PENTATEUCH, HEXATEUCH, OR ENNEATEUCH?
Identifying Literary Works in Genesis through Kings

Contents

Methodological Studies

Case Studies

How Many Books (*teuchs*):

Pentateuch, Hexateuch, Deuteronomistic History, or Enneateuch?

Thomas Römer

1. Introduction: A New Interest in the "Latest Redactors"

"The older the better." This adage applies to the mainstream of histori-
cal and critical research on the Hebrew Bible from its very beginnings
in the nineteenth century. Pentateuchal research in the time of the classi-
cal Documentary Hypothesis as elaborated by Wellhausen and others was
mainly interested in the oldest source, the so-called Yahwist; many works
on the Former Prophets or the Historical Books were eager to recover the
oldest sources, putting aside the passages stemming from later redac-
tors that obstructed the way to the "original and historical account." Most
commentaries and monographs on the Latter Prophets were interested in
reconstructing the *ipsissima verba*, the authentic oracles of the Prophets,
which were apparently more "valuable" than the later additions. We will not
analyze here the reasons for this fascination with the oldest parts of the Bible,
which may well be a heritage of romanticism, or may betray the quite naïve
assumption that the oldest text of the Bible could prove the historicity of the
related events. Suffice it to say that the quest for the oldest sources did not
generate a real interest in the questions of how the major literary works of
the Bible came into being, and of their meaning or intention. Challenged by
more synchronically oriented methods, such as narratology, innerbiblical
exegesis, and others, diachronically oriented exegesis has become interested
in the question of the formation of the biblical books or literary works. This
is particularly apparent in research on the Prophets, where the interest has
shifted from the prophet to the book, with a growing scepticism concerning
the possibility of reconstructing the "historical" prophets. Research on the
Pentateuch and the Former Prophets has become more and more interested

in the question of the latest redactions that shaped the Pentateuch and the other major literary productions. But here the question arises: what other literary works do we have in the Torah and the Nebiim?

If one starts reading the Hebrew Bible, one may of course consider that the death of Moses reported in Deut 34 represents a major conclusion, and that this is the idea of the editors of the Torah. Others may determine that this episode is not a very fitting conclusion, since God's promise of the land, which is repeated throughout all books of the Torah, has not been fulfilled. Therefore one should add to the main account the book of Joshua, where the conquest of the land is narrated. In this perspective, the Pentateuch is replaced by the idea of an original Hexateuch. One may also suggest that there is a major narrative that runs from Gen 1 to 2 Kgs 25; these books can be read, as Joseph Blenkinsopp puts it, as "a consecutive history from creation to exile."[1] In the first book of the Latter Prophets, the chronological framework is no longer respected, since Isa 1:1 brings us back into the time of the two kingdoms of Israel and Judah. Therefore some scholars posit the existence, at some stage of the formation of the biblical books, of an "Enneateuch" or a "Primary History,"[2] running from the book of Genesis to the books of Kings, from Paradise lost to the loss of Jerusalem.[3] And there is yet another possible major literary unit. If one looks at the openings of the books that constitute the Pentateuch, one realizes that Exodus, Leviticus and Numbers are closely related to the foregoing book by a consecutive waw: *wĕ'elleh šĕmôt; wayyiqrā', wayyĕdabbēr*, whereas the book of Deuteronomy opens in an "absolute" way: *'ēlleh haddĕbārîm*. This may suggest that the book of Deuteronomy should be understood as a new beginning of a work that runs until the end of Kings. In Moses' final discourse, he announces the possibility of the loss of the land and the exile, and that is what happens in the last chapters of Kings. This entity of Deuteronomy–Kings is the so-called "Deuteronomistic History," as invented or discovered by Martin Noth.[4]

---

1. Joseph Blenkinsopp, *The Pentateuch: An Introduction to the First Five Books of the Bible* (ABRL; New York: Doubleday, 1992), 34. This idea can already be found in Benedict de Spinoza, *A Theologico-Political Treatise and, A Political Treatise* (trans. R. H. M. Elwes; New York: Dover, 1951), 128, "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."

2. David N. Freedman, "Pentateuch," *IDB* 3:711–27, p. 713.

3. Bernard 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.

4. Martin Noth, *The Deuteronomistic History* (trans. J. Doull et al.; JSOTSup 15; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1981; 2d ed., 1991); trans. of *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien: Die sammelnden und bearbeitenden Geschichtswerke im Alten Testament*

Of all these units—Pentateuch, Hexateuch, Deuteronomistic History, Primary History—only the Pentateuch is a canonical reality. One could argue that the Enneateuch covers roughly the two first parts of the canon of the Septuagint: the Law and the Historical Books; one should not forget, however, that the second part of the Greek canon[5] does not end with the fall of Jerusalem and the exile, but continues with the books of Ezra and Nehemiah to the reconstruction of the temple, and with the Maccabees into the Roman period. Should we then reject all these *teuchs* and other Deuteronomistic Histories and restrict ourselves to Torah and Nebiim? This solution does not take into account a number of scholarly observations that had led to the idea of the different literary units that I mentioned. Let us therefore examine briefly the arguments for the existence (or non-existence) of the Hexateuch, the Deuteronomistic History, and the Enneateuch. The various possibilities for explaining the different literary units may make one think of a puzzle; these various options are in fact related to different models for the formation of the two first parts of the Hebrew Bible and also to various theological options for understanding Israel's earliest history.[6]

2. FROM A DEUTERONOMISTIC HISTORY TO THE ENNEATEUCH—AND THEN TO THE PENTATEUCH?

When Noth invented (or discovered) the Deuteronomistic History, he encountered a literary problem, since the remaining Tetrateuch (the books of Genesis to Numbers) had then no fitting conclusion. He therefore postulated that the end of the older sources (the Yahwist and the Elohist) had been lost when the pentateuchal documents were combined with the Deuteronomistic History. After European and some American scholarship said "farewell" to the traditional Documentary Hypothesis,[7] new solutions were put forward that resolved Noth's problem differently.

(Halle: Niemeyer, 1943; 2d repr. ed., 1957; 3d repr. ed.: Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1967).

5. I cannot discuss here the question of whether the Greek canon is originally a Jewish construction or a Christian invention; see on this recently Jean-Daniel Kaestli, "La formation et la structure du canon biblique: Que peut apporter l'étude de la Septante?" in *The Canon of Scripture in Jewish and Christian Tradition—Le canon des Écritures dans les traditions juive et chrétienne* (ed. P. S. Alexander and J.-D. Kaestli; Publications de l'institut romand des sciences bibliques 4; Prahins: Zèbre, 2007), 99–113.

6. See especially Suzanne Boorer, "The Importance of a Diachronic Approach: the Case of Genesis–Kings," *CBQ* 51 (1989): 195–208, who shows that we can discern very different approaches to the theme of the land.

7. For an overview of the pentateuchal debate see David M. Carr, "Controversy and

John Van Seters considers the Yahwist to be a post-Deuteronomistic author who wrote the pre-Priestly traditions of Genesis, Exodus and Numbers as a "prologue" to the Deuteronomistic History—which means that he envisions, in fact, an Enneateuch.[8] P, according to Van Seters, is a redactor who adds his texts to that of the Yahwist, but whose work is also perceptible in the beginning of the book of Judges and even in 1 Kgs 8. But who is then responsible for the Pentateuch? Van Seters does not—if I understand him correctly—provide a clear answer. In his "social science commentary" on the Pentateuch, Van Seters claims that there is no clear evidence for a Pentateuch before the first century c.e., and that "the unity implied in ... the Pentateuch is not a literary one, but a theological one."[9] The idea of a D-composition and a P-composition (in Genesis/Exodus–Numbers/Deuteronomy), as advocated by E. Blum, R. Albertz, J. Blenkinsopp, and others,[10] comes close to Van Seters's J and P in that these "compositions" also presuppose the Deuteronomistic History and were created in order to supplement the work of the Deuteronomists in Deuteronomy to Kings.[11] But this model offers a quite clear theory about the rise of the Pentateuch, which is seen as a compromise between the Deu-

Convergence in Recent Studies of the Formation of the Pentateuch," *RelSRev* 23 (1997): 22–31; Thomas B. Dozeman and Konrad Schmid, eds., *A Farewell to the Yahwist? The Composition of the Pentateuch in Recent European Interpretation* (SBLSymS 34; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006).

8. See especially John Van Seters, *In Search of History: History in the Ancient World and the Origin of Biblical History* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983); idem, *Prologue to History: The Yahwist as Historian in Genesis* (Zurich: Theologischer Verlag, 1992); idem, *The Life of Moses: The Yahwist as Historian in Exodus–Numbers* (Louisville: Westminster; and Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1994).

9. John Van Seters, *The Pentateuch: A Social Science Commentary* (Trajectories; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), 17.

10. Erhard Blum, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch* (BZAW 189; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1990); Rainer Albertz, *A History of Israelite Religion in the Old Testament Period: Volume 2: From the Exile to the Maccabees* (trans. J. Bowden; London: SCM Press, 1992); trans. of *Religionsgeschichte Israels in alttestamentlicher Zeit 2* (ATD Ergänzungsreihe Band 8/2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1992); Joseph Blenkinsopp, "Deuteronomic Contribution to the Narrative in Genesis–Numbers: A Test Case" in *Those Elusive Deuteronomists: The Phenomenon of Pan-Deuteronomism* (ed. L. S. Schearing and S. L. McKenzie; JSOTSup 268; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), 84–115; William Johnstone, "Recounting the Tetrateuch," in *Covenant As Context: Essays in Honour of E. W. Nicholson* (ed. A. D. H. Mayes and R. B. Salters; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 209–34.

11. Recently, as a result of the debate about the link between the patriarchs and the Exodus, Blum has modified his model; he now concludes that the D-composition did not include the Genesis traditions. See Erhard Blum, "The Literary Connection Between the Books of Genesis and Exodus and the End of the Book of Joshua," in Dozeman and Schmid, *A Farewell to the Yahwist?* 89–106.

teronomistic and Priestly groups in the middle of the Persian period in order to provide an identity to rising Judaism.[12] Cutting off the books of Joshua to Kings reflects the desire both to accept the loss of political autonomy and also to provide a document acceptable to Jews and Samaritans. According to this model, the Pentateuch results from a political and theological will to relegate the books relating the conquest and the history of the monarchy to a "secondary status." But how should one then explain the fact that starting with the book of Genesis we find passages that apparently make more or only sense in the context of a Hexateuch?

3. Hexateuch or Pentateuch?

The idea that there was an original Hexateuch and not a Pentateuch is as old as the Documentary Hypothesis. It arose because of the idea that the book of Joshua is the fitting conclusion to the narration that starts with the promise of the land in the book of Genesis, so that the end of J and E (and also P) should be preserved in Joshua.[13] The assumption of an "old" Yahwistic Hexateuch (covering the stories from the origins to the entry into the land) seems nowadays very difficult to maintain,[14] since the texts in Genesis through Joshua that try to "create" a Hexateuch are apparently late insertions, as for instance Gen 50:25 and Exod 13:19, which 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 do serve as preparation for Joshua 24. Joshua 24:32 is thus the end of a narrative trajectory that starts in Gen 50:25 (or even in 33:19).[15] Exodus 16:35, which relates the beginning of God's gift

---

12. Whether this compromise was fostered by the Persian imperial authorization is a matter of debate; see the different opinions in James W. Watts, ed., *Persia and Torah: The Theory of the Imperial Authorization of the Pentateuch* (SBLSymS 17; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2001).

13. This idea was made popular by Julius Wellhausen, *Die Composition des Hexateuchs und der historischen Bücher des Alten Testaments* (Berlin: Reimer, 1899; repr. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1963).

14. Recent attempts to reconstruct an "old" predeuteronomistic Hexateuch can be found in Erich Zenger, ed., *Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (5th ed.; Studienbücher Theologie 1/1; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2004), 100–106; or Reinhard G. Kratz, *The Composition of the Narrative Books of the Old Testament* (trans. J. Bowden; London: T&T Clark; New York: Continuum, 2005), 216; trans. of *Die Komposition der erzählenden Bücher des Alten Testaments: Grundwissen der Bibelkritik* (Uni-Taschenbücher 2157; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000), 221.

15. In fact, the explicit suggestion that Joseph was buried in Shechem might even bring us back to the beginning of the Joseph story; as noted by the great medieval Jewish commentator, Rashi (Rabbi Solomon son of Isaac, 1040–1105), "They [Joseph's brothers]

of manna, opens a period that ends only after the entry in the land, as stated in Josh 5:12: "The manna ceased the day they ate the produce of the land." The introduction and praise of the figure of Caleb in Num 13–14 only makes sense together with Josh 14:13–15, where he receives the territory of Hebron.

The most decisive argument for the existence of a Hexateuch is Josh 24. This final discourse is clearly later than Joshua's last words in chapter 23,[16] which stem from Deuteronomistic redactors. Joshua 24, already described by Gerhard von Rad as the summary of a Hexateuch,[17] recapitulates all major events from the days of the patriarchs to the conquest of the land. And Joshua introduces his speech by the prophetic formula: "Thus says YHWH, the God of Israel" (v. 2), and appears to be here a "prophet like Moses" (Deut 18:15). At the end of the speech, he becomes even more comparable to Moses; he concludes a covenant, gives the people statutes and ordinances, and writes all "these words" in the book of the law of God (*sēper tôrat 'ĕlōhîm*) (vv. 25–26). The expression *haddĕbārîm hā'ēlleh*, may refer back to the beginning of the book of Deuteronomy, *'ēlleh haddĕbārîm* (according to Seidel's law, which denotes an inverted or chiastic citation) and may be understood as an attempt to present the book of Joshua as inseparably linked to Deuteronomy. One way or another, the author of Josh 24, who is writing in the Persian period, wants to create a Hexateuch,[18] and this attempt is prepared for by several texts in the Pentateuch.

Therefore, E. Otto, R. Achenbach, and others are right in distinguishing within the Torah a "hexateuchal redaction" and a "pentateuchal redaction."[19]

---

stole him from Shechem (see Gen 37: 13), and they [Joshua's generation] returned him to Shechem." Rashi ad Josh 24 (translated by M. Brettler). For this theme see also Markus Witte, "Die Gebeine Josefs," in *Auf dem Weg zur Endgestalt von Genesis bis II Regum* (ed. M. Beck and U. Schorn; BZAW 370; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2006), 139–56, who argues that these very late texts reflect the transport of Alexander's corpse.

16. Joshua 24 presupposes Deuteronomistic and Priestly terminology and texts. M. Anbar has convincingly demonstrated that Josh 24 is a very late text, and this idea is shared by a growing number of scholars: see Moshé Anbar, *Josué et l'alliance de Sichem (Josué 24:1–28)* (BBET 25; Frankfurt: Lang, 1992).

17. Gerhard von Rad, "The Form-Critical Problem of the Hexateuch," in idem, *The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays* (trans. E. W. Trueman Dicken; Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd; 1966; repr. London: SCM Press, 1984), 1–78. German original: "Das formgeschichtliche Problem des Hexateuchs (1938)," in idem, *Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament* (TB 8; Munich: Kaiser, 1958), 9–86.

18. Thomas C. Römer and Marc Z. Brettler, "Deuteronomy 34 and the Case for a Persian Hexateuch," *JBL* 119 (2000): 401–19.

19. Eckart Otto, *Das Deuteronomium im Pentateuch und Hexateuch: Studien zur Literaturgeschichte von Pentateuch und Hexateuch im Lichte des Deuteronomiumrahmens* (FAT 30; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000); idem, "The Pentateuch in Synchronical and Diachronical Perspectives: Protorabbinical Scribal Erudition Mediating Between

According to this model, an important number of texts that were formerly considered "Yahwistic" and "Deuteronomistic" are now attributed to the hexateuchal or pentateuchal redactors; but it is not always clear which stylistic or other reasons allow for those attributions. According to Otto and Achenbach, both groups of redactors belong to the priestly class of the Zadokites. But they do not say why these two groups should have had competing ideas about the extent of the scriptural foundations of developing Judaism. Is it in any case plausible that the redactors of the Pentateuch all stem from the same priestly faction, given the fact that Judeans as well as Samaritans adopted the Torah, and that it contains both Priestly and non-Priestly (Deuteronomistic and other) texts? One should rather think of both sets of redactors as mixed social groups. As Otto has rightly observed, the two options betray quite different ideas about what should be cardinal to Judaism: for the Hexateuch the main theme is the land, whereas for the Pentateuch Israel's identity is founded in the Torah mediated by Moses. This makes it quite understandable that the idea of a Hexateuch was rejected in favor of the Torah.

The last words of Deuteronomy, which quite obviously belong to the redactors of the Pentateuch, assert that "never again has a prophet arisen in Israel like Moses, whom Yhwh knew face to face" (Deut 34:10)—thereby establishing an important hiatus between the activity of Moses and the story told in the succeeding books. Joshua 24 tries to present Joshua as a prophet and a "second Moses," whereas Deut 34:10–12 states that Moses and Joshua cannot be put on the same level. Contrary to Deut 34:8–9, which highlights Joshua as Moses' successor, vv. 10–12 insist on the coherence of the Pentateuch as a theological but also a literary unit. The same is true for the last redactions in vv. 1–7* of the same chapter. John Van Seters has argued that, "the Pentateuch does not have a final 'form' because the division at the end of Deuteronomy was not based upon literary considerations. Unless one can convincingly demonstrate such a design by careful literary analysis, the concept of a Pentateuch remains problematic for any literary analysis of the Hebrew Bible."[20]

To be sure, the Pentateuch is a theological construct. But there are also clear indicators of a "pentateuchal redaction," as Konrad Schmid and others

---

Deuteronomy and the Priestly Code," in *Das Deuteronomium zwischen Pentateuch und Deuteronomistischem Geschichtswerk* (ed. E. Otto and R. Achenbach; FRLANT 206; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004), 14–35; Reinhard Achenbach, *Die Vollendung der Tora: Studien zur Redaktionsgeschichte des Numeribuches im Kontext von Hexateuch und Pentateuch* (BZABR 3; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2003); idem, "Pentateuch, Hexateuch und Enneateuch: Eine Verhältnisbestimmung," *ZABR* 11 (2005): 122–54.

20. Van Seters, *Pentateuch*, 17.

have demonstrated.[21] The promise to the patriarchs, which is expressed by the verb *nišbaʿ* (Deut 34:4), contains a formulation that is a quote of Gen 12:7. The whole Torah is framed by the promise of the land, but the *nišbaʿ*-formula, linked to the patriarchs, runs through the whole Pentateuch, thereby fostering its coherence.[22] Interestingly, this formula does not occur in the Former Prophets, which clearly favors the attribution of these texts to a pentateuchal redaction. Moses' death at 120 years (Deut 34:7) is a reference to Gen 6:3, which creates an *inclusio* with the Primary History and underlines the idea that Moses' death has nothing to do with a divine sanction, but results from God's decision to limit the age of mankind to 120 years. Finally, the idea that Moses stands above all other prophets and mediators, as expressed in Deut 34:10, also occurs in Exod 33:11 and Num 12:8, which therefore may also stem from a pentateuchal redaction.

Joshua 24 and Deut 34, as well as the texts that are related to these chapters, provide in my view good evidence for the attempt to create a "real" Hexateuch and, probably in reaction to this attempt, a "real" Pentateuch; that is to say, a scroll or a collection of scrolls that were kept separately from others. But if one tends to give credence to this hypothesis, as I am inclined to do, two further questions arise: from which earlier literary unit did the redactors separate the first books in order to constitute a Hexa- or a Pentateuch? And should one understand Deut 34 and Josh 24 as absolute endings, or as literary devices whose function is to subdivide a larger literary unit. This brings us to the question of the Enneateuch, or "Primary History."

4. From an Enneateuch to the Pentateuch?

The idea that the books of Genesis to Kings constitute the Bible's first story is quite common, especially in synchronic readings such as the work of Danna Fewell and David Gunn; they claim that this "Primary History" ten-

---

21. See for instance Konrad Schmid, "Der Pentateuchredaktor: Beobachtungen zum theologischen Profil des Toraschlusses in Dtn 34," in *Les dernières rédactions du Pentateuque, de l'Hexateuque et de l'Ennéateuque* (ed. T. Römer and K. Schmid; BETL 203; Leuven: Leuven University Press and Peeters, 2007), 183–97; Schmid takes up observations made by Felix García López, "Deut 34, Dtr History and the Pentateuch," in *Studies in Deuteronomy: In Honour of C. J. Labuschagne on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday* (ed. F. García Martínez et al.; VTSup 53; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 47–61; Thomas Römer, *Israels Väter: Untersuchungen zur Väterthematik im Deuteronomium und in der deuteronomistischen Tradition* (OBO 99; Fribourg: Universitätsverlag; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990), 554–68 and others.

22. Genesis 50:24; Exod 31:13; 33:1; (see also Lev 26:42); Num 32:11; and seven times in Deuteronomy.

tatively dated from the end of the Babylonian or the beginning of the Persian period and is "placed first in the Bible (whether the Jewish or the Christian scriptures)."[23] That means that this epic story is earlier than its canonical subdivision, an opinion shared by a number of scholars working with historical-critical methods. In 1975, Clements suggested that the Former Prophets should be seen together with the Pentateuch as constituting the first corpus of Scripture in nascent Judaism.[24] Thomas Dozeman, in a recent article and in this volume, analyzes Exodus 32 and claims that this text was written for an Enneateuch, since it merges Deut 9:7–10.11 and 1 Kgs 12:26–32 into one story. This Enneateuch existed as a Deuteronomistic and pre-Priestly composition.[25] This idea comes close to the concept of a great "Deuteronomistic History," composed during the Babylonian Exile, and running from Gen 2:4b through 2 Kgs 25, as advocated by Weimar and Zenger.[26]

H.-Chr. Schmitt also thinks that the Enneateuch came before the Pentateuch. According to him one can recover in Genesis–Kings the hand of a late Deuteronomistic redactor who combines a Tetrateuch, into which the Priestly texts have already been integrated, and the Deuteronomistic History (as formulated by Noth), in order to create a "late Deuteronomistic History" (*spätdeuteronomistisches Geschichtswerk*). The evidence for such a work can be found, according to Schmitt, especially in late redactional texts emphasizing the theme of the faith (the root *'-m-n*, *hip'il*, as in Gen 15:6; Exod 14:31; 19.9; Num 14:11; 20:11; running until 2 Kgs 17:14), as well as the necessity of "listening to the voice of Yhwh" (*šāmar bĕqôl Yhwh*).[27] Konrad Schmid is also sympathetic to the idea of an Enneateuch, but he is more sceptical about the idea that such an Enneateuch ever existed without the Latter Prophets. Schmid distinguishes an earlier, pre-Priestly Enneateuch running from

---

23. Danna Nolan Fewell and David M. Gunn, *Gender, Power, and Promise: The Subject of the Bible's First Story* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1993), 12. This assumption is not totally correct: in the Christian Bibles (and in the LXX) Ruth comes between Judges and Samuel and Kings is followed by Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah and Esther.

24. Ronald E. Clements, *Prophecy and Tradition* (Growing Points in Theology; Oxford: Blackwell, 1975), 55.

25. Thomas B. Dozeman, "The Composition of Ex 32 within the Context of the Enneateuch," in Beck and Schorn, *Auf dem Weg zur Endgestalt*, 175–89, pp. 188–89.

26. See for instance Erich Zenger, "Theorien über die Entstehung des Pentateuch im Wandel der Forschung," in idem, *Einleitung*, 74–123.

27. Hans-Christoph Schmitt, "Das spätdeuteronomistische Geschichtswerk Gen i–2 Regum xxv und seine theologische Intention," in *Congress Volume Cambridge 1995* (ed. J. A. Emerton; VTSup 66; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 261–79; repr. in *Theologie in Prophetie und Pentateuch: Gesammelte Aufsätze* (ed. U. Schorn and M. Büttner; BZAW 310; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2001), 277–94; idem, *Arbeitsbuch zum Alten Testament* (Uni-Taschenbücher 2146; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2005), 242–46.

Exod 3 through 2 Kgs 25:21, since he agrees with others that the literary link between the patriarchs and the exodus was first created by the Priestly writer. For Schmid then, the idea of an Enneateuch covering Genesis through Kings must therefore be a post-Priestly construction.[28] Finally, we should also mention the work of Erik Aurelius, who claims that the Enneateuch took form "in reverse" (first Samuel–Kings, then the literarily "earlier" books), an idea that is also expressed by Graeme Auld.[29] In the beginning there was a first exilic edition of Samuel–Kings—the only books that we may, according to Aurelius, label "Deuteronomistic History." Several redactors expanded these books and at a later stage integrated the Mosaic and patriarchal traditions, thus creating an Enneateuch. This Enneateuch is "framed," in a way, by Exod 19:3b–8 and 2 Kgs 18:12; which are, with the exception of Judg 2:20, the only texts in the Hebrew Bible wherein the exhortations to listen to YHWH's voice and to keep his covenant are combined.[30]

If there was an original Enneateuch with canonical status in Persian period Judaism, as argued by Schmitt and also Chapman,[31] for what reasons was this Enneateuch then shortened to a Pentateuch? Schmitt simply argues that the concept of a Pentateuch arose only in the Hellenistic period because of the late Deuteronomistic idea that Moses was the only mediator of the Law.[32] For the advocates of an Enneateuch, texts like Deut 34 or Josh 24 are not considered to be conclusions. Schmitt explains the end of Deuteronomy not as a conclusion but as a transition;[33] but does a verse like "never again has a prophet arisen in Israel like Moses" (Deut 34:10), really sound like a tran-

28. Konrad Schmid, *Erzväter und Exodus: Untersuchungen zur doppelten Begründung der Ursprünge Israels innerhalb der Geschichtsbücher des Alten Testaments* (WMANT 81; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1999); ET: *Genesis and the Moses Story* (Siphrut 3; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2010); idem, "The So-Called Yahwist and the Literary Gap Between Genesis and Exodus," in Dozeman and Schmid, *A Farewell to the Yahwist?* 29–50. A similar model can be found in the work of Kratz, *Composition*.

29. A. Graeme Auld, "The Deuteronomists and the Former Prophets, or What Makes the Former Prophets Deuteronomistic?" in Schearing and McKenzie, *Those Elusive Deuteronomists*, 116–26 repr. in idem, *Samuel at the Threshold* (SOTSMS; Burlington, Vt.: Ashgate, 2004), 185–91.

30. Erik Aurelius, *Zukunft jenseits des Gerichts: Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Studie zum Enneateuch* (BZAW 319; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2003).

31. Stephen B. Chapman, "How the Biblical Canon Began: Working Models and Open Questions," in *Homer, the Bible and Beyond: Literary and Religious Canons in the Ancient World* (ed. M. Finkelberg and G. G. Stroumsa; Jerusalem Studies in Religion and Culture 2; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 29–51.

32. Schmitt, *Arbeitsbuch*, 243.

33. Hans-Christoph Schmitt, "Dtn 34 als Verbindungsstück zwischen Tetrateuch und Deuteronomistischem Geschichtswerk," in Otto and Achenbach, *Das Deuteronomium zwischen Pentateuch und Deuteronomistischem Geschichtswerk*, 181–92.

sition? And what about Josh 24? According to Aurelius the author of these texts wants to counterbalance the Deuteronomistic insistence on the Sinaitic covenant by creating a covenant in the land. For Konrad Schmid, Josh 24 was conceived as a hinge to the following story in order to create two major parts of the Primary History: the time of salvation (from the origins to the conquest) and the time of decline and judgment (from the Judges to the end of the monarchy). Schmid highlights especially Joshua's claim: "You cannot serve YHWH, for he is a holy God, he is a jealous God, he will not forgive your transgressions and your sins ..." (vv. 19–20), which indeed prepares the reader or the listener for the following story of divine judgment. Schmid also points to Judg 6:7–10 and 10:6–16, where the people are accused of worshipping other gods, transgressing Joshua's exhortation and fulfilling his prediction about Israel's incapacity to serve YHWH. There is certainly a link between these three texts. But Josh 24:19–20 is clearly an insertion, which interrupts the narrative logic of 24:18 (the people's commitment) and 24:22 (Joshua's ratifying of the commitment) and contradicts the whole point of the dialogue between Joshua and the Israelites.[34] Judges 6:7–10 and 10:6–16 are also late interpolations, which recall the style and the theology of the Chronicles; Josh 6:7–10 is absent from a fragment of a scroll of Joshua found in Qumran.[35] This means that these texts were only added after the idea of a Hexateuch was rejected, in order to integrate the scroll of Joshua definitively into the Former Prophets as the opening of *this* collection.

4.1. *Enneateuch or Pentateuch and the First Part of the Prophets?*

Do the books of Kings have a fitting conclusion? The question of the meaning of 2 Kgs 25:27–30 is still heavily debated and has been understood in very different ways: as a sign of messianic hope;[36] as a quite defeatist "no future" statement;[37] as an indication that the Deuteronomist was an archivist of

---

34. V. 21 is clearly a *Wiederaufnahme* according to Seidel's law. For v. 19–21 as insertion see also Aurelius, *Zukunft*, 175; Thomas Römer, "Das doppelte Ende des Josuabuches: Einige Anmerkungen zur aktuellen Diskussion um 'deuteronomistisches Geschichtswerk' und 'Hexateuch,'" *ZAW* 118 (2006): 523–48, esp. 539.

35. See Blum, "Literary Connection," in Dozeman and Schmid, *A Farewell to the Yahwist?* 103–4; Römer, "Ende," 546–47.

36. Gerhard von Rad, "Die deuteronomistische Geschichtstheologie in den Königsbüchern," in idem, *Gesammelte Studien*, 189–204; repr. from *Deuteronomium-Studien* (FRLANT 40; Göttingen: Vandenhoek & Ruprecht, 1947), 52–64; Jon D. Levenson, "The Last Four Verses in Kings," *JBL* 103 (1984): 353–61, Juha Pakkala, "Zedekiah's Fate and the Dynastic Succession," *JBL* 125 (2006): 443–52.

37. This was Noth's idea.

a sort;[38] or as a paradigm for the transformation of exile into Diaspora.[39] In a way the answer depends on the literary context in which one reads the ending of Kings. If one takes 2 Kgs 25:27–30 to be the conclusion of an Enneateuch, one may find in these last verses an echo of the ending of the book of Genesis, since the transformation of Jehoiachin's status reminds the reader of Joseph's career in Genesis 37–50.[40] But whereas Genesis 50 ends with the death of Joseph (and the following book relates the exodus from Egypt), the last words of 2 Kgs 25:27–30 are "all the days of his life." This may be understood as a differentiation between the Egyptian and the Babylonian Diaspora:[41] the Jews of the Babylonian Diaspora may accept life outside the land for many generations. In this perspective the end of Kings could be read as an aetiology of exile and Diaspora. One may also observe a parallel between the ending of Deuteronomy and the ending of Kings, since both end outside the land.

Nevertheless, there is no canonical evidence for an Enneateuch, so that one may ask if one should read 2 Kgs 25:27–30 or, as argued by E. A. Knauf,[42] the whole book of Kings, as a transition to the following prophetic books. In the context of the Nebiim, the book of Kings relates of course the decline and the fall of the Israelite and Judean monarchy, but in so doing it functions as an introduction to the prophetic oracles of judgment and salvation of the prophetic books. One may observe that the book of Kings contains a number of cross-references to the following books of Isaiah and Jeremiah: 2 Kgs 18–20 (Isaiah's meeting with King Hezekiah) has a parallel in Isa 36–39; 2 Kgs 22–23 (Josiah's reform) is echoed in Jehoiachim's "counter reform" (Jer 36); and 2 Kgs 25 has a parallel in Jer 52. These parallels indicate that there was a will to unite all these books into one collection. One may even observe a number of cross-references between the end of Kings and the opening of the book of Isaiah.[43] Isaiah 1:7: "Your country lies desolate, your cities are burned with

---

38. Serge Frolov, "Evil-Merodach and the Deuteronomists: The Sociohistorical Setting of Dtr in the Light of 2 Kgs 25,27–30," *Bib* 88 (2007): 174–90

39. Jeremy Schipper, "'Significant Resonances' With Mephiboshet in 2 Kings 25:27–30: A Response to Donald F. Murray," *JBL* 124 (2005): 521–29; Ronald E. Clements, "A Royal Privilege: Dining in the Presence of the Great King," in *Reflection and Refraction* (ed. R. Rezetko, T. H. Lim, and W. B. Aucker; VTSup 113; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 49–66.

40. Thomas Römer, "Transformations in Deuteronomistic and Biblical Historiography: On 'Book-Finding' and Other Literary Strategies," *ZAW* 109 (1997): 1–11.

41. There is no doubt that the Babylonian Diaspora thought of the Egyptian Jews, especially those of Elephantine, in a quite negative way (Jer 44).

42. Ernst Axel Knauf, "1–2 Rois," in *Introduction à l'Ancien Testament* (ed. T. Römer, J.-D. Macchi, and C. Nihan; MdB 49; Geneva: Labor et Fides, 2004; 2009 2nd. ed.), 384–93.

43. Konrad Schmid, "Buchtechnische und sachliche Prolegomena zur Enneateuchfrage," in Beck and Schorn, *Auf dem Weg zur Endgestalt*, 1–14, 10–12.

fire" can be read as taking up the destruction of Judah and Jerusalem (see especially 2 Kgs 25:9 where the destruction is described as burning). Isa 1:8–9: "Daughter Zion is left like a booth in a vineyard. … YHWH Sabaoth has left some survivors. …" reminds the reader of 2 Kgs 25:12, where it is said that the Babylonians had left some people in the land to be vinedressers and tillers of the soil. So Isaiah alludes to the judgment related in Kings in order to introduce a collection of oracles of doom, which are followed by oracles of salvation and restoration. These give the explicit reasons for the failure of the monarchies in Israel and Judah, but they also show that judgment is not YHWH's last word, that there is hope for a future and a gathering from all the nations. The link between the Former and the Latter Prophets may therefore be stronger than is commonly acknowledged. But how is one able to explain this link from a historical perspective?

5. FROM DEUTERONOMISTIC AND PRIESTLY LIBRARIES TO PENTATEUCH AND THE PROPHETS

For the advocates of an Enneateuch, the book of Deuteronomy presents a problem because Moses' reenactment of the Law is located apart from the Sinai revelation. Paolo Sacchi, who thinks that the Pentateuch is the "wrong problematic" and that one should speak of an Enneateuch, wants to cut Deuteronomy off from the Primary History; Konrad Schmid also thinks of Deuteronomy as a possibly very late insertion into the narrative running from Exodus through Kings.[44] But where had this scroll of Deuteronomy been preserved before it was integrated into a larger unit? The literary history of Deuteronomy may suggest that it was first conceived as an independent scroll during the seventh century B.C.E.; but when revised and supplemented during the Babylonian era, it was clearly linked to the books of Joshua–Kings, much more than to the Tetrateuch.[45] Suffice it here to list the following examples:[46] Deuteronomy 6:5 has only one exact parallel in the Hebrew Bible—2 Kgs 23:25, the characterization of King Josiah. The "law of the king" in Deut 17:14–20 prepares for the various Deuteronomistic stories about the rise of kingship in 1 Sam 8–12, as well as the stories about Solomon's

---

44. Paolo Sacchi, "Le Pentateuque, le Deutéronomiste et Spinoza," in *Congress Volume Paris 1992* (ed. J. A. Emerton; Leiden: Brill, 1995), 276–88, 286; Schmid, *Erzväter*, 164.

45. I have tried to argue for this view of the Deuteronomistic History in Thomas Römer, *The So-Called Deuteronomistic History: A Sociological, Historical and Literary Introduction* (London: T&T Clark and New York: Continuum, 2005; 2d ed., 2007).

46. Thomas Römer, "The Form-Critical Problem of the So-Called Deuteronomistic History," in *The Changing Face of Form Criticism for the Twenty-First Century* (ed. M. A. Sweeney and E. Ben Zvi; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 240–52.

decline in 1 Kgs 9–11*, and also the end of the book of Kings (the descent to Egypt). There is also evidence on the level of vocabulary that Deuteronomy–Kings was edited in the same redactional context: the frequent mention of the "other gods" (*'ĕlōhîm 'ăḥērîm*) is a standard expression in the books of Deuteronomy–Kings, but is attested only two or three times in Exodus; the same may be said of the root *š-m-d* (to destroy), which is 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 Yнwн," which occurs often in all books from Deuteronomy–Kings (28 times), but only once before (in Num 32:13). The root *k-ʿ-s (hipʿil,* "to offend") is attested in Deuteronomy and the Prophets, but not in the Tetrateuch.

These multiple links, to which others could be added, support the idea of a "Deuteronomistic Library" (not necessarily a "Deuteronomistic History," written on one scroll). This library probably also contained an older story of Moses, which may be recovered in the book of Exodus, but also some prophetic scrolls edited by the same Deuteronomistic group. The book of Jeremiah certainly underwent Deuteronomistic editing,[47] and this may also be the case for the so-called "Book of the Four," even if the Deuteronomistic character of Micah or Zephaniah is matter of debate.[48] If the idea that the Deuteronomistic Library contained some prophetic scrolls is acceptable, it would explain why the so-called Deuteronomistic History, without the book of Deuteronomy, became part of the Nebiim. This would also perhaps explain the "nonmention" of "Deuteronomistic" prophets like Jeremiah or Hosea in the Deuteronomistic History, because their books were kept together with the Deuteronomistic History.[49] We would then have two "libraries" containing scrolls that were used to construct the Pentateuch and later on the Prophets: the Deuteronomistic one, and the Priestly one.

As Christophe Nihan has shown, the original P document probably ended in Lev 16. It was supplemented by the "Holiness School," which added Lev 17–26, and which probably already had the intention to combine the Priestly

---

47. Rainer Albertz, *Israel in Exile: The History and Literature of the Sixth Century B.C.E* (trans. D. Green; Studies in Biblical Literature 3; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003); German original: *Der Exilszeit* (Biblische Enzyklopädie 7; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2001), distinguishes three Deuteronomistic editions of Jeremiah.

48. For a Deuteronomistic "Book of the Four" see James D. Nogalski, *Literary Precursors to the Book of the Twelve* (BZAW 217; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1993); for a more cautious position see Rainer Albertz, "Exile as Purification: Reconstructing the 'Book of the Four,'" in *Thematic Threads of the Book of Twelve* (ed. P. L. Reddit and A. Schart; BZAW 325; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2003), 232–51.

49. Clements, *Tradition*, 47–48.

texts with the book of Deuteronomy.[50] The removal of Deuteronomy from the Deuteronomistic Library is due to the fact that the coherence of the Torah as a compromise or consensus between the Priestly and the lay party was found in the figure of Moses. When Deuteronomy became the conclusion of the Torah, it acquired a new status: it was now considered to provide an explanation for the Sinai revelation.[51] The origin of the Pentateuch was, according to this model, the partition of Deuteronomy from the following books.

If one follows this model, the idea of an original Enneateuch should be rejected. But this does not mean that efforts were not made by the guardians of the Pentateuch and those of the first collection of the Nebiim to strengthen the links between both collections: the introduction to the exodus story in Exod 1:6–8[52] is written in analogy to Judg 2:6–10; and during the second century B.C.E., there was an attempt to introduce in Genesis–Kings a chronology that is related to the dedication of the temple in 164 B.C.E.; but which is, with the exception of 1 Kgs 6:1, apparently limited to the Pentateuch.[53] There might have been a conception of reading Genesis–Kings as an "epic story," but not of making this story into a canonical unit, since it did not really end with Kings, but was followed by the Latter Prophets.

6. INSTEAD OF A CONCLUSION: SOME OPEN QUESTIONS

6.1. How Do We Define Literary Introductions, Conclusions and Transitions?

As we have already seen, only two books in the Pentateuch have an "absolute" beginning: Gen 1:1 and Deut 1:1–5. In the Former Prophets only 1 Sam 1:1 looks like the beginning of a new story. Joshua 1:1 and Judg 1:1 feature similar literary constructions, but are closely related to the foregoing book by the first words "after the death of Moses" (Josh 1:1) and "after the death of Joshua" (Judg 1:1). If one accepts this line of argument,[54] then we would

---

50. Christophe Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch: A Study in the Composition of the Book of Leviticus* (FAT II/25; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007).

51. For the question of the function of Deuteronomy in the Pentateuch see Otto, "The Pentateuch in Synchronical and Diachronical Perspectives," 14–35.

52. According to Christoph Levin, *Der Jahwist* (FRLANT 157; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993), 315, Exod 1:1–7 was written later than the pentateuchal redaction.

53. See especially Jeremy Hughes, *Secrets of the Times: Myth and History in Biblical Chronology* (JSOTSup 66; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1990), who also addresses the difficult problem of the differences between MT, LXX and Sam. Apparently MT depends on a Priestly chronology which tried to situate the dedication of the temple in the year 4000 and the Exodus in 2666 (see ibid., 43–45).

54. Which is not really formalistic, but based on the formulation of the opening;

have, on the level of introductions, evidence for a Pentateuch (if Deut 34 is an ending) or an Enneateuch; for a Deuteronomistic History (Deuteronomy–Kings); and maybe for a story about the monarchy in Samuel–Kings.

The question of conclusions seems even more complicated. Deuteronomy 34 is without a doubt a conclusion, at least on the canonical level, since this is the last chapter of the Torah as it stands. But some authors have challenged the idea that this chapter had always functioned in this fashion. Chapman, following Schmitt, thinks that Moses' description as the greatest of all prophets serves to correlate the Torah with the Prophets.[55] But this correlation could also function as a qualitative distinction; which would still speak in favor of conceiving Deut 34 as a conclusion, but as the conclusion of a literary work that indicates the existence of other literary collections. The case of Josh 24 and 2 Kgs 25 is still more difficult, since we have no canonical evidence for an independent Hexateuch or Deuteronomistic History. But even if Josh 24 does not conclude a Hexateuch, as I have argued, it is at least conceived as a conclusion to the book of Joshua: it clearly interrupts the Deuteronomistic transition, in which Josh 23 was followed directly by Judg 2:6. The function of 2 Kgs 25:27–30 depends on whether these verses are considered to be the conclusion of the "exilic" version of the Deuteronomistic History, or whether they were a later addition. If this history ended with 2 Kgs 25:21 ("Judah was exiled from its land") or with 2 Kgs 25:26 ("all the people … went to Egypt") as is sometimes argued, then 2 Kgs 25:27–30 could encompass an Enneateuch, but an Enneateuch which was probably already followed by some Prophetic scrolls.

6.2. How Many Scrolls for the "Larger Literary Units"?

When scholars speak about a Pentateuch, Hexateuch, Deuteronomistic History or Enneateuch, they most often think of one scroll comprising the whole;[56] especially for the Pentateuch it is commonly accepted that its separation in five scrolls only occurred at a very late stage of its formation. But if one perceives the different Torah references to the patriarchs as belonging to a pentateuchal redaction, it is of interest that these passages occur in all five books; so that one may then ask whether the pentateuchal redactors are not presupposing a collection of several scrolls, which they try to bind together more closely. The length of the five books of the Torah also speaks against the

---

for a formalistic approach see Wolfgang Schneider, "Und es begab sich …: Anfänge von Erzählungen im Biblischen Hebräisch," *BN* 70 (1993): 62–87.

55. Chapman, "How the Biblical Canon Began," 41.

56. Schmid, "Prolegomena," 5–7, for instance, tries to show that one scroll containing the whole Enneateuch is materially possible.

idea of a quite mechanical division for strictly practical reasons. It is immediately clear that each book of the Torah has its own profile. This is especially the case for Genesis and Deuteronomy, whereas Exodus and Leviticus are more closely connected.[57]

If one thinks more about scrolls as being kept together in vessels made of clay, the question of the larger literary units becomes a bit less exclusive. If there was, for instance, a Deuteronomistic Library with different scrolls including some prophetic ones, one can easily understand that these scrolls were not necessarily revised altogether at the same time or by the same person. It is also understandable that it would have been easy to transfer Deuteronomy and Joshua into another vessel in which priests and Deuteronomists collected the scrolls of the future Torah.

6.3. Intertextuality and Comprehensive Redactions

Finally I would like to address a methodological issue: How can we distinguish comprehensive redactional activity from restricted additions that are limited to one or two passages, or from cases of intertextuality, which do not necessarily imply redactional activities. One may, for instance, observe that the story of Jephthah sacrificing his daughter has many parallels with the Aqedah story in Gen 22, but this does not mean that the author of Judg 11 wrote his story in the context of an Enneateuch. Does the obvious relation between Exod 32 and 1 Kgs 12 support the idea of an Enneateuch? One could also argue that Exod 32 was written (or revised) in order to integrate "Jeroboam's sin" into the Torah, maintaining that the former Deuteronomistic History had become "secondary" after the publication of the Pentateuch and the separation of Deuteronomy from the following books. In order to discern comprehensive redactions, several stylistic and thematic observations should coalesce. We have seen that Schmitt emphasizes a "faith-redaction" whose horizon would be the Enneateuch; if, however, one examines the passages he quotes, they are all limited, with one exception (2 Kgs 17:14), to the books of (Genesis,) Exodus, Numbers and Deuteronomy.[58] Is that enough evidence? Otto has observed that it is quite easy to distinguish several themes or motifs that bind together Genesis–Deuteronomy or Joshua;[59] I would add Deuteronomy–Kings as well, but it seems difficult to me to find evidence of

---

57. See on this also Blenkinsopp, *Pentateuch*, 45.

58. Quite on the same theological level are Exod 4:1–9; 14:31; 19:9; Num 14:11; Deut 1:31; 9:32; and 1 Kgs 17:14 (the case of Gen 15:1 is difficult to decide); the other occurrences of the root refer to very different meanings.

59. Otto, *Deuteronomium*, 219: "If one wants to claim a literary unit that includes after Joshua 24 the rest of the Former Prophets, one should explain why such chains (like

an Enneateuch redaction. Priestly passages occur in 1 Kgs 6–8, but this is not enough to posit a thoroughgoing Priestly redaction of the Enneateuch.[60] On the redactional level, there is almost no evidence for an Enneateuch.

Should we then be happy with Torah and Nebiim and give up the idea of other larger literary units? This option does not take into account that Torah and Nebiim both have forerunners that did not totally disappear after the publication of the Torah. The so-called "historical Psalms" and other historical summaries refer to a Pentateuch (Ps 95), a Hexateuch (Ps 105; Ps 114), maybe even a Tetrateuch (Ps 136),[61] or an Enneateuch (Jer 32; Pss 78, 80, 106).[62] As in any library, it would have been possible to take out or to combine all or only part of the scrolls of the Persian period temple library. And it was also possible to focus on different scrolls depending of the context in which they were used, edited and finally read.

Gen 50:25f.–Exod 13:19–Josh 24:32) do not extend further then Joshua 24" (my translation).

60. See for these the interesting explanations of Reinhard Achenbach, "Der Pentateuch, seine theokratischen Bearbeitungen und Josua–2 Könige," in Römer and Schmid. *Les dernières rédactions*, 225–53.

61. It is also possible that Psalm 136 has in mind a Hexateuch, or even a "Heptateuch," including Judges.

62. This listing is a bit arbitrary because these texts do not cover all traditions of the larger units they are referring to; for some Psalms it is difficult to decide which "great story" they are summarizing.