26	26
a) Dtn 144a	Moses' description of the battle
b) Num 1445a (JE)	Narrator's description of the battle
	ויצא האמרי הישב בהר ההוא (a
	וירד העמלקי והכנעני הישב בהר ההוא (b
27	27
a) Dtn 144b	Moses' description of the battle
b) Num 1445b (JE)	Narrator's description of the battle
To be the second of the second	ויכתו אתכם בשעיר עד חרמה (a
	ל) ויכתום עד החרמה (b

Moses' charge to the people in Dtn 120-21 echoes Yahweh's instructions in Num 132 (P) and Caleb's command to inherit in Num 1330 (JE). The request of the people that scouts be sent in Dtn 122 is derived from Yahweh's instructions in Num 132 (P) and the description of their return in Num 1326b (P or JE [?]). The extent of the trip in Dtn 124 is based on Num 1323 (JE) while the return of fruit in Dtn 1252 is derived from Moses' instructions to the scouts in Num 1320 (JE). The reasons advanced by the people for not going up into the land in Deut 128 are based upon the scout's report in Num 1328, 33 (JE); Moses harangue encouraging the people to go up at Dtn 132 touches upon their lack of faith in language echoing Yahweh's speech to Moses at Num 1411 (JE) in which Yahweh wishes to destroy Israel.

Among the motifs not taken up by the author of the Deuteronomic version is the list of scouts (Num 133-15 [P]), the northermost extent of the expedition (Num 1321 [P]), the people's plan to return to Egypt (Num 144 [P]), and Yahweh's plan to smite the people and raise a nation out of Moses' seed (Num 1413-19[JE]).

In the Numbers version, the deity initiates the episode commanding Moses: "Send men to scout the land of Canaan which I am giving to the Israelite people; send one man from each of their ancestral tribes ..." (132a, ba [P8]). In the Deuteronomic version, however, the people initiate the undertaking: "I said to you, 'You have come to the hill country of the Amorites which the Lord our God is giving to us Then all of you came to me and said, 'Let us send men ahead to explore the land for us and bring back word on the route ...! I approved of the plan and so I selected twelve of your men, one from each tribe" (120-23).

The difference between the third and first person narrative style accounts for many of the changes which the Numbers text has undergone in the course of its Deuteronomic transformation. Moreover, the Deuteronomic writer has abridged and rearranged the material from Numbers freely in order to shift the onus for the ensuing loss of faith and the resultant punishment from the deity to the people and to Moses.

The data evidence that the author of the Deuteronomic version was also familiar with the summary account of the spy episode found in Num 328-13 (JEP).88 Thus the motif, of anger and swearing in Dtn 134b is based on Num 3210, while the first part of the oath in Dtn 135aα parallels the first words of Nu 3211aα (JE) (and not Num 1423a [JE]) the remainder of Dtn 135aβ echoes the syntax of Num 1435aβ (P) but the vocabulary of this verse's later metamorphosis in Num 3213bα (P).

This analysis indicates that the author of the Deuteronomic story had access to and was familiar with the redacted accounts of the spy story and its aftermath. Dtn 120-46 is classified as Dtr 89 and in terms of its linguistic typology is an exemplar of classical Biblical Hebrew. Chronologically, therefore, it must be dated anteriorly to post-exilic LBH as described by Polzin. 90

What conclusions may be drawn from the data and arguments presented above? Our expanded demonstration of Kaufmann's empirical argument shows that the Levitical tithe law which was the economic basis of priestly income in the post-exilic period cannot have been a post-exilic law and therefore that it and the socio-religio complex which it presupposes must be pre-exilic. (Historical, geographical, social, and political considerations suggest a ninth century B.C.E. setting for the law.) Hurvitz demonstrates the non-post-exilic provenance of many items in the technical lexicon of P. Polzin's contribution, as herein interpreted, indicates that within the P narratives the two strands, Pg and Ps, can be differentiated linguistically and that Ps appears to be somewhat later than Pg typologically. Pg, however, is definitely pre-exilic; and since both Pg and Ps employ the same terms described by Hurvitz as pre-exilic, Ps cannot be post-exilic.

⁸⁸ For the source analysis of this pericope cf. Gray, Numbers, ad loc. Loewenstamm demonstrates that Num 32₈₋₁₃ presupposes the final redaction of the spy stories in Num 13–14 (The Relation of the Settlement, 23–25).

⁸⁹ Polzin, Late Biblical Hebrew, 117 note 12.

⁹⁰ Polzin, Late Biblical Hebrew, 94-95.

⁹¹ A third linguistic study of relevance to this discussion is A. R. Guenther, A Diachronic Study of Biblical Hebrew Prose Syntax: An Analysis of the Verbal Clause in Jeremiah 37–45 and Esther 1–10, a Ph.D thesis submitted to the University of Toronto, 1977. Guenther analyzed the clause builders (= CB) in his two main corpora in order to determine those features in which they contrasted and in which the contrasts were not due to sylistics but to language change. The resultant list of twelve features was then used in an analysis of JE, CH, Dtr, P⁸, P⁸, etc. as delimited by Polzin. Guenther concludes:

 $_{\rm J}$ ER, DTR, and CH belong together as representatives of early BH. The relative order of the first three corpuses cannot be determined. The Court History would appear to follow them. The Priestly writings (Pg and Ps) are somewhat anomalous. Though they are basically early they contain some late features. The memoirs of Nehemiah (N₁), DAN and EST are essentially late BH but not as late as N₂ (non-memoir), EZRA and the non-