

# The Formation of the Pentateuch

Bridging the Academic Cultures of  
Europe, Israel, and North America

Edited by

Jan C. Gertz, Bernard M. Levinson,  
Dalit Rom-Shiloni, and Konrad Schmid

Mohr Siebeck

e-offprint of the author with publisher's permission

JAN C. GERTZ is Professor of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament at the Ruprecht-Karls-Universität Heidelberg.

BERNARD M. LEVINSON is Professor of Jewish Studies and Hebrew Bible and of Law at the University of Minnesota in Minneapolis.

DALIT ROM-SHILONI is Associate Professor of Hebrew Bible at the Department of Biblical Studies, Tel Aviv University.

KONRAD SCHMID is Professor of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament at the University of Zurich.

ISBN 978-3-16-153883-4

ISSN 0940-4155 (Forschungen zum Alten Testament)

Die Deutsche Bibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliographie; detailed bibliographic data are available on the Internet at <http://dnb.dnb.de>.

© 2016 by Mohr Siebeck Tübingen, Germany. [www.mohr.de](http://www.mohr.de)

This book may not be reproduced, in whole or in part, in any form (beyond that permitted by copyright law) without the publisher's written permission. This applies particularly to reproductions, translations, microfilms and storage and processing in electronic systems.

The book was printed by Gulde Druck in Tübingen on non-aging paper and bound by Buchbinderei Spinner in Ottersweier.

Printed in Germany.

e-offprint of the author with publisher's permission

## Table of Contents

*Jan Christian Gertz, Bernard M. Levinson, Dalit Rom-Shiloni, Konrad Schmid*  
Convergence and Divergence in Pentateuchal Theory – The Genesis  
and Goals of This Volume . . . . . 1

### *Part One*

#### *Empirical Perspectives on the Composition of the Pentateuch*

*Jan Christian Gertz*  
Introduction . . . . . 11

*Christopher A. Rollston*  
Inscriptional Evidence for the Writing of the Earliest Texts of the  
Bible – Intellectual Infrastructure in Tenth- and Ninth-Century Israel,  
Judah, and the Southern Levant . . . . . 15

*David P. Wright*  
The Covenant Code Appendix (Exodus 23:20–33), Neo-Assyrian  
Sources, and Implications for Pentateuchal Study . . . . . 47

*David M. Carr*  
Data to Inform Ongoing Debates about the Formation of the  
Pentateuch – From Documented Cases of Transmission History to a  
Survey of Rabbinic Exegesis . . . . . 87

*Molly M. Zahn*  
Innerbiblical Exegesis – The View from beyond the Bible . . . . . 107

*Armin Lange*  
From Many to One – Some Thoughts on the Hebrew Textual History  
of the Torah . . . . . 121

*Part Two*  
*Can the Pentateuch Be Read in Its Present Form?*  
*Narrative Continuity in the Pentateuch*  
*in Comparative Perspective*

<i>Jeffrey Stackert</i>	
Introduction . . . . .	199
<i>Jean Louis Ska</i>	
What Do We Mean by Plot and by Narrative Continuity? . . . . .	201
<i>Yairah Amit</i>	
Travel Narratives and the Message of Genesis . . . . .	223
<i>Joel S. Baden</i>	
Why Is the Pentateuch Unreadable? – Or, Why Are We Doing This Anyway? . . . . .	243
<i>Jeffrey Stackert</i>	
Pentateuchal Coherence and the Science of Reading . . . . .	253
<i>Jean-Pierre Sonnet</i>	
Does the Pentateuch <i>Tell</i> of Its Redactional Genesis? – The Characters of YHWH and Moses as Agents of <i>Fortschreibung</i> in the Pentateuch’s Narrated World . . . . .	269
<i>Joel S. Baden</i>	
Continuity between the Gaps – The Pentateuch and the Kirta Epic . . . . .	283

*Part Three*  
*The Role of Historical Linguistics in the Dating of Biblical Texts*

<i>Shimon Gesundheit</i>	
Introduction – The Strengths and Weaknesses of Linguistic Dating . . . . .	295
<i>Erhard Blum</i>	
The Linguistic Dating of Biblical Texts – An Approach with Methodological Limitations . . . . .	303
<i>Jan Joosten</i>	
Diachronic Linguistics and the Date of the Pentateuch . . . . .	327

<i>William M. Schniedewind</i> Linguistic Dating, Writing Systems, and the Pentateuchal Sources . . . . .	345
<i>Thomas Römer</i> How to Date Pentateuchal Texts – Some Case Studies . . . . .	357
<i>Noam Mizrahi</i> The Numeral 11 and the Linguistic Dating of P . . . . .	371
<i>Jakob Wöhrle</i> There’s No Master Key! – The Literary Character of the Priestly Stratum and the Formation of the Pentateuch . . . . .	391
<i>Frank H. Polak</i> Oral Platform and Language Usage in the Abraham Narrative . . . . .	405
<i>Frank H. Polak</i> Storytelling and Redaction – Varieties of Language Usage in the Exodus Narrative . . . . .	443
 <i>Part Four</i> <i>The Significance of Second Temple Literature and the Dead Sea Scrolls for the Formation of the Pentateuch</i>  	
<i>Bernard M. Levinson</i> Introduction . . . . .	479
<i>Sidnie White Crawford</i> What Constitutes a Scriptural Text? – The History of Scholarship on Qumran Manuscript 4Q158 . . . . .	483
<i>Molly M. Zahn</i> Scribal Revision and the Composition of the Pentateuch – Methodological Issues . . . . .	491
<i>Reinhard G. Kratz</i> Reworked Pentateuch and Pentateuchal Theory . . . . .	501
<i>Richard J. Bautch</i> Holy Seed – Ezra 9–10 and the Formation of the Pentateuch . . . . .	525
<i>Sara Japhet</i> What May Be Learned from Ezra–Nehemiah about the Composition of the Pentateuch? . . . . .	543

*Part Five*  
*Evidence for Redactional Activity in the Pentateuch*

<i>Konrad Schmid</i>	
Introduction . . . . .	563
<i>Jean Louis Ska</i>	
Some Empirical Evidence in Favor of Redaction Criticism . . . . .	567
<i>Christoph Levin</i>	
The Pentateuch – A Compilation by Redactors . . . . .	579
<i>Konrad Schmid</i>	
Post-Priestly Additions in the Pentateuch – A Survey of Scholarship . . . . .	589

*Part Six*  
*The Integration of Preexisting Literary Material in the  
Pentateuch and the Impact upon Its Final Shape*

<i>Joel S. Baden</i>	
Introduction . . . . .	607
<i>Rainer Albertz</i>	
Noncontinuous Literary Sources Taken Up in the Book of Exodus . . . . .	609
<i>Itamar Kislev</i>	
The Story of the Gadites and the Reubenites (Numbers 32) – A Case Study for an Approach to a Pentateuchal Text . . . . .	619
<i>Karin Finsterbusch</i>	
Integrating the Song of Moses into Deuteronomy and Reshaping the Narrative – Different Solutions in MT Deut 31:1–32:47 and (the Hebrew <i>Vorlage</i> of) LXX Deut 31:1–32:47 . . . . .	631
<i>David P. Wright</i>	
Source Dependence and the Development of the Pentateuch – The Case of Leviticus 24 . . . . .	651

*Part Seven*  
*Historical Geography of the Pentateuch*  
*and Archaeological Perspectives*

<i>Jan Christian Gertz</i>	
Introduction . . . . .	.685
 <i>David Ben-Gad HaCohen</i>	
Biblical Criticism from a Geographer's Perspective – "Transjordan" as a Test Case . . . . .	.687
 <i>Israel Finkelstein and Thomas Römer</i>	
Early North Israelite "Memories" of Moab . . . . .	.711
 <i>Thomas B. Dozeman</i>	
The Historical Geography of the Pentateuch and Archaeological Perspectives . . . . .	.729
 <i>Jan Christian Gertz</i>	
Hezekiah, Moses, and the Nehushtan – A Case Study for a Correlation between the History of Religion in the Monarchic Period and the History of the Formation of the Hebrew Bible . . . . .	.745
 <i>Angela Roskop Erisman</i>	
For the Border of the Ammonites Was . . . Where? – Historical Geography and Biblical Interpretation in Numbers 21 . . . . .	.761

*Part Eight*

*Do the Pentateuchal Sources Extend into the Former Prophets?*

<i>Konrad Schmid</i>	
Introduction . . . . .	.779
 <i>Baruch J. Schwartz</i>	
The Pentateuchal Sources and the Former Prophets – A Neo-Documentarian's Perspective . . . . .	.783
 <i>Cynthia Edenburg</i>	
Do the Pentateuchal Sources Extend into the Former Prophets? – Joshua 1 and the Relation of the Former Prophets to the Pentateuch . . . . .	.795
 <i>Thomas Römer</i>	
The Problem of the Hexateuch . . . . .	.813

### Part Nine

#### *Rethinking the Relationship between the Law and the Prophets*

*Dalit Rom-Shiloni*

Introduction . . . . . 831

*Konrad Schmid*

The Prophets after the Law or the Law after the Prophets? –  
Terminological, Biblical, and Historical Perspectives . . . . . 841

*Marvin A. Sweeney*

Hosea's Reading of Pentateuchal Narratives – A Window for a  
Foundational E Stratum . . . . . 851

*Reinhard Achenbach*

The Sermon on the Sabbath in Jeremiah 17:19–27 and the Torah . . . . . 873

*Georg Fischer*

וּתְפִישׂי הַתּוֹרָה לֹא יִדְעוּנִי – The Relationship of the Book of Jeremiah to  
the Torah . . . . . 891

*Dalit Rom-Shiloni*

Compositional Harmonization – Priestly and Deuteronomic  
References in the Book of Jeremiah – An Earlier Stage of a  
Recognized Interpretive Technique . . . . . 913

*John Kessler*

Patterns of Descriptive Curse Formulae in the Hebrew Bible, with  
Special Attention to Leviticus 26 and Amos 4:6–12 . . . . . 943

*Mark J. Boda*

Reading Zechariah 9–14 with the Law and the Prophets – Sibling  
Rivalry and Prophetic Crisis . . . . . 985

*Jakob Wöhrle*

Jacob, Moses, Levi – Pentateuchal Figures in the Book of the Twelve . . . 997

*Christophe L. Nihan*

Ezekiel and the Holiness Legislation – A Plea for Nonlinear Models . . . 1015

*Ariel Kopilovitz*

What Kind of Priestly Writings Did Ezekiel Know? . . . . . 1041



*Michael A. Lyons*

How Have We Changed? – Older and Newer Arguments about the  
Relationship between Ezekiel and the Holiness Code . . . . . 1055

*Tova Ganzel and Risa Levitt Kohn*

Ezekiel's Prophetic Message in Light of Leviticus 26 . . . . . 1075

### *Part Ten*

#### *Reading for Unity, Reading for Multiplicity – Theological Implications of the Study of the Pentateuch's Composition*

*Benjamin D. Sommer*

Introduction . . . . . 1087

*Benjamin D. Sommer*

Book or Anthology? – The Pentateuch as Jewish Scripture . . . . . 1091

*Markus Witte*

Methodological Reflections on a Theology of the Pentateuch . . . . . 1109

*Jean-Pierre Sonnet*

The Dynamic of Closure in the Pentateuch . . . . . 1121

*James W. Watts*

Narratives, Lists, Rhetoric, Ritual, and the Pentateuch as a Scripture . . . 1135

Contributors . . . . . 1147

#### Ancient Sources Index

Hebrew Bible . . . . . 1151

Ancient Near Eastern and Epigraphic Texts and Papyri . . . . . 1190

Deuterocanonical Works . . . . . 1192

Second Temple Literature . . . . . 1192

Texts from the Judean Desert . . . . . 1192

New Testament . . . . . 1194

Rabbinic Works . . . . . 1194

Early Christian Writings and Greco-Roman Literature . . . . . 1195

Medieval Writers . . . . . 1195

Author Index . . . . . 1197



# The Problem of the Hexateuch

*Thomas Römer*

## Pentateuch, Hexateuch, Enneateuch<sup>1</sup>

If one reads the Hebrew Bible from a canonical perspective, one may of course consider that the death of Moses as reported in Deut 34 is a major conclusion or, to the Pentateuch, an absolute ending. The last verses of the Pentateuch clearly indicate the idea of a chronological and theological caesura:

*Deuteronomy 34:10–12*

Since that time no prophet has risen in Israel like Moses, whom YHWH knew face to face, for all the signs and wonders which YHWH sent him to perform in the land of Egypt against Pharaoh, all his servants, and all his land, and for all the mighty power and for all the great terror which Moses performed in the sight of all Israel.

This concluding remark suggests that the narration has come to an end, because it reports the death and a final appreciation of Moses, the main figure of the preceding story. If one looks, however, at the verses that precede this conclusion, one gets the impression that the story will continue through Joshua, introduced as Moses's successor:

*Deuteronomy 34:8–9*

So the sons of Israel wept for Moses in the plains of Moab thirty days; then the days of weeping and mourning for Moses came to an end. Now Joshua the son of Nun was filled with the spirit of wisdom, for Moses had laid his hands on him; and the sons of Israel listened to him and did as YHWH had commanded Moses.

These verses suggest that the story will be followed by the conquest of the land related in the book of Joshua. Indeed, the divine promise of the land, which is repeated throughout the books of the Torah, apparently still awaits its fulfillment, which comes, in the current form of the text, with the conquest narrative in the book of Joshua. It is, therefore, tempting to replace the Pentateuch with the Hexateuch. This theory is almost as old as historical-critical research on

---

<sup>1</sup> For this chapter, see T. RÖMER, "How Many Books (teuchs): Pentateuch, Hexateuch, Deuteronomistic History, or Enneateuch?," in *Pentateuch, Hexateuch, or Enneateuch? Identifying Literary Works in Genesis through Kings* (ed. T.B. Dozeman et al.; AIL 8; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011), 25–42.

the Pentateuch, at least as old as the Documentary Hypothesis as elaborated by Kuenen and Wellhausen.<sup>2</sup>

An alternative to the Hexateuch as the major textual unit is the Enneateuch, running from Gen 1 to 2 Kgs 25. This idea had already been formulated by Spinoza, who claimed that “all these books [. . .] were all written by a single author, who wished to relate the antiquities of the Jews from their first beginning down to the first destruction of the city.”<sup>3</sup> Spinoza used this observation in order to argue that the Pentateuch could not have been written before all of the events found in the books of Genesis–Kings had taken place. He considered the Torah as well as the Former Prophets to have been compiled in the Persian period. Many scholars still think that there existed “a consecutive history from creation to exile,”<sup>4</sup> an Enneateuch running from the book of Genesis to the books of Kings, from “Paradise lost to the loss of Jerusalem.”<sup>5</sup> R. Clements suggested that the Former Prophets together with the Pentateuch should be seen as constituting the first corpus of Scripture in nascent Judaism.<sup>6</sup> This idea comes close to that of a great Deuteronomistic History, composed during the Babylonian exile and running from Gen 2:4b to 2 Kgs 25, as advocated by E. Zenger.<sup>7</sup> Similarly, H.-C. Schmitt thinks that the Enneateuch preceded the Pentateuch. According to him, one can recover in Genesis–Kings the hand of a late Deuteronomistic redactor who revised the older sources in the Pentateuch in order to combine them with the so-called Deuteronomistic History.<sup>8</sup> K. Schmid is also sympathetic to the idea of an Enneateuch, but he is more skeptical about the idea that it would have existed without the Latter Prophets.<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> For the rise of the idea of a Hexateuch, see T. RÖMER, “‘Higher Criticism’: The Historical and Literary-critical Approach – with Special Reference to the Pentateuch,” in *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament: The History of Its Interpretation* (ed. M. Sæbø; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013), 3.1:393–423, here 406–407.

<sup>3</sup> B. DE SPINOZA, *A Theologico-Political Treatise and A Political Treatise* (New York: Dover, 1951), 128.

<sup>4</sup> J. BLENKINSOPP, *The Pentateuch: An Introduction to the First Five Books of the Bible* (ABRL; New York: Doubleday, 1992), 34.

<sup>5</sup> B. GOSSE, “L’inclusion de l’ensemble Genèse–II Rois, entre la perte du jardin d’Eden et celle de Jérusalem,” *ZAW* 114 (2002), 189–211.

<sup>6</sup> R. E. CLEMENTS, *Prophecy and Tradition* (Growing Points in Theology; Oxford: Blackwell, 1975), 55.

<sup>7</sup> See, e.g., E. ZENGER et al., *Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (ed. C. Frevel; 8th ed.; Studienbücher Theologie 1/1; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2012), 120–129.

<sup>8</sup> H.-C. SCHMITT, “Das spätedeuteronomistische Geschichtswerk Gen 1–2 Regum XXV und seine theologische Intention,” in *Theologie in Prophetie und Pentateuch: Gesammelte Aufsätze* (BZAW 310; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2001), 277–294.

<sup>9</sup> K. SCHMID, *Erzväter und Exodus: Untersuchungen zur doppelten Begründung der Ursprünge Israels innerhalb der Geschichtsbücher des Alten Testaments* (WMANT 81; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1999), 359–373; English translation, IDEM, *Genesis and*

Space does not allow a discussion of the Enneateuch theory in this context. Suffice it to say that the theory relies on the presence of a narrative coherence covering (at least parts of) the Pentateuch and the Former Prophets. But the different theories about the existence of an Enneateuch do not claim that the so-called sources or documents that can be found in the Torah also occur in the books of Kings. That has, in fact, never been a serious option in the history of research. The few attempts to trace the pentateuchal sources J and E through the beginning of Kings have never convinced anyone other than those who had this idea, namely, K. Budde, who thought that J and E ended in 1 Kgs 2, and G. Hölscher, who placed their end in 1 Kgs 12\*.<sup>10</sup> Unlike the Enneateuch theory, the hypothesis of a Hexateuch is quite different, since it is intrinsically linked to the development of the Documentary Hypothesis.

### The Disappearance and Return of the Hexateuch

The idea that the sources of the Pentateuch continue in the book of Joshua was a widely shared assumption of the Documentary Hypothesis. As Wellhausen had already admitted, however, there was also a kind of agreement that many, if not a majority, of texts in the book of Joshua could not be attributed to J/E or P.<sup>11</sup> That led A. Alt, M. Noth's teacher, to propose that the conquest narratives in the first part of Joshua are an independent tradition that does not belong to J or E.<sup>12</sup> Noth used this observation when he came up with his theory about the Deuteronomistic History.<sup>13</sup> The book of Deuteronomy became the opening of a narrative unit that covered the books of Deuteronomy to 2 Kings.

Several observations can indeed support Noth's idea of such a literary unit. First, if one looks at the openings of the books that constitute the Pentateuch, one realizes that Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers are each closely related to the preceding book by a consecutive waw – וַאֲלֵה שְׁמוֹת, וַיִּקְרָא, and וַיְדַבֵּר – whereas the book of Deuteronomy opens in an “absolute way” – אֵלֶּה הַדְּבָרִים. This may

---

*the Moses Story: Israel's Dual Origins in the Hebrew Bible* (trans. J.D. Nogalski; Siphru 3; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2010), 334–353.

<sup>10</sup> For bibliography and details, see O. KAISER, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (5th ed.; Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1984), 94.

<sup>11</sup> J. WELLHAUSEN, *Die Composition des Hexateuchs und der historischen Bücher des Alten Testaments* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1963), 116–117.

<sup>12</sup> A. ALT, *Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israel* (3 vols; Munich: Beck, 1953), 1:176–192.

<sup>13</sup> M. NOTH, *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien: Die sammelnden und bearbeitenden Geschichtswerke im Alten Testament* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1967); English translation, *THE DEUTERONOMISTIC HISTORY* (trans. J. Doull et al.; 2nd ed.; JSOTSup 15; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991).

suggest that the book of Deuteronomy should be understood as the beginning of a new compositional unit.

Second, the book of Deuteronomy contains pretty clear allusions to the Former Prophets: the Jordan crossing is repeatedly announced as the first step of the conquest of the land in Moses's speech in Deuteronomy. This crossing is reported in Josh 3–4. Deuteronomy also contains many allusions to the conquest itself, recounted in Josh 2–12. But the previews in Deuteronomy are not limited to the book of Joshua: The separation of the people from YHWH, described at the beginning of Judges, is already mentioned in Deuteronomy (cf. Deut 6:12–15 and Judg 2:12–14). The law of the king in Deut 17:14–20 is essentially a preview of the history of the monarchy found in the books of Samuel and Kings.<sup>14</sup> The desire to appoint a king, as is the practice among other nations (17:14), points toward 1 Sam 8. The warning against too many women, who would confuse the king's mind and heart, hints at the narrative of Solomon (1 Kgs 11). The commandment to read the Torah can be understood as alluding to the devout Josiah and his discovery of the book (2 Kgs 22–23). Finally, the loss of the land and the Babylonian exile described toward the end of the two books of Kings already stands behind the curses of Deut 28.

Third, the book of Deuteronomy shares some important vocabulary with the Former Prophets. It contains an important number of words and expressions that do not or only rarely occur in the Tetrateuch, as for instance the theme of the Israelites following other gods. The expression אלהים אחרים appears often in Deuteronomy–Kings but is found only twice in the book of Exodus. The same can be said of the root שמד (to destroy), frequently attested in Deuteronomy and the Prophets but rare in the Tetrateuch. One may also mention the expression “to do what is evil in the eyes of YHWH,” which occurs often in all books from Deuteronomy to Kings (twenty-eight times) but only once before (in Num

---

<sup>14</sup> The core of Deut 17:14–20 is dated by most scholars to either the seventh or the sixth century BCE; see, e.g., F. GARCÍA LÓPEZ, “Le roi d’Israël: Dt 17,14–20,” in *Das Deuteronomium: Entstehung, Gestalt und Botschaft* (ed. N. Lohfink; BETL 68; Leuven: Peeters, 1985), 277–297; B. M. LEVINSON, “The Reconceptualization of Kingship in Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic History’s Transformation of the Torah,” *VT* 51 (2001), 511–534; E. W. NICHOLSON, “‘Do Not Dare to Set a Foreigner Over You’: The King in Deuteronomy and ‘The Great King,’” *ZAW* 118 (2006), 46–61; R. ALBERTZ, “A Possible *terminus ad quem* for the Deuteronomic Legislation? A Fresh Look at Deut. 17:16,” in *Homeland and Exile: Biblical and Ancient Near Eastern Studies in Honour of Bustenay Oded* (ed. G. Galil et al.; VTSup 130; Leiden: Brill, 2009), 271–296. There are, however, indications that the whole text is a post-Dtr insert that wants to introduce into the Pentateuch the possibility of the restoration of a Judean monarchy; see R. ACHENBACH, “Das sogenannte Königsgesetz in Deuteronomium 17,14–20,” *ZABR* 15 (2009), 216–233; T. RÖMER, “La loi du roi en Deutéronome 17 et ses fonctions,” in *Loi et justice dans la Littérature du Proche-Orient ancien* (ed. O. Artus; BZABR 20; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2013), 99–111. In this case, Deut 17:14–20 would not belong to the Deuteronomistic History.

32:13). Equally, the root כעס (*hiphil*, “to offend”) is attested in Deuteronomy and the Prophets but not in the Tetrateuch.

For more than two decades, Noth’s theory has come under heavy attack, especially in European scholarship, and this for different reasons, which I will not present in this contribution.<sup>15</sup> Instead of a Deuteronomistic History, several scholars have returned to the idea of a Hexateuch.<sup>16</sup> Yet, the question remains what kind of Hexateuch those scholars have in mind.

## Hexateuchal Themes in the Pentateuch

Some passages in the books of Genesis–Numbers clearly try to create a Hexateuch. For instance, Gen 50:25 and Exod 13:19 deal with the transportation of Joseph’s bones from Egypt to Israel. These verses do not make much sense in the context of the Pentateuch, but they do function well to prepare the reader for Josh 24. Joshua 24:32 thus marks the end of a narrative trajectory that starts in Gen 50:25<sup>17</sup> (or even 33:19).<sup>18</sup>

### *Genesis 50:25*

Then Joseph made the sons of Israel swear, saying, “God will surely take care of you, and you shall carry my bones up from here.”

### *Exodus 13:19*

Moses took the bones of Joseph with him, for he had made the sons of Israel solemnly swear, saying, “God will surely take care of you, and you shall carry my bones from here with you.”

<sup>15</sup> For a presentation and evaluation of the Deuteronomistic controversy, see T. RÖMER, “The Current Discussion on the So-Called Deuteronomistic History: Literary Criticism and Theological Consequences,” *Humanities* 46 (2015), 43–66.

<sup>16</sup> E. OTTO, *Das Deuteronomium im Pentateuch und Hexateuch: Studien zur Literaturgeschichte von Pentateuch und Hexateuch im Lichte des Deuteronomiumsrahmen* (FAT 30; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000); R. G. KRATZ, “Der vor- und nachpriesterschriftliche Hexateuch,” in *Abschied vom Jahwisten: Die Komposition des Hexateuch in der jüngsten Diskussion* (ed. J. C. Gertz et al.; BZAW 315; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2002), 295–323; C. FREVEL, “Die Wiederkehr der Hexateuchperspektive: Eine Herausforderung für die These vom deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerk,” in *Das deuteronomistische Geschichtswerk* (ed. H.-J. Stipp; ÖBS 39; Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 2011), 13–53.

<sup>17</sup> In fact, the suggestion that Joseph was buried in Shechem creates a specific link with the beginning of the Joseph story, as noted by the medieval Jewish commentator Rashi (Rabbi Solomon son of Isaac, 1040–1105): “They [Joseph’s brothers] stole him from Shechem (see Gen 37:13), and they [Joshua’s generation] returned him to Shechem”; see Rashi on Josh 24, translated by Marc Brettler, in T. RÖMER and M. Z. BRETTLER, “Deuteronomy 34 and the Case for a Persian Hexateuch,” *JBL* 119 (2000), 401–419, here 410.

<sup>18</sup> E. BLUM, *Die Komposition der Vätergeschichte* (WMANT 57; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1984), 44–45.

*Joshua 24:32*

Now they buried the bones of Joseph, which the sons of Israel brought up from Egypt, at Shechem, in the piece of ground which Jacob had bought from the sons of Hamor the father of Shechem for one hundred pieces of kesita; and they became the inheritance of Joseph's sons.

The idea that these passages belong to the same literary level could garner broad agreement. The question is whether they belong to any old sources. Genesis 50:25 and Exod 13:19 have traditionally been attributed to E, which would mean that Josh 24:32 also belongs to E. But, as is often observed, it is difficult to reconstruct an E account of the passage through the sea. Furthermore, Gen 50:25 may not belong to the original Joseph story, which was probably conceived as an independent narrative before it was incorporated into the end of the book of Genesis. If קֶשֶׁטָה means “money,” as advocated in most commentaries and translations, then the text of Josh 24 could hardly be older than the fifth century, because it was only at that time that people started to use coins in Palestine.<sup>19</sup> Therefore, it is not astonishing that European scholars like E. Blum and J. C. Gertz tend to ascribe these verses to late redactors.<sup>20</sup>

A further Hexateuchal theme is the promise of land to Caleb in Num 13–14. The promise that he will enter the land together with Joshua and receive a territory is related to Deut 1:35–36 and Josh 14:13–14, where the territory around Hebron is allotted to him.

*Numbers 14:23–24*

“They shall by no means see the land, which I swore to their fathers, nor shall any of those who spurned me see it. But my servant Caleb, because he has had a different spirit and has followed me fully, I will bring into the land which he entered, and his descendants shall take possession of it.”

*Deuteronomy 1:35–36*

“Not one of these men, this evil generation, shall see the good land which I swore to give your fathers, except Caleb the son of Jephunneh; he shall see it, and to him and to his sons I will give the land on which he has set foot, because he has followed YHWH fully.”

*Joshua 14:13–14*

So Joshua blessed him and gave Hebron to Caleb the son of Jephunneh for an inheritance. Therefore, Hebron became the inheritance of Caleb the son of Jephunneh the Kenzizite until this day, because he followed YHWH, the God of Israel, fully.

<sup>19</sup> E. A. KNAUF, *Josua* (ZBK 6; Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 2008), 200.

<sup>20</sup> E. BLUM, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch* (BZAW 189; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1990), 363–365, and J. C. GERTZ, *Tradition und Redaktion in der Exoduserzählung: Untersuchungen zur Endredaktion des Pentateuch* (FRLANT 186; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1999), 380, 389. See also M. WITTE, “Die Gebeine Josefs,” in *Auf dem Weg zur Endgestalt von Genesis bis II Regum: Festschrift für Hans-Christoph Schmitt zu seinem 65. Geburtstag* (ed. M. Beck and U. Schorn; BZAW 370; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2006), 139–156, who argues that these very late texts reflect the transport of Alexander's corpse.



In contrast to the theme of Joseph's bones, it is more difficult to decide whether these verses all belong to the same literary level. The decision hinges on how one understands the relationship between the parallel texts in Numbers and in Deuteronomy. Joshua 14 may have been added by a redactor already aware of the tradition about Caleb in Numbers and Deuteronomy. Indeed, many commentators agree that Josh 14:1–15\* does not belong to the same literary level as either Num 14 or Deut 1.<sup>21</sup>

There also exists a strong connection between Exod 16 and Josh 5. Exodus 16:35 relates the beginning of the divine gift of manna. This narrative opens a period that ends only after the entry into the land, as stated in Josh 5:12: "The manna ceased the day they ate the produce of the land." Exodus 16 is at the earliest a P text,<sup>22</sup> so the note in Josh 5 cannot be earlier.

Interestingly, the whole of Joshua 5 takes up themes from the book of Exodus. Joshua's vision in Josh 5:13–15<sup>23</sup> creates a parallel with Moses's call in Exod 3:5:

*Joshua 5:15*

שֶׁל־נִעְלָדָךְ מֵעַל רַגְלֶךָ  
כִּי הַמָּקוֹם אֲשֶׁר אַתָּה עֹמֵד עָלָיו קֹדֶשׁ הוּא

Take off your sandal from your foot.  
Indeed, the place where you are standing is  
holy.

*Exodus 3:5*

שֶׁל־נִעְלָדֶיךָ מֵעַל רַגְלֶיךָ  
כִּי הַמָּקוֹם אֲשֶׁר אַתָּה עֹמֵד עָלָיו אֲדַמְתִּי-קֹדֶשׁ הוּא

Take off your sandals from your feet.  
Indeed, the place where you are standing is  
holy ground.

It is not clear which text depends on which, but it is clear that this intertextuality makes Joshua appear as a new Moses. The note about the circumcision of the children of the exodus generation reads like a midrash on Exod 12:43–50. If one considers Josh 3–4 to be related to the crossing of the sea (Exod 14), then one may even construct a sort of chiasm, exposing how the redactors of the first chapters of Joshua wanted to correlate the conquest account with the exodus story:<sup>24</sup>

<sup>21</sup> V. FRITZ, *Das Buch Josua* (HAT 1/7; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994), 152–154, attributes v. 13 to a "D-redactor" (later than the Dtr edition of Joshua) and v. 14 to a later addition. According to OTTO, *Das Deuteronomium* (see n. 16), 79–84, and KNAUF, *Josua* (see n. 19), 20–21, 138–140, the passage belongs to a hexateuchal redaction.

<sup>22</sup> For J. S. BADEN, "The Original Place of the Priestly Manna Story in Exodus 16," *ZAW* 122 (2010), 491–504, Exod 16 as a whole belongs to the P document. L. SCHMIDT, "Die Priesterschrift in Exodus 16," *ZAW* 119 (2007), 483–498, considers only vv. 1aß, 2f, 9–14bα, 15, 21, 11aαb, 23, 24a, 25f, and 35a as belonging to P; similarly, R. ALBERTZ, *Exodus 1–18* (ZBT 2/1; Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 2012), 256–278.

<sup>23</sup> For this passage, see T. RÖMER, "Joshua's Encounter with the Commander of Yhwh's Army (Josh 5:13–15): Literary Construction or Reflection of a Royal Ritual?," in *Warfare, Ritual, and Symbol in Biblical and Modern Contexts* (ed. B. Kelle et al.; AIL 18; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2014), 49–63, especially 52–55.

<sup>24</sup> See also K. BIEBERSTEIN, *Josua-Jordan-Jericho: Archäologie, Geschichte und Theologie der Landnahmeerzählungen Josua 1–6* (OBO 143; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995), 418.

- A Divine revelation to Moses (Exod 3)
- B Passover (Exod 12:1–28)
  - C Circumcision for the Passover (Exod 12:43–50; see also 4:24–26)
  - D Crossing of the Sea (Exod 14)
    - Sinai and wilderness
  - D' Crossing of the Jordan (Josh 3–4)
- C' Circumcision before the Passover (Josh 5:2–9)
- B' Passover (Josh 5:10–12)
- A' Divine revelation to Joshua (Josh 5:13–15)

It is possible that the episodes in Josh 5 belong to a hexateuchal redaction.<sup>25</sup> In this context, the appearance of the divine warrior in 5:13 can also be understood as fulfilling the promise made in Exod 23:20: “I am going to send an angel in front of you, to guard you on the way and to bring you to the place that I have prepared.” Its aim is to connect the book of Joshua as narrowly as possible with the preceding Pentateuch.<sup>26</sup> It does not, therefore, seem very plausible to find old pentateuchal sources in Josh 5. Rather, we witness here the activity of redactors who indeed wanted to construct a Hexateuch.

So far, it seems difficult to reconstruct older sources in the book of Joshua. Before we pronounce a final judgment on the question, however, let us examine the question of P in Joshua as well as the question of the different endings of the book.

### The End of P in Joshua?

Although Wellhausen was convinced of the existence of a Hexateuch, he had some difficulty reconstructing the original P (or Q) source in the book of Joshua. He tentatively considered 18:1 to belong to P. Its original place would have been before Josh 14.<sup>27</sup> The reorganization of the text of Joshua by Wellhausen did not meet with much success, but the idea of 18:1 as a possible end for P did. In the current discussion concerning the end of P (which cannot be summarized

---

<sup>25</sup> KNAUF, *Josua* (see n. 19), 63–67, attributes vv. 10–12 to P (see below) and vv. 1–10 and 13–15 to a late hexateuchal redaction that, because of the idea of a second circumcision cannot be older than the second century BCE (p. 64). For a hexateuchal perspective on Josh 5, see also E. BLUM, “Beschneidung und Passa in Kanaan: Beobachtungen und Mutmaßungen zu Jos 5,” in *Freiheit und Recht: Festschrift für Frank Crüsemann zum 65. Geburtstag* (ed. C. Hardmeier et al.; Gütersloh: Kaiser, 2003), 292–322.

<sup>26</sup> H. AUSLOOS, “The Book of Joshua, Exodus 23 and the Hexateuch,” in *The Book of Joshua* (ed. E. Noort; BETL 250; Leuven: Peeters, 2012), 259–266.

<sup>27</sup> WELLHAUSEN, *Composition* (see n. 11), 127–129.

in this context),<sup>28</sup> some scholars advocate a modified Wellhausenian solution. E. A. Knauf,<sup>29</sup> closely following N. Lohfink,<sup>30</sup> reconstructs P in Joshua as follows:

*Joshua 4:19\**

The people came up from the Jordan on the tenth of the first month.

*Joshua 5:10–12*

The sons of Israel camped at Gilgal and they observed the Passover on the evening of the fourteenth day of the month on the desert plains of Jericho. On the day after the Passover, on that very day, they ate some of the produce of the land, unleavened cakes and parched grain. The manna ceased on the day after they had eaten some of the produce of the land, so that the sons of Israel no longer had manna, but they ate some of the yield of the land of Canaan during that year.

*(Joshua 14:1–2\**

Now these are the territories which the sons of Israel inherited in the land of Canaan, which Eleazar the priest, and Joshua the son of Nun, and the heads of the households of the tribes of the sons of Israel apportioned to them for an inheritance, by the lot of their inheritance.)

*Joshua 18:1*

Then the whole congregation of the sons of Israel assembled themselves at Shiloh and set up the tent of meeting there; and the land was subdued before them.

*(Joshua 19:51*

These are the inheritances that Eleazar the priest, and Joshua the son of Nun, and the heads of the households of the tribes of the sons of Israel distributed by lot in Shiloh before the LORD at the doorway of the tent of meeting. So they finished dividing the land.)<sup>31</sup>

*(Joshua 24:29b*

Joshua the son of Nun, the servant of YHWH, died, being one hundred and ten years old.)<sup>32</sup>

This reconstruction confronts us with a very short P account, quite different from what we can find in the books of Genesis and Exodus. Two main arguments support the idea of P ending in Joshua: First, since YHWH promises the gift of the land in Exod 6:8 (P), this gift must also be narrated. Second, only Josh 18 brings the program of Gen 1 to an end; the verb *כבש* (“to subdue”) appears in Josh 18:1 and in Gen 1:28, creating an inclusion that signifies the fulfillment of God’s

<sup>28</sup> See the discussion in C. NIHAN, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch: A Study in the Composition of the Book of Leviticus* (FAT 2/25; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007), 20–68.

<sup>29</sup> KNAUF, *Josua* (see n. 19), 20.

<sup>30</sup> N. LOHFINK, “The Priestly Narrative and History,” in *Theology of the Pentateuch: Themes of the Priestly Narrative and Deuteronomy* (trans. L.M. Mahoney; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994), 136–172.

<sup>31</sup> Josh 14:1–2\* and 19:51 are attributed to P by Lohfink but not by Knauf.

<sup>32</sup> This half verse is attributed to P only by KNAUF, *Josua* (see n. 19), 20, although even he wonders whether this verse belongs to P or to a later Priestly redaction.

original order after the Israelites enter the land. This view is not convincing, however. The command in Gen 1:28 is addressed to all humankind and defines its role in creation, whereas Josh 18:1 is about Israel and its land. Genesis 1 depicts an ideal creation, not the world in which humankind lives. This world is established after the flood, where the command to subdue the earth is no longer part of the divine order given to Noah (Gen 9:1–5).

The mention of Shiloh also does not fit with the idea that 18:1 should be the ending of P.<sup>33</sup> Shiloh is mentioned here for the first time and will appear often in the following books of the Former Prophets, especially in Samuel. This first mention of Shiloh does not make sense if Josh 18:1 is supposed to be a conclusion. Josh 18:1 should, therefore, not be considered as the conclusion of a P document starting in Gen 1. More likely, this verse belongs to late Priestly additions to the so-called Deuteronomistic History, which may reach as far as the books of Kings.<sup>34</sup> Joshua 18:1 takes up Num 32:22–29 (note the use of the **כבש** root in vv. 22 and 29)<sup>35</sup> and prepares for 2 Sam 8:11, where the root **כבש** reappears in the statement that all nations were subdued by David.

### Different Endings in the Book of Joshua<sup>36</sup>

It has sometimes been observed that the book of Joshua contains several passages or verses that sound like a conclusion. Can we detect in one of those conclusions the end of an old Hexateuchal narrative?

#### (a) *Joshua 10:42*:

Joshua captured all these kings and their land at one time because YHWH, the god of Israel, fought for Israel.

According to Knauf, the passage 10:40–42\* concludes the oldest conquest account, which was part of an “exodus and conquest narrative,” with a possible beginning in Exod 2.<sup>37</sup> The statement “YHWH fought for Israel” does indeed

<sup>33</sup> As R. D. NELSON, *Joshua: A Commentary* (OTL; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1997), 209, rightly points out, the emphasis on Shiloh is not a specific Priestly feature. In the so-called Deuteronomistic History, “Shiloh was viewed as the legitimate forerunner to Jerusalem.”

<sup>34</sup> R. ACHENBACH, “Der Pentateuch, seine theokratischen Bearbeitungen und Josua–2 Könige,” in *Les dernières rédactions du Pentateuque, de l’Hexateuque et de l’Ennéateuque* (ed. T. Römer and K. Schmid; BETL 203; Leuven: Peeters, 2007), 225–253.

<sup>35</sup> FRITZ, *Das Buch Josua* (see n. 21), 179–180.

<sup>36</sup> This chapter is a summarized and somewhat modified version of T. RÖMER, “Book-Endings in Joshua and the Question of the So-Called Deuteronomistic History,” in *Raising Up a Faithful Exegete: Essays in Honor of Richard D. Nelson* (ed. K. L. Noll and B. Schramm; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2010), 85–99.

<sup>37</sup> KNAUF, *Josua* (see n. 19), 17.

have a parallel in Exod 14:14, but is this enough to postulate a narrative reaching from Moses to Joshua? The ideology of YHWH fighting for Israel and the delimitation of the conquered land from Kadesh-Barnea to Gibeon in Benjamin<sup>38</sup> may well fit a seventh-century BCE setting for the passage, probably under the rule of Josiah. But Josh 10:40–42 may also be considered the “summation of southern conquests”<sup>39</sup> related in Josh 10:28–42 and thus not correspond to the conquest account in Josh 3–10\*. As a matter of fact, the mention of the kings fits better with 10:28–39 than with the preceding stories, which are not centered on foreign monarchs. Furthermore, 10:42 does not speak of the conquest of the whole land (contrary to 11:23 and 21:43), only of the land controlled by the kings mentioned in chapter 10.

(b) *Joshua 11:23*:

Joshua took the entire land according to all that YHWH had spoken to Moses; and Joshua gave it as an inheritance to Israel according to their tribal allotments by their tribes. And the land was at rest from war.

This verse does indeed sound like a conclusion. It refers to YHWH’s initial speech to Joshua in 1:1–9\*, with references to the conquest of the land (1:2), the distribution of the land as a נחלה, and the former promises made to Moses (1:3). These links indicate that we have here a Deuteronomistic text, which suggests that the distribution of the land has already taken place, although the repartition of the land to the tribes is related only in chapters 13–19. It is therefore possible that the concluding remark in 11:23 reflects a stage of the formation of Joshua in which the list material contained in 13–19 did not yet exist.<sup>40</sup> U. Becker suggested that 11:23 was the original conclusion of the book and was followed by the report of Joshua’s death in Judg 2:8–9 (or Josh 24:29–30).<sup>41</sup> The language of 11:23 is clearly Deuteronomistic, although the last phrase, “and the land had rest from war,” does not appear often in the Deuteronomistic History. In the Former Prophets, the verb שקט with ארץ as subject occurs only in the framing remarks of the book of Judges: 3:11, 30; 5:31; 8:28.<sup>42</sup> In contrast to Judg 2:20, Josh 11:23 expresses the idea that Joshua conquered the whole (כל) land. The same idea occurs in Josh 21:43–45. Of course, one cannot exclude the possibility that the passage in 11:16–23\* preserves traces of an ending of a pre-Deuteronomistic

<sup>38</sup> The mentions of Gaza and the unidentifiable “land of Goshen” in 10:41 may be later additions, as argued by most commentators.

<sup>39</sup> NELSON, *Joshua* (see n. 33), 138.

<sup>40</sup> NELSON, *Joshua* (see n. 33), 164.

<sup>41</sup> U. BECKER, “Endredaktionelle Kontextnetzungen des Josua-Buches,” in *Die deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerke: Redaktions- und religionsgeschichtliche Perspektiven zur ‘Deuteronomismus’-Diskussion in Tora und Vorderen Propheten* (ed. M. Witte et al.; BZAW 365; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2006), 139–161, here 151–152.

<sup>42</sup> With other subjects in Judg 18:7, 27 (עם) and 2 Kgs 11:20 (עיר). Its main occurrences are in Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Chronicles.

story heavily reworked at a later time. Be that as it may, to reconstruct this older story is a difficult, if not impossible, task.

(c) *Joshua 21:43–45 and Josh 23*. Joshua 21:43–45 provides a clear Deuteronomistic conclusion, with the idea that everything is fulfilled. These verses introduce the original version of Josh 23, which shares the same idea. As I have tried to demonstrate elsewhere, the original account of Josh 23 (verses 1–3\*, 9, 11, 14b–16a) has been reworked by a later Deuteronomistic redactor.<sup>43</sup> The revision of Josh 23, which took place at the end of the sixth or the beginning of the fifth century BCE, introduces the idea that YHWH did not expel all of Israel's enemies and thus prepares the transition to the book of Judges (Josh 23 and Judg 2:6–22\*). As Wellhausen already observed, it is likely that Josh 23 is a Dtr composition.<sup>44</sup>

(d) *Joshua 24*. One may also agree that Joshua's second farewell speech in chapter 24 is not a Deuteronomistic text. If so, the question arises whether Josh 24 is an older text and would therefore be the ending of a pre-Dtr source, as Wellhausen stated. He was inclined to ascribe Josh 24\* to E.<sup>45</sup> In recent European scholarship, there is a trend, following the older works of Van Seters and Anbar,<sup>46</sup> to consider Joshua's speech in 24:3–14 a post-Dtr creation that apparently presupposes P.<sup>47</sup> The closest parallel for Joshua's speech occurs in Neh 9, a text from the middle of the Persian period at the earliest,<sup>48</sup> with the following elements in common:

<sup>43</sup> T. RÖMER, "Das doppelte Ende des Josuabuches: Einige Anmerkungen zur aktuellen Diskussion um 'deuteronomistisches Geschichtswerk' und 'Hexateuch,'" *ZAW* 118 (2006), 523–548.

<sup>44</sup> WELLHAUSEN, *Composition* (see n. 11), 133.

<sup>45</sup> WELLHAUSEN, *Composition* (see n. 11), 133–134.

<sup>46</sup> J. VAN SETERS, "Joshua 24 and the Problem of Tradition in the Old Testament," in *In the Shelter of Elyon: Essays on Ancient Palestinian Life and Literature in Honor of G. W. Ahlström* (ed. W. B. Barrick and J. R. Spencer; JSOTSup 31; Trowbridge: JSOT Press, 1984), 139–158; M. ANBAR, *Josué et l'alliance de Sichem (Josué 24:1–28)* (BBET 25; Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 1992).

<sup>47</sup> Cf. Exod 14:9 (P) and Josh 24:6; Exod 14:10 (P); and Josh 24:7; and the expression כָּל-יִצְרָאֵל בְּנֵי in Gen 17:8 (P) and Josh 24:3. For a post-Priestly date of the speech, see, among many others, E. AURELIUS, "Zur Entstehung von Josua 23–24," in *Houses Full of All Good Things: Essays in Memory of Timo Veijola* (ed. J. Pakkala and M. Nissinen; Publications of the Finnish Exegetical Society 95; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2008), 95–114. Carr's theory that Josh 24 was a pre-P text that underwent "priestly washing" is a circular argument; see D. M. CARR, "Strong and Weak Cases and Criteria for Establishing the Post-Priestly Character of Hexateuchal Material," in *The Post-Priestly Pentateuch: New Perspectives on Its Redactional Development and Theological Profiles* (ed. F. Giuntoli and K. Schmid; FAT 101; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015), 19–34.

<sup>48</sup> M. OEMING, "'See, We Are Serving Today' (Nehemiah 9:36): Nehemiah 9 as a Theological Interpretation of the Persian Period," in *Judah and the Judeans in the Persian Period* (ed. O. Lipschits and M. Oeming; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2006), 571–588.

	<i>Joshua 24</i>	<i>Nehemiah 9</i>
Abraham	3 (+ Isaac, Esau, Jacob)	vv. 7–8
Fathers – Egypt– Cry – Sea	vv. 6–7	v. 9
Miracle at the sea	v. 7	v. 11
Wilderness	v. 7	v. 19
Enemies “given in the hand”	v. 8	v. 24
Enemies as “king”	v. 12	vv. 22, 24
List of the “goods of the land”	v. 12	v. 25
<i>Sondergut</i>	Balaam vv. 9–10	Creation v. 6
	Crossing of the Jordan	Sinai and rebellion
	v. 11	vv. 13–20

Therefore, it seems difficult to find traces of older sources in Joshua’s speech. The same holds true for the following ceremony. It has often been observed that chapter 24 depicts Joshua as a second Moses:<sup>49</sup> like Moses, he concludes a covenant; like Moses, he enacts laws and decrees (v. 25); like Moses, he raises a stone; and, like Moses, he writes a scroll (v. 26: “and Joshua wrote all the words in the scroll of the law of God”). The rare expression ספר תורת אלהים (see also Neh 8:18) was possibly coined as an alternative to the term תורת משה, which in the Persian period became a name for the nascent Pentateuch. The fact that Moses is not mentioned in the original form of Joshua’s historical recapitulation<sup>50</sup> may be explained by the emphasis that the author wants to put on Joshua. The same holds true concerning the absence of the Sinai lawgiving, since Joshua promulgates the law at the end of chapter 24. The statement that Joshua establishes a statute and ordinance for the people (חק ומשפט) creates a parallel between Joshua and Ezra (see Ezra 7:10). It offers an alternative to the giving of the law on Mount Sinai.<sup>51</sup>

Joshua 24 thus reflects a discussion in the Persian period about whether the Torah<sup>52</sup> should end with the book of Deuteronomy or should also include the book of Joshua. The very different end of this chapter in the LXX,<sup>53</sup> apparently also known in Qumran (even if the text was later reworked),<sup>54</sup> perhaps reflects the original ending of the Hexateuch, since it emphasizes the role of Joshua even more.<sup>55</sup> The location of this chapter in Shechem and the pan-Israelite perspec-

<sup>49</sup> For the following, see RÖMER and BRETTLE, “Deuteronomy 34” (see n. 17), 401–419.

<sup>50</sup> Verse 5a is a gloss.

<sup>51</sup> SCHMID, *Erzväter* (see n. 9), 228.

<sup>52</sup> For an overview of the current understanding of the promulgation of the Torah, see G.N. KNOPPERS and B.M. LEVINSON (eds.), *The Pentateuch as Torah: New Models for Understanding Its Promulgation and Acceptance* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2007).

<sup>53</sup> A. ROFÉ, “The End of the Book of Joshua according to the Septuagint,” *Hen* 4 (1982), 17–36.

<sup>54</sup> B. LUCASSEN, “Josua, Richter und CD,” *RevQ* 18 (1998), 373–396.

<sup>55</sup> See 24:31 (LXX), where Joshua is buried together with “the stone swords by which he circumcised the sons of Israel in Galgal, when he (!) led them out from Egypt,” quoted from the English translation of A.G. AULD, *Joshua: Jesus Son Of Nauē in Codex Vaticanus* (Septuagint

tive of Josh 24 (v. 1 mentions “all tribes”) can be understood as an attempt to integrate the Samaritan Yahwists.<sup>56</sup> Nevertheless, the alternatives of Pentateuch or Hexateuch reflect different perspectives on Israel’s identity. In a Hexateuch, the Torah is linked with the conquest of the land, whereas in the Pentateuch, Moses dies without entering the land. The Pentateuch better fits a diaspora perspective. It states explicitly that the land is part of the promise but that it is not necessary to listen to and to live according to the Torah. For that reason, the final cut was made after the book of Deuteronomy and Joshua became a sort of deuterocanonical book (see Josh 1:8).

In sum, Josh 24 indeed creates a Hexateuch, but only in the middle of the Persian period as an alternative to the Torah. The last chapters of the book of Joshua, therefore, do not allow the reconstruction of older pentateuchal sources.

## Exodus and Eisodus

G. von Rad, who defended the existence of a Yahwistic Hexateuch from the time of Solomon, never tried to demonstrate precisely which texts in Joshua could be attributed to J, E, or P.<sup>57</sup> His argument was based on the so-called historical credo in Deut 26:5–9, in which the exodus and the possession of the land cannot be separated. In fact, several scholars defend the idea that the oldest exodus narrative must have ended with an account of the entrance or the conquest of the land. This might be the case, but we also have to ask ourselves whether we can still reconstruct this oldest exodus-conquest account. In a way, M. Noth proposed a way out when he postulated that the conquest stories of the older sources were deleted when P, which according to him had no conquest account, became the framework of the Pentateuch.<sup>58</sup> This solution has always been criticized. Yet, we have to admit that the idea that all older sources were religiously kept by the later redactors is anachronistic. It presupposes the idea of a canonical or sacred text, which did not exist before the work of the Masoretes.

---

Commentary Series; Leiden: Brill, 2005), 83. For the complex history of transmission of the LXX conclusion of Joshua, see M. RÖSEL, “The Septuagint-Version of the Book of Joshua,” *SJOT* 16 (2002), 5–23.

<sup>56</sup> C. NIHAN, “The Torah between Samaria and Judah: Shechem and Gerizim in Deuteronomy and Joshua,” in *The Pentateuch as Torah: New Models for Understanding Its Promulgation and Acceptance* (ed. G.N. Knoppers and B.M. Levinson; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2007), 187–223, here 197–199.

<sup>57</sup> G. VON RAD, *Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament* (TB 8; Munich: Kaiser, 1971), 9–86; English translation, IDEM, *The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays* (London: SCM, 1984), 1–78.

<sup>58</sup> NOTH, *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien* (see n. 13), 210–211.



## Conclusion

Although there is narrative continuity between the books of the Pentateuch and Joshua (Hexateuch) and even across the entire Former Prophets (Enneateuch), there is hardly any evidence of the classic pentateuchal sources in the Former Prophets. The Former Prophets are closely related to the book of Deuteronomy and may therefore still be considered Deuteronomistic. On the literary level, it is impossible to find older sources in the Former Prophets. The links between the Pentateuch and Joshua, as well as with the following books, do not reflect sources that begin somewhere in the Pentateuch but are the work of different redactors who, with different agendas, tried to correlate the pentateuchal scrolls with those of the Former Prophets.

