation and Reformulation*, 132.

⁷⁴ ROFÉ, ‘Piety,’ 79–80. See also SOGGIN, *Joshua*, 32, who regards v. 8 as a postexilic adaptation. Similarly, NOORT, ‘Josua und seine Aufgabe,’ 73, thinks that v. 7 was added by a nomistic Dtr redactor and v. 8 by a later hand.

⁷⁵ RÖMER, ‘Josué,’ 119–123.

⁷⁶ According to ROFÉ, ‘Piety,’ 78–79, Josh 1:7 LXX without “all the Torah” is the preferred reading. The MT plus is an adaption from v. 8. But see the critical remarks of SCHÄFER-LICHTENBERGER, *Josua und Salomo*, 192–193.

⁷⁷ TOV, ‘Growth,’ 331.

⁷⁸ TOV, ‘Growth,’ 332–333.

⁷⁹ TOV, ‘Growth,’ 336.

shorter version of LXX.⁸⁰ However, the Dtr differences may not point to a separate Dtr redactional stratum, but could be scribal changes influenced by Dtr phraseology.⁸¹ In any event, a clear, unifying ideological intent within these additions is missing. Moreover, it is possible that the MT pluses were reduced by the LXX translator to achieve a more concise text.⁸²

5. Joshua as an Independent Book

Since the unconditional promise of the total conquest of the land is in conflict with the legally oriented book of Deuteronomy and with the incomplete occupation according to Judges, the earliest form of Josh 1 might be the prologue to an independent book of Joshua.⁸³ This approach is mainly advocated by Friedrich Nötscher, Thomas Dozeman, and Cynthia Edenburg.

According to Nötscher, the author of the book of Joshua used oral and written sources, which would explain the stylistic imbalance. But these sources are not identical with the supposed sources of the Pentateuch. Although it forms the continuation of the Pentateuch, the book of Joshua was an independent narrative influenced by Deuteronomy, even though the Dtr parts cannot be separated.⁸⁴

Dozeman stresses the fact that some motifs in the original account of Josh 1 that might indicate a relationship to Deuteronomy (Joshua's succession to Moses, the land as a divine gift, the divine promise of the land, Moses' address to the eastern tribes) are also present in the (non-)Priestly literature of the Tetrateuch.⁸⁵ Therefore, the variety of themes of the whole Pentateuch might indicate that Josh 1 was a post-pentateuchal composition that functions either as a literary bridge to the whole Pentateuch or as an introduction to an independent book of Joshua.⁸⁶ Later, a new introduction (v. 1a) and the conditional promise to the people (vv. 3–4) and to Joshua (vv. 7–9) were added. The demand of *torah* observance in vv. 1a, 3–4, and 7–9 is in line with both surrounding books, such that the once independent book of Joshua fits well in its present canonical context. Through these modifications, the once-independent book of Joshua was shaped in conformity to Deuteronomy and Judges.⁸⁷ Though Dtr in content, these verses cannot be part of an exilic Dtr

⁸⁰ TOV, 'Growth,' 337–338.

⁸¹ TOV, 'Literary Development,' 71.

⁸² VAN DER MEER, 'Textual Criticism,' 363.

⁸³ DOZEMAN, *Joshua 1–12*, 204.

⁸⁴ NÖTSCHER, *Josua*, 6–7.

⁸⁵ DOZEMAN, *Joshua 1–12*, 205.

⁸⁶ DOZEMAN, *Joshua 1–12*, 206 argues in favor of the second option.

⁸⁷ DOZEMAN, 'Joshua 1, 1–9,' 181–182. But see the criticism of KRAUSE, *Exodus und Eisdodus*, 104–105.

redaction, since they were added later than the post-pentateuchal composition in Josh 1:1b–2, 5–6.

Similar results are obtained by Edenburg, who emphasizes that some Priestly and late non-Priestly expressions from the Pentateuch were used in Josh 1 next to many Dtr idioms. Furthermore, Josh 1 displays connections with late prophetic texts and the Psalms. In her view, the basic narrative can be detected in vv. 1–2 and 9–11, whereas vv. 3–6 and 12–17 were added later. Finally, vv. 7–8 might have been inserted in a third redaction, with v. 8 possibly being a later reinterpretation of v. 7. In its final form, Josh 1 seems to connect Joshua to the Pentateuch.⁸⁸ The original conquest story of Joshua was overwritten when the different books of the Former Prophets were brought together to form an overarching historical narrative. Thus, Josh 1 served as the literary bridge to the Pentateuch.⁸⁹

However, at least the beginning of Josh 1:1 with *wayyiqtol* in v. 1a and v. 1b contradicts the view that Joshua could be an independent book on its own, since this construction refers to the preceding narrative and signals a new literary unit.⁹⁰ Moreover, the book of Joshua seems to be the narrative continuation of the Pentateuch, since Joshua is presented as the successor of Moses.⁹¹ Thus, Josh 1 cannot be the opening of an independent book of Joshua, but needs the previous context. Nevertheless, scholars like Rösel, Dozeman, and Edenburg have shown that Josh 1 seems to be a late text, since it displays – besides its Dtr flavor – peculiarities that indicate a rather late origin.⁹²

6. Conclusions

This brief overview has shown that the views on the literary history of Josh 1 are quite diverse and far from a consensus. At the very least, the Dtr flavor of Josh 1 has been maintained. But all other assumptions are in a state of flux.

The pentateuchal sources of the Yahwist (J) and Elohist (E) have been rightly dismissed, though there is still a yearning for pre-Dtr sources. The last option is often linked with the return to the Hexateuch (without the pentateuchal sources) or with a supposed relationship of Joshua to an Exodus-Conquest story.

⁸⁸ EDENBURG, 'Pentateuchal Sources,' 806–808.

⁸⁹ EDENBURG, 'Pentateuchal Sources,' 809–810.

⁹⁰ HOWARD, *Joshua*, 71.

⁹¹ HERTZBERG, *Bücher*, 14.

⁹² See also RÖSEL, *Joshua*, 27–39. Therefore, at least vv. 1–9 seem to be a late text and the observed tensions might not point to different authors or redactors. In that respect, the formula “be strong and brave” might be taken from Deut 31 and be expanded by a nomistic element; see *ibid.*, 37.

Likewise, a uniform DtrH as outlined by Noth has come under fire, since the Dtr editing in Josh 1 shows some tensions which betray several Dtr hands at work. The view of a coherent Dtr text neglects a proper evaluation of the tensions. Even the large narrative scope of DtrH spanning from Deuteronomy to 2 Kings is abandoned more and more on behalf of smaller literary works (like DtrL).

The following passages within Josh 1 have been regularly regarded as secondary additions, though their redactional evaluation is judged differently. Further studies will have to deal with these observations:

1) Verses 3–4⁹³ or 3–5a⁹⁴? The change to the plural address sets vv. 3–4, (5a) apart from their context. Furthermore, this passage is a quotation from Deut 11:24, but now used as a word of YHWH to Moses. Moreover, the borders of the Promised Land are different from those in v. 2, which seems to be restricted to Cisjordan. Thus, the territorial description of the land does not regard the Jordan as a border.⁹⁵ Perhaps vv. 3–4 were added in the Persian period to designate the province of Transeuphratene as a land for Jews.⁹⁶ In addition, v. 3 is an inverted verbal clause, which might be significant in a literary-critical analysis.⁹⁷ It is also possible that this insertion extends to v. 5a due to the verbal parallel in Deut 11:24–25a. Interestingly, only v. 5a refers to a military conquest of the Promised Land,⁹⁸ whereas the rest of Josh 1 sketches the settlement almost peacefully. Perhaps there were two editions of the conquest tradition, one that was military and another one that was cultic.⁹⁹ All in all, vv. 3–5a seem to be a later Dtr addition.

However, this view does not have unequivocal support. Thus, the change to the plural in v. 3 might be due to the gift of the Promised Land to all Israelites and not to Joshua alone.¹⁰⁰ Furthermore, the change from singular to plural in v. 3 might be motivated by v. 2 (אתה וכל העם הזה).¹⁰¹ Therefore, YHWH directly addresses the Israelites in vv. 3–5a within the divine address to Joshua by incorporating Deut 11:24–25a and changing the address to the

⁹³ STEUERNAGEL, *Übersetzung und Erklärung*, 154; HOLZINGER, *Buch Josua*, 2; OTTO, *Mazzotfest*, 87; RÖMER, 'Josué,' 121; KRATZ, *Komposition*, 198–199; NENTEL, *Trägerschaft*, 22–23; ACHENBACH, 'Pentateuch,' 235–236 n. 22; RÖMER, *Deuteronomistic History*, 175; BRAULIK, 'Länderoberungserzählung,' 139.

⁹⁴ HOLLENBERG, 'Bestandtheile,' 473–474; SMEND, *Erzählung*, 280; RUDOLPH, *Elohist*, 164; BIEBERSTEIN, *Josua*, 93–95; DOZEMAN, *Joshua 1–12*, 206.

⁹⁵ RÖMER, *Deuteronomistic History*, 117 n. 19.

⁹⁶ RÖMER, *Deuteronomistic History*, 175.

⁹⁷ For the above arguments, see RÖMER, 'Josué,' 121; NENTEL, *Trägerschaft*, 22–23.

⁹⁸ KNAUF, *Josua*, 43.

⁹⁹ SOGGIN, *Joshua*, 33. See also HERTZBERG, *Bücher*, 16.

¹⁰⁰ SCHÄFER-LICHTENBERGER, *Josua und Salomo*, 194.

¹⁰¹ NOTH, *Josua* (3rd ed.), 27. However, though this change might be anticipated in v. 2, the following sentence hinders this smooth transition; see BIEBERSTEIN, *Josua*, 94 n. 54.

plural.¹⁰² All in all, vv. 3–5a might be a redactional expansion. But this assessment is far from secure.

2) Verses 7–8¹⁰³ or 7–9^{*104}? These verses are regularly regarded as a later insertion, since the demand for courage shifts from trust in the divine promise to *torah* observance, which will be the condition for a successful conquest of the Promised Land. Thus, there is a change from an unconditional (v. 6) to a conditional promise of success (vv. 7–9) which is grammatically intensified with the particle רק.¹⁰⁵ Furthermore, whereas the context repeats typical expressions taken from Deut 1:37–38; 3:28; 31:6–8, 23, similar idioms are lacking in vv. 7–9a.¹⁰⁶ Perhaps two Dtr redactors were responsible for this tension. In this respect, the exhortation to physical strength in war was transformed to spiritual fortitude achieved by studying *torah*. Thus, a nomistic redactor has modified the military exhortation.¹⁰⁷ Therefore, the original military “encouragement formula” is transformed into an exhortation to spiritual fortitude.¹⁰⁸ Furthermore, v. 7a is a repetition of the “encouragement formula” which leads into an admonition to *torah* observance.¹⁰⁹ It seems that these verses have been inserted by the technique of *Wiederaufnahme*.¹¹⁰ Thus, the “encouragement formula” of v. 9 might belong to the addition.¹¹¹ However, whereas the thematic shift and other indicators signal a secondary redaction, neither the evaluation of v. 8 nor the end of this addition is clear. Perhaps v. 8 is already a later comment shifting the focus to *torah* study.

¹⁰² For HERTZBERG, *Bücher*, 15, the change in the address is typical of Dtr literature.

¹⁰³ STEUERNAGEL, *Übersetzung und Erklärung*, 154–155; SCHMITT, *Frieden*, 146; FISHBANE, *Interpretation*, 384–385; ROWLETT, *Joshua and the Rhetoric*, 137–140; VAN DER MEER, ‘Textual Criticism,’ 370; IDEM, *Formation and Reformulation*, 174; ACHENBACH, ‘Pentateuch,’ 235–236 n. 22. According to GLATT-GILAD, ‘Revealed,’ 191 n. 23, the passage with the “law book” can be dated to the initial preexilic stage of DtrH.

¹⁰⁴ DILLMANN, *Bücher*, 442; HOLZINGER, *Buch Josua*, 2; SMEND, *Erzählung*, 280; RUDOLPH, *Elohist*, 164; NOTH, *Studien*, 41 n. 4; SMEND, ‘Gesetz,’ 494–497; OTTO, *Mazzotfest*, 87; TENGSTRÖM, *Hexateucherzählung*, 143; MAYES, *Story of Israel*, 46–47; LOHFINK, ‘Darstellung,’ 90; FRITZ, *Josua*, 26; BIEBERSTEIN, *Josua*, 95–96; NENTEL, *Trägerschaft*, 24–27.

¹⁰⁵ GERMANY, *Exodus-Conquest Narrative*, 314.

¹⁰⁶ See already HOLLENBERG, ‘Bestandtheile,’ 474–475. Moreover, *torah* observance might be another thematic insertion, see also BUTLER, *Joshua 1–12*, 196.

¹⁰⁷ In contrast, RÖSEL, ‘Redaktion,’ 184, points out that the redactor might have used the formula “be strong and very courageous” in both ways.

¹⁰⁸ FISHBANE, *Interpretation*, 384.

¹⁰⁹ BIEBERSTEIN, *Josua*, 96.

¹¹⁰ GERMANY, *Exodus-Conquest Narrative*, 314.

¹¹¹ BIEBERSTEIN, *Josua*, 97–98. HAWK, *Joshua*, 10–11, identifies a concentric pattern within vv. 7–9. According to ROWLETT, *Joshua and the Rhetoric*, 138, the rhetorical question in v. 9a is not out of place in a battle context, so she assigns it to her war oracle.

3) *Verses 10–18*,¹¹² *12–15*,¹¹³ or *12–18*¹¹⁴? By adding these verses, the conquest is underscored as a pan-Israelite enterprise. The involvement of the Transjordanian tribes corresponds to Deut 3:18–20 and is a Dtr concept. However, there are no clear indicators for evaluating vv. 10–18 or part of them as a redactional supplement. The shift of content is not a sufficient argument for a redactional addition in the second half of Josh 1.

4) *Verses 17–18*,¹¹⁵ *17b and 18b*,¹¹⁶ or *17b alone*¹¹⁷? These verses show internal tensions, which might suggest redactional activity. At least, v. 17b seems to link the willingness of the Transjordanian tribes to a condition and interrupts the line of reasoning. But the literary problems in vv. 17–18 still await an adequate solution.

Further studies on Josh 1 and the transition from Deuteronomy to Joshua will have to deal with the above tensions through a careful assessment of the individual arguments. Beyond this, a broader consensus on the chapter is still not in sight.

¹¹² KRATZ, *Komposition*, 198–199.

¹¹³ NENTEL, *Trägerschaft*, 29–30. BIEBERSTEIN, *Josua*, 98–99, thinks that vv. 16–18 were the response of the officials to Joshua's speech in vv. 10–11.

¹¹⁴ SMEND, *Erzählung*, 280; RUDOLPH, *Elohist*, 164; OTTO, *Mazzotfest*, 87; FRITZ, *Josua*, 26. OTTO, *Das Deuteronomium im Pentateuch*, 135, attributes vv. 12–18 to his Hexateuch Redactor.

¹¹⁵ KNOBEL, *Numeri, Deuteronomium und Josua*, 605.

¹¹⁶ ALBERS, *Quellenberichte*, 33; STEUERNAGEL, *Übersetzung und Erklärung*, 155; HOLZINGER, *Buch Josua*, 2; RUDOLPH, *Elohist*, 164.

¹¹⁷ OTTO, *Mazzotfest*, 87.