The Formative Impact of the Hexateuch Redaction

An Interim Result

Rainer Albertz

Jean Luis Ska, whom I would like to pass my warmest congratulations for his 70th birthday with this article, is one of the most sensitive and most thoughtful scholars of our Old Testament academic community. His "Introduction to Reading the Pentateuch" offers the readers deep insights into the literary and compositional problems of the Torah, which are going far beyond the answers given by the traditional Source Theory.[1] In several detailed studies he has questioned the long-lasting prejudice that non-priestly passages of the Pentateuch should almost be regarded as of pre-priestly origin. On the contrary, they can come from much later, post-exilic times.[2]

One of the non-priestly redactional layers, of which a post-priestly origin is acknowledged by several scholars, is the "Hexateuch redaction" (HexR), which is supposed to have combined the books of Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, and Joshua with each other, before the Pentateuch was finally created.[3] As far as I see, there are, however, three main reasons

---

[1] See J.-L. SKA, *Introduction to Reading the Pentateuch* (trans. P. Dominique; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2006); cf. the French edition IDEM, *Introduction à la lecture du Pentateuque: Clés pour l'interprétation des cinq premiers livres de la Bible* (trans. F. Vermorel; Éditions Lessius, Bruxelles: cerf, 2000).

[2] Cf. e.g. J.-L. SKA, "Exodus 19:3–6 and the Identity of Post-exilic Israel," in *The Exegesis of the Pentateuch: Exegetical Studies and Basic Questions* (ed. IDEM; FAT 66; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009), 139–164; J.-L. SKA, "Some Groundwork in Genesis 15," in *The Exegesis of the Pentateuch: Exegetical Studies and Basic Questions* (ed. IDEM; FAT 66; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009), 67–81.

[3] See E. BLUM, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch* (BZAW 189; Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 1990), 363–365; E. BLUM, "Pentateuch – Hexateuch – Enneateuch? oder: Woran erkennt man ein literarisches Werk in der hebräischen Bibel?," in *Textgestalt und Komposition: Exegetische Beiträge zu Tora und Vordere Propheten* (ed. IDEM; FAT 69; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 375–404, here 386–404; 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), 210–211; T.C. RÖMER, "Deuteronomium 34 zwischen Pentateuch, Hexateuch und deuteronomistischem Geschichtswerk," *ZAR* 5 (1999), 167–178; T.C. RÖMER and M.Z. BRETTLER, "Deuteronomy 34 and the Case for a Persian Hexateuch," *JBL* 119

why the existence of such a HexR is not generally accepted among Old Tes-
tament scholars. First, several scholars still conclude their view from the
thematic link between Israel's exodus from Egypt and its conquest into the
promised land (cf. Exod 3:8) that there must have been an original literary
connection, although a pre-Dtr. narrative thread from Numbers to Joshua is
difficult to establish.[4] Second, the textual scale of the HexR is not yet settled.
Erhard Blum, on the one hand, restricted its scale – apart from the concluding
chapter Josh 24 – on a limited number of short passages in Gen and Exod,
which has to do with the transport and the burial of Joseph's bones at She-
chem and some other motifs.[5] Because of this limited scale, Blum does not
speak of a Hexateuch redaction, but preferred to call it a "Jos-24-Bear-
beitung", earlier,[6] or a "Hexateuch-Bearbeitung" recently.[7] Consequently, it is
not surprising that Reinhard G. Kratz doubted whether such a few and scat-
tered motifs from Gen to Josh could create an extended redactional unit as the

---

(2000), 401–419; T. RÖMER, "La fin de l'historiographie deutéronomiste et la retour de
l'Hexateuque?," *ThZ* 57 (2001), 269–280; E. OTTO, *Das Deuteronomium im Pentateuch
und Hexateuch* (FAT 30; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000), 103, 131, 243–245; E. OTTO,
"Forschungen zum nachpriesterschriftlichen Pentateuch," *ThR* 67 (2002), 125–155, here
139–148; E. OTTO, "Pentateuch," *RGG⁴* 6.1089–1102, here 1100–1102; R. ACHENBACH,
"Pentateuch, Hexateuch und Enneateuch," *ZAR* 11 (2005), 122–154.

[4] See for example E. ZENGER *et al.*, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (5th edition;
Kohlhammer Studienbücher 1,1; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2004), 101–103; C. FREVEL, "Die
Wiederkehr der Hexateuchperspektive. Eine Herausforderung für die These vom deutero-
nomistischen Geschichtswerk," in *Das deuteronomistische Geschichtswerk* (ed. H.-J.
Stipp; ÖBS 39; Frankfurt: Lang, 2011), 13–53, here 25–31; E.A. KNAUF, *Josua* (ZBK.AT
6; Zürich: TVZ, 2008), 17–21; R.G. KRATZ, *Die Komposition der erzählenden Bücher des
Alten Testaments: Grundwissen Bibelkritik* (UTB 2157; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ru-
precht, 2000), 219–221, 286–303, 320–321. While Zenger, Frevel, and Knauf just postu-
late an early literary connection between Gen or Exod–Num and Josh, Kratz tries to
demonstrate a thin narrative thread running from Num 25:1a to Josh 2:1; 3:1 (including
just Deut 34:5–6), based on the local name Šiṭṭîm. It will turn out, however, that Josh 2:1;
3:1 belong to the secondary HexR, see below. Cf. also the critical remarks of ACHENBACH,
"Pentateuch" (see n. 3), 126–145, about his position.

[5] Thus, Gen 31:21aβ; 33:19; 35:1–7*; 48:21–22; 50:24–26; Exod 1:5b–6, 8; 13:19, see
E. BLUM, "Die literarische Verbindung von Erzvätern und Exodus: Ein Gespräch mit
neueren Endredaktionshypothesen," in *Abschied vom Jahwisten: Die Komposition des
Hexateuch in der jüngsten Diskussion* (ed. J.C. Gertz *et al.*; BZAW 315; Berlin and New
York: de Gruyter, 2002), 119–156, here 145–151; and E. BLUM, "The Literary Connection
Between the Books of Genesis and Exodus and the End of the Book of Joshua," in *A
Farewell to the Yahwist? The Composition of the Pentateuch in Recent European Interpre-
tation* (ed. T.B. Dozeman and K. Schmid; SBL.S 34; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 89–106, here
96–106.

[6] See BLUM, *Studien* (see n. 3), 363.

[7] See BLUM, "Verbindung" (see n. 5), 251.

Hexateuch.[8] On the other hand, Eckart Otto grants the HexR an important role in the formation of the six books. According to him, it is the Hexateuch redactor, who connected the amplified priestly source (P^G and P^S from Gen 1 to Lev 16*) with the Dtr. edited Deuteronomy, which was already connected with Joshua at this time. Thus, not only the oldest stratum of the book of Numbers, but all those texts which focus on the inheritance of the promised land (e.g. Gen 15; Deut 31:1–8; Josh 24) belong to him.[9] Thus, Otto thinks of an influential redaction, but – almost ignoring stylistic criteria – he has some difficulties to distinguish it from other non-priestly redactional layers[10] and never published a comprehensive list of those passages, which he would attribute to it. Thus, in Otto's model, the HexR remains rather vague. Third, the HexR suffers from the fact that its location in the formation process of the Pentateuch is not yet settled. While Otto thinks of a relative early phase, when Deut-Josh was connected with the still separated priestly source (Gen 1–Lev 16) for the first time, Blum moved it near to the end of the formation process, just before the book of Joshua was cut away and the Pentateuch was established.

Elaborating my commentary on Exodus,[11] I became aware of the fact that the HexR has shaped the formation of this book much more than just inserting those few verses dealing with Joseph's death and physical remains (Exod 1:5b–6, 8; 13:19), which Blum had attributed to it. Thus, I would like to try expanding the list of those passages, which can be assigned to the HexR with some degree of probability, using not only thematic, but also stylistic and compositional criteria. All these passages ought to be secondary in their context, should be written in a similar style – as far as no given material is cited – and should pursue similar interests. By doing this, I intend to foster the HexR hypothesis, although the results will be only preliminary, because I have not studied all the books of the Hexateuch with the same degree of intensity so far. Finally, I will make some suggestions about the possible date of HexR and its concerns.

---

[8] See R.G. KRATZ, "Der vor- und der nachpriesterliche Hexateuch," in *Abschied vom Jahwisten: Die Komposition des Hexateuch in der jüngsten Diskussion* (ed. J.C. Gertz *et al.*; BZAW 315; Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 2002), 295–323, here 302–303. At any rate, Kratz admits that those verses, which deal with the transport and burial of Joseph's bones at Shechem (Gen 33:18–19; 50:25–26; Exod 13:19; Josh 24:32) draw a "redactional bow" around the Hexateuch.

[9] See the recent overview in E. OTTO, "Deuteronomiumstudien III: Die literarische Entstehung und Geschichte des Buches Deuteronomium als Teil der Tora," *ZAR* 17 (2011), 79–132, here 101–103.

[10] Cf. OTTO, "Deuteronomiumstudien III" (see n. 9), 106, where he admits that the HexR often cannot be distinguished from the Pentateuch redaction in Deuteronomy.

[11] See R. ALBERTZ, *Exodus: Band I: Ex 1–18* (vol. I.; ZBK.AT 2.1; Zürich: TVZ, 2012) and R. ALBERTZ, *Exodus: Band II: Ex 19–40* (vol. II.; ZBK.AT 2.2; Zürich: TVZ, 2015).

1. The HexR in Genesis

Gen 15:13–17a; 31:21aβ; 33:19; 35:1–4; 48:21–22; 50:24–26.

In the book of Genesis, the HexR is restricted to the patriarchal story, as far
as I see. Most of the passages named above are already attributed to it by
Blum.[12] In his earlier study on the patriarchal composition, Blum assigned all
those passages, which prepare the burial of Joseph's bones at Shechem (Gen
33:19; 48:21–22; 50:24–26; cf. Josh 24:32) to his late Dtr. redaction D.[13]
When he later discovered his "Jos-24-Bearbeitung" he attributed Gen 50:25–
26 to it, but tried to keep the Gen 50:24 for D,[14] because the land oath to the
patriarchs is typical for it (cf. 15:18; 26:3; Exod 13:11; 32:13; 33:1b; Deut
34:4). The verses 50:24–26, however, form a chiasm and cannot be divided as
Blum accepted later. This example points out that the HexR can borrow some
stylistic elements from D and seems to presuppose it. Since it has become
more and more clear that Blum's KD followed the earlier stages of the priest-
ly composition (KP),[15] the division of late non-priestly texts between D and
HexR is one of the main tasks for future investigations.

   The thesis that Gen 33:19, where Jacob buys a field near Shechem, and
50:24–26, where Joseph take an oath from his brothers to carry his bones
with them, when they will leave Egypt, belong to a motif chain, which con-
nects the books of Genesis and Exodus with the book of Joshua, is generally
accepted. In Exod 13:19 the oath has been explicitly fulfilled, and in Josh
24:32 Gen 33:19 is cited, when Joseph's bones are buried just on this spot.
Both passages are secondary to their contexts: Gen 33:19 interrupts the se-
quence of 33:18 and 20 (cf. the cross-reference *šām*); and the little scene
50:24–26 repeatedly introduces Joseph, after his descendents have already
been mentioned (vv. 22b–23). Probably 48:21–22 also belongs to this motif
chain,[16] a clause added to the blessing of Ephraim and Manasse. Verse 21

---

[12] See BLUM, "Verbindung" (see n. 5), 153; Idem, "Connection" (see n. 5), 96–98.

[13] E. BLUM, *Die Komposition der Vätergeschichte* (WMANT 37; Neukirchen-Vluyn:
Neukirchener Verlag, 1984), 39–44, 255–257, 392.

[14] BLUM, *Studien* (see n. 3), 363.

[15] J.C. GERTZ, *Tradition und Redaktion in der Exoduserzählung: Untersuchungen zur
Endredaktion des Pentateuch* (FRLANT 186; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000),
305–327, has shown that Exod 4:1–17 presupposes P, accepted by Blum, "Connection"
(see n. 5), 94–95. R. ALBERTZ, "Ex 33,7–11, ein Schlüsseltext für die Rekonstruktion der
Redaktionsgeschichte des Pentateuch," *BN* N.F. 149 (2011), 13–43, has argued that the
oracle tent of Exod 33:7–11, one of the central motifs of Blum's KD (cf. BLUM, *Studien*
[see n. 3], 73–88), presupposes the priestly tabernacle.

[16] Here I am now ready to follow Blum, "Connection" (see n. 5), 97, although I had at-
tributed Gen 48:21 to the second version of the exilic patriarchal narrative before, see R.

prepares the death motif of 50:24 and announces the exodus in the way of a return (*šūb* hi.) to the land of the fathers, just as Joseph's skeleton would return home. Gen 48:22 takes up a variant tradition, how Joseph, including his descendants, inherits from Jacob the area of Shechem (cf. Josh 24:32b).

The isolated little scene Gen 35:1–4,[17] where Jacob advises his family to bury the foreign gods being among them at the terebinth-tree of Shechem, before they would arrive at Bethel, prepares the peculiar idea of Josh 24:2, 14–15 that the patriarchs venerated foreign gods beyond the Euphrates, by which the author of HexR interprets the story of Laban's household gods (*t^erāpîm*) stolen by Rahel (Gen 31:19, 34, 35). The rare expression *^ælohê hannekār* of Gen 35:2, 4 is used also in Josh 24:23, where Gen 35:2bα is nearly verbally cited. The terebinth-tree of v. 4 is also mentioned in Josh 24:26. The little note in Gen 31:21aβ that Jacob actually passed the Euphrates on his way home probably belongs to the same concept. Thus, we meet corresponding ideas, by which the HexR actualized the patriarchal tradition in Gen and Josh in a specific way.

The little scene Gen 50:24–26, where Joseph's last will and death is reported, reveals that the author of the HexR is interested in doing some compositional work. On the one hand, he provides the book of Genesis with a clear conclusion; on the other hand, he offers an outlook onto the future, referring verbally to Exod 3:16 in Gen 50:24, 25. A comparable outlook on the future course of salvation history can be found in Gen 15:13–17a, a divine speech, which is – as the presumptive repetition of v. 12aα in 17a shows – a clear insertion into the covenant ceremony.[18] Here Abraham is informed by God that he would die in peace, but his descendants would suffer as immigrants into a foreign country for 400 years, until the fourth generation would return home with a lot of property. The text intends to give an overview of the entire complicated salvation history told in the Hexateuch, in which the Israelites, whom had been liberated from the Egyptian suppression, would conquer just that land where their forefathers already had lived. The long delay of the fulfillment of the land promise given to Abraham (v. 18) is explained as the result of God's will. It has to do with the fact that the guilt of the Amorites has not reached the level that they could be defeated by the Israelites (v. 16b). This far reaching theological speculation almost speaks a

ALBERTZ, "Die Josephsgeschichte im Pentateuch," in *Diasynchron: Beträge zur Exegese, Theologie und Rezeption der Hebräischen Bibel* (ed. T. Naumann and R Hunziker-Rodewald; FS Walter Dietrich; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2009), 11–36, here 31.

[17] Blum, "Verbindung" (see n. 5), 153, specifies the unit as Gen 35:1–7*. In my view, Gen 35:5a, 6–8 altogether can be assigned to the expanded Jacob story; v. 5b seems to be intruded with the insertion of Gen 34.

[18] This opinion was strongly confirmed by SKA, "Groundwork" (see n. 2), 78–80.

non-priestly language, but uses some priestly expressions and data.[19] Thus, it presupposes the priestly edition of the book of Genesis. Moreover, it clearly presupposes the story of Gen 15*, which can be assigned to the post-priestly and late Dtr. layer D.[20] There are three reasons why the passage can probably attributed to the HexR: First, its compositional function, second, the concept that the conquest is presented as a return (šub) home, which agrees with 48:21, and third, that the earlier inhabitants of the country are called Amorites as in many places of this redaction.[21] The statement about the guilt of the Amorites in 15:16b can directly be applied to Sihon story Num 21:21–32, which will turn out to belong to the HexR likewise.[22]

2. The HexR in Exodus

Exod 1:1b, (deleting "Joseph" in v. 3), 5b–6, 8; 3:4b, 6a, 12aβ–15, 16aβ; 4:5; 13:17–19; 15:1–5, 14, 15b; 18:1–27; 33:18–23.		
Integrated material:		
YHWH hymn	Exod 15: [...] 6–18*	late 7th century, Judah

Konrad Schmid and Jan Christian Gertz have shown that the priestly source (P[G]), whom I call the first priestly editor (PB[1]), constructed the first bridge between the patriarchal and the exodus story[23] by sketching the development of how from the small Jacob family, which came to Egypt, the huge Israelite people emerged (Exod 1:1–5a*, 7). This clear idea is unnecessarily complicated by the information that not all the sons came to Egypt together with Jacob (v. 1b), but Joseph was already there (v. 5b).[24] It is given just for the reason to tell that Joseph, his brothers and all their contemporary generation

---

[19] Cf. the use of the nomen r[e]kuš in Gen 15:14 with 12:5; 13:6; 36:7; 46:6, and the expression b[e]šêbâ ṭôbâ in 15:15 with 25:8. The 400 years lasting stay in Egypt reminds of the 430 years of Ex 12:41, the fourth generation of Gen 50:23.

[20] See e.g. BLUM, Komposition (see n. 13), 363–383.

[21] Cf. Gen 48:22; Num 21:13; 21:21–34; 22:2; Josh 2:10; 5:1; 7:7; 24:8, 11–12, 15, 18.

[22] See below.

[23] See SCHMID, Erzväter (see n. 3), 152–153, and GERTZ, Tradition (see n. 15), 352–366. The thesis was accepted by BLUM, "Verbindung" (see n. 5), 145–149, who earlier had ascribed the connection to KD.

[24] Probably the priestly list originally contained the name of Joseph next to Benjamin in Ex 1:3 (cf. Gen 35:22b–26), which was secondarily deleted, when the verses Exod 1:1b, 5b were added. For more details and the textual problems produced by v. 5b see ALBERTZ, Exodus I (see n. 11), 39–46.

died (v. 6) with the effect that the new king of Egypt, who came up, did not know anything of Joseph's beneficial deeds for the country (v. 8). Thus, the suppression of the Israelites in Egypt told in the exodus story becomes better understandable. Since these verses lean against the priestly list, they cannot constitute a pre-priestly connection between the Joseph and the exodus story. Their later date becomes apparent from the fact that the transition from one epoch to the other is modeled according to the Dtr. description of how all things changed after the death of Joshua in the period of Judges (Judg 2:8, 10). Taking the recourse to Joseph into account, already Blum suggested that Exod 1:5b–6, 8 are written by the same redactor as Gen 50:24–26.[25] Thus, these verses, including v. 1b, can be ascribed to the HexR, that structured the transition from the time of the patriarchs to the period of exodus as a deep political change to a new epoch.

The work of the HexR in the book of Exodus, however, is not restricted to these few verses (apart from Exod 13:19). Within the vocation story (Exod 3–4), there are several references back to the gods of the patriarchs (3:6a, [13], 15, 16aβ; 4:5), which all belong to secondary passages of these chapters.[26] God's self introduction in 3:6a comes too late, after he has already spoken to Moses in v. 5. Together with the call of v. 4b, which interrupts the connection between v. 4a and 5, it takes up the wording of YHWH's revelation to Jacob in Gen 46:2–3. YHWH presents himself to Moses not only as the gods of the three patriarchs, but also as the god of his own father, who is nearly unknown in the older tradition (cf. Exod 2:1). Gertz has shown that the passage 3:12aβ–15, which diverts the topic of Moses' unworthiness (v. 11) to the question of which god has sent him with his mission of liberation, is to be regarded as a secondary insertion.[27] The reference in 3:16aβ, which identifies the god of the forefathers of the exodus generation with those of the patriarchs, distorts the syntactical coherence. Finally, the syntactically incomplete note of 4:5, which diverts the people's belief from Moses' credibility (v. 1) to the belief in the fact that the gods of the patriarchs have revealed themselves to him, clearly shows a secondary character. This last passage is important for identifying the author of all these intrusions. Since it already presupposes the post-priestly expansion of the vocation story in Exod 4:1–17, which can be attributed to the late-Dtr. D redaction,[28] he must belong to a very late phase of Pentateuch formation, similar to the addition in Gen 15:13–17a. The observation that all these passages intend to construct compositional links between the books of Genesis and Exodus presenting YHWH's revela-

---

[25] See BLUM, "Verbindung" (see n. 5), 149–151, and "Connection" (see n. 5), 104–106.

[26] For more details see ALBERTZ, *Exodus I* (see n. 11), 67–90.

[27] See GERTZ, *Tradition* (see n. 15), 292–298.

[28] Cf. the belief motif in Exod 4:1, 8, 9 and 4:31; 14:31; 19:9; Num 14:11 and ALBERTZ, *Exodus I* (see n. 11), 72–77, 89–99.

tion to Moses as a continuation and concluding highlight of all those revela-
tions given to the patriarchs, pleads for the HexR. Although its author has
emphasized the political break between the epoch of the patriarchs and that of
the exodus fathers (Exod 1:6, 8), he stresses the theological continuity bet-
ween the two eras.

The note in Exod 13:19 that Moses took Joseph's bones with him and so
fulfilled the oath taken from Joseph's brothers (Gen 50:25) is generally ac-
cepted to belong to some kind of HexR. Not always it is seen, however, that
this note seamlessly belongs to the entire passage 13:17–19, which interrupts
the narrative connection between 13:20 and 12:37 in the older Exodus com-
position (K^{EX}). God's fundamental, but little belated reflection about the right
way for Israel's wandering, which already looks forward to the problems told
in book of Numbers (Num 14:3–4), has a clear compositional function. It
intends to mark the beginning of the period of Israel's wandering through the
desert as its end will be indicated in Num 20:14–17. Thus, the interest of the
HexR in structuring Israel's foundation history becomes apparent again.[29]

Having this compositional interest in mind, the HexR also seems to be the
best candidate for having inserted the song of Moses (Exod 15:1–18) into the
book of Exodus. While in vv. 6–18* a given YHWH hymn seems to be in-
cluded, almost formulated in the 2nd person singular, the verses 1–5, which
speak of YHWH in the 3rd person alluding to the psalms (e.g. Ps 118:14, 28)
and to the pre-priestly and priestly context (Exod 14:4, 7, 25), are rather
composed by the redactor himself. Since he lets Moses speak of the "God of
my father", which reminds of God's revelation to him in 3:6a and because he
opens with the second part of the hymn a conquest perspective probably em-
phasized by himself in 15:14, 15b, there are good reasons for identifying him
with the Hexateuchal editor. The introduction 15:1aα reminds of a similar
introduction of the well song in Num 21:17–18, which may have also been
inserted by him. With the song of Moses, which provides Israel's salvation at
the Reed Sea with a mythological background, the HexR created a strong
compositional marker, which emphasized this event over all other miracles
which happened during Israel's liberation from Egypt.[30] The HexR seems to
have presupposed the insertion of the short Miriam song in Exod 15:19–21 by
the priestly editor (PB^1), which may have originally followed 14:30.

Exod 18, too, has a late origin, because the chapter is not integrated in the
pre-priestly (Exod 15:22, 27; 16:1aα; 17:1b; 19:2aα, b) and the priestly itine-
raries (16:1aβb; 17:1a; 19:1, 2aβ), through which all other stories around are
lined up. Moreover, its statements that Moses has two sons and has sent his
wife back to her father contradict what is told by the older Moses story in

---

[29] With this structuring the HexR contradicted the priestly editor (PB^1), who had relo-
cated the events at the Reed Sea to Egypt (cf. Exod 14:2) because of theological reasons.

[30] For more details see ALBERTZ, *Exodus I* (see n. 11), 235–236, 248–255.

2:22 and 4:20a.[31] The two connected scenes of this chapter[32] can only be understood from its compositional function: The first scene (18:1–12), where Moses tells his father-in-law all the divine miracles which led to Israel's liberation, and all the tribulation (*t^elā'â*) the people had to suffer in the desert (v.8), and where Jethro praised YHWH's salvific power over all other gods (vv. 9–11), looks back to all events of the exodus and wanderings. With this, the first part of the book of Exodus is concluded. The second scene (18:13–27), where Jethro gives his son-in-law some good pieces of advise, how he could be relieved from his judicial duties in order to convey and teach the divine law to the people, looks forward to the revelations on Sinai. Thus, it prepares the second part of the book. That this compositional axis for the book of Exodus was probably written by the author of the HexR becomes apparent from two observations: First, in 18:4 he spoke of the god of Moses' father as he had done in 3:6a and 15:2. Second, the little strange sign given to Moses in his reworking of the vocation story (3:12aβb), namely that the Israelites would venerate God after their liberation at the mountain of God, became true in 18:12, where a sacrificial meal of Israel's leaders, together with Jethro, at that very mountain (v. 5) is mentioned. The chapter reveals that the HexR intended to stress the positive function which those strangers, who showed piety and solidarity with Israel, played in the foundation history of the people.

Finally, the secondary character of the little scene in Exod 33:18–23, which interprets the revelatory statements of its older context (33:11, 17; 34:5–7) is generally accepted.[33] Since the divine statements of 33:20, 23 oppose and restrict the claim of the late Dtr. redactor D, that Moses has spoken with YHWH "from face to face" at the Tent of Meeting (33:7–11), the date of the scene moves in a very late period, where the HexR is situated. One characteristic feature of the passage enables to make a closer assignment. In 33:19 YHWH reveals his identity to Moses with the words: "I will be gracious to whom I will be gracious, and I will have compassion on whom I will have compassion" interpreting his statement of 34:6. The rare *idem-per-idem* formulation reminds of YHWH's self-characteristic in 3:14 "I will be who I will be", which could be assigned to the HexR because of different reasons.[34] His reworking of Exod 3–4 shows that the author of this redaction is interested in the innermost characteristics of the deity. While solemnly stating in 3:15 that YHWH has demonstrated his faithfulness as the god of the patriarchs in the past, the author emphasized in v. 14 that YHWH will be present in the future, but his freedom cannot be restricted (v. 14). Compared with that

---

[31] The plural "his sons" in Exod 4:20 is a secondary alignment.

[32] For more details see ALBERTZ, *Exodus I* (see n. 11), 296–314.

[33] See for more details ALBERTZ, *Exodus II* (see n. 11).

[34] See above.

statement Exod 33:19 shows some progress in the divine revelation: YHWH reveals his innermost mercy and compassion, but demonstrated his freedom through bestowing them upon Israel, even after it has fallen into sin. Thus, the passage Exod 33:18–23 fits the speculation about continuity and change of the divine within the HexR.

3. The HexR in Numbers

Num 10:28b–32; 20:14–21, 23b(without *le 'mor*); 21:13aβb, 17a, 21–35; 22:2, 3b, 6aα$_2$; 24:8a, 14b–19.		
Integrated material:		
Well song	Num 21:17b–18	
Hesbon song	Num 21:27–30	7th or 6th century BCE
Deut 3:1–3	Num 21:33–35	moved forward from the DtrH
Balaam story	Num 22:2–24:14a, 25*	6th century (?) BCE

The non-priestly texts of the book of Numbers starts with a little scene, in which Moses begged Hobab, the son of his father-in-law, for accompanying Israel during its wanderings from Mount Sinai to the promised land and promised to give him a share in all the goods that YHWH will give Israel (Num 10:29–32). The scene stands in an isolated position because Hobab is not mentioned elsewhere in the Pentateuch and his requested function of guiding Israel during its wanderings competes with the concept of guidance by the divine cloud or the cultic ark developed in the priestly (9:15–23) and the non-priestly context (10:33–36). The scene obtains its sense only from its compositional function of forming a frame with Exod 18 around the Sinai pericope, the last passage, where Moses' father-in-law is mentioned (Exod 18:1–2, 5, 12, 14, 17). That he is not called Jethro, but Reguel, does not matter; this can be understood as a deliberate balancing of different given traditions (2:18 against 3:1; 4:18). While the pious and helpful father-in-law is given a farewell to go "to his own country" (18:27), his son is hindered from going "to its own country and its own people" (Num 10:30–31), but invited to

join Israel.[35] Thus, there are verbal and conceptional links with Exod 18; so there are good reasons to attribute the scene to the HexR. Since the strange clause Num 10:28b, which only consists of one word *wayyissāʿû* "then" or "when they departed", functions as an transition from the subscription of the priestly description of the departure order (10:18–28a) to the Hobab scene, it was probably written by the author of the HexR as well. This would include that the HexR already presuppose the first priestly layer of the book of Numbers (PB[3]), which shows already some influence from the late-Dtr. layer D[36] and therefore postdates the priestly layers of the books of Exodus and Leviticus (PB[1] and PB[2]).[37]

The story of how the king of Edom refused Israel's march through his country (Num 20:14–21) clearly interrupts the priestly Meriba story (20:1–13), which motivates Aaron's immediate (20:22–29) and Moses' later death (Deut 32:48–52).[38] The non-priestly author, who inserted it, felt obliged to take from the priestly story (Num 20:1) the Kadesh location (v. 14), but had difficulties to align this place, located in the southwestern Negev, with Edom's traditional home in southeastern Transjordan. Thus he formulated Moses' message to the king of Edom in v. 16: "And now we are here at Kadesh, a town next to your frontier (*qᵉṣê gᵉbûlækâ*)," which sounds somewhat strange.[39] Since a similar local alignment, in which Mount Hor, where Aaron should die, is located "at the frontier (*gᵉbûl*) of the land Edom", is secondarily inserted into the priestly story (20:23b*), it becomes very clear that the author of the Edom story actually postdates the PB[3] context. Its compositional perspective is remarkable, because it looks back at almost the whole salvation history, the patriarchs, the Israel's long stay in Egypt, its suppression by the Egyptians, its prayers and its liberation by Moses, who here is stylized as a divine messenger. Such a compositional retrospective was already found in Exod 18:1–12 and will be found in Josh 24, an agreement, which speaks for the HexR. Since in Num 20:14 the rare expression *kâl-hattᵉlāʾâ ʾᵃšær māṣāʾ* "all the tribulation, which has met (us)" is used,

---

[35] Hobab's final agreement is ignored in the scene, because the presence of his descendants among Israel was well known (cf. Judg 4:11, 17). For the author the urgent invitation was decisive.

[36] See his adaption of the non-priestly Tent of Meeting (Exod 33:7–11) in Num 14:10; 16:19; 20:6 and of the belief motif in 20:12.

[37] What I call PB[2] corresponds to some degree with the "Holiness School" conceptualized by I. KNOHL, *The Sanctuary of Silence: The Priestly Torah and the Holiness School* (reprint Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2007), 104–105.

[38] For more details of the following see R. ALBERTZ, "Das Buch Numeri jenseits der Quellentheorie: Eine Redaktionsgeschichte von Num 20–24," *ZAW* 123 (2011), 171–183 and 336–347.

[39] It did not sound that strange in the post-exilic period, when the Edomites had invaded and settled into the Negev.

which appears within the Pentateuch only in Exod 18:8 – here including the wanderings – and outside only in Neh 9:32, the assignment of Num 20:14–21, 23b* to the HexR seems very probable. After the divine foresight in Exod 13:17–19 has opened the long period of wilderness, Moses' retrospective view in Num 20:14–21 closes it.

The story about Israel's defeat of the Amorite king Sihon of Heshbon (Num 21:21–32) is very strongly structured according to the Edom story.[40] It is conceptualized as a counter story: Since Sihon reacted to Israel's request of marching through his country much more aggressively than the king of Edom, his country was conquered and settled by the Israelites. From these reasons it seems to be reasonable to conclude that the Sihon story was composed by the HexR likewise.[41] Apart from his own material, including the Heshbon song, this late author seems to be dependent on the Dtr. variant of Deut 2:26–37. He obviously reused the report about the defeat of king Og from Bashan in Deut 3:1–3 in order to complete his view of the conquest of Transjordan (Num 21:33–35). In difference to these Dtr. reports, however, he deliberately ignored the theological dimensions of the conquest, on the one hand, leaving it to Moses to reveal them, on the other hand, he emphasized the definite settlement of Transjordan (v. 24, 31, 35), a view, which accords with his retrospective in Josh 24:8, but differs from Deut 3:19–20 and Num 32:16–30. No doubt, the HexR intended to show with his version of the Sihon and Og story that after the end of the wilderness period, which he had marked in 20:14–21, the period of conquest already started in 21:21–35. This attempt to structure Israel's foundation history, however, has to struggle with the problem that the given text in between (especially 21:4–20) still deals with the hardship of the wilderness wanderings. It probably comes from D, who intended to show how after the divine judgment of Num 14:45 Israel had to suffer a long period of wanderings until it reached those areas in the east near the peak of Pisga (21:20), where it campaigned according to Deut 3:27; 34:1. Since this given itinerary leads past Heshbon, probably the same author inserted a reference to the frontier (*gᵉbûl*) of the Amorites in Num 21:23aβb in order to better the coherence. Perhaps he inserted also the well song in v. 17–18a, whose introduction v. 17a reminds of the song of Moses in Exod 15:1aα. With the well song, which rejoices about the gift of water, he intended to stress the end of the period of judgment and hardship and the beginning of a salvific period.

---

[40] Cf. Num 21:21 with 20:14, 21:22 with 20:17, and 21:23 with 20:18, 23.

[41] The view that both stories come from the same author is supported also by R. ACHENBACH, *Die Vollendung der Tora: Studien zur Redaktionsgeschichte des Numeribuches im Kontext von Hexateuch und Pentateuch* (BZAR 3; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2003), 335–347, 358–369, calling them a "Diptychon". He also assigned them to the HexR, although this label taken from Otto's model, means something different.

Since the Balaam story is secondarily provided with a reference back just to the Sihon and Og story in Num 22:2, it seems very probable that it was the author of the HexR again, who took it up and incorporated it into the emerging book of Numbers. This conclusion is corroborated by the fact that the story, which already has mentioned the exodus topic twice (22:11; 23:22), is provided with additional verbal links to the beginning of the exodus story. In his request to Balaam, the Moabite king Balak stated that Israel has become stronger (*'āṣûm min*) than his people (Num 22:6aα₂) as did the Pharaoh in Exod 1:9. And in Num 22:3b it is told that the Moabites do not only fear the Israelites (v. 3a), but also find them disgusting (*qûṣ*) as did the Egyptians in Exod 1:12b. Thus, the author of the HexR intended to parallelize the beginning and the end of the long liberation process of the Israelite people. As the origin and the growth of the people provoked Pharaoh's attempts of suppression and extermination, so Israel's population and strength induced Balak's plans to annihilate it with the help of the Balaam's curses. Because of this intention, the repeated exodus reference of Num 24:8a may come from the same redactor. It is widely accepted that Balaam's fourth saying 24:14b–19 is a later addition to the original story. Since it announces the subjugation of Moab and Edom by a future king, probably David (cf. 2 Sam 8:2, 13–14), that means, just of those two nations, that have shown hostility to Israel in Num 20–24*, may also have been added by the Hexateuch redactor. Both nations, which did not show solidarity with Israel in the period of its weakness, will suffer retaliation in the future, when Israel will have become powerful. This outlook would constitute a profound conclusion of the first period of conquest and the book of Numbers at an earlier stage, before chapters 25–36 were added by a Pentateuchal redaction (PB⁵).[42]

4. The HexR in Deuteronomy

Deut 23:5b–6; 34:1bβ–3(?).

My results concerning the book of Deuteronomy are especially preliminary. Otto reckons with a lot of post-exilic additions to the book, but he often refrained from attributing them to the Hexateuchal, Pentateuchal or other redactions.[43] There are texts, which seems to show a post-priestly origin as Deut 4,

---

[42] For this probably latest addition of the book of Numbers see R. ALBERTZ, "A Pentateuchal Redaction in the Book of Numbers?: The Late Priestly Layers of Num 25–36," *ZAW* 125 (2013), 220–233.

[43] Cf. Otto, "Deuteronomiumstudien III" (see n. 9), 101–107, and his commentary E. OTTO, *Deuteronomium 1,1–4,43* (HThK.AT; Freiburg, Basel, and Wien: Herder, 2012) and

or to present similar interests like the passages elaborated above as Deut 9:1–
5 or 10:12–22, but they speak in a different language, much more stamped by
the Dtr. idiom. One could think about whether the names of the three pat-
riarchs appearing in several places in Deuteronomy (Deut 1:8; 6:10; 9:5, 27;
29:12; 30:20; 34:4), which have been proven to be secondary insertions by
Thomas Römer,[44] come from the HexR, because they clearly have a composi-
tional function. Since they are restricted to the book of Deuteronomy, howe-
ver, and not found in the book of Joshua, they were more likely inserted by
the late Dtr. redactor D, because Deut 34:4 clearly shows a Dtr. design (cf.
Exod 33:1b and Gen 12:7; 15:18; 24:7; 26:3). According to my view, D was
the first who connected the books Gen–Lev (Triteuch) with the already exist-
ing Deut.[45] As far as can I see, there is only one passage which can be at-
tributed to the HexR quite likely, that is the clearly secondary reference to
Balaam (Deut 23:5b–6) in the community rule. The Ammonites and Moabites
are excluded from the Israelite sacral community not only because they did
not supported the Israelites after their exodus from Egypt with bread and
water, but because Balak, the king of Moab, hired Balaam hired Baalam to
curse them. The statement of v. 6aα that YHWH did not want to heed Ba-
laam's word, has a nearly verbal parallel in Josh 24:10.[46] Since the Dtr. retro-
spective of Moses in Deut 1–3 did not mention the Balaam event after the
defeat of Sihon and Og, the Hexateuchal redactor added it later in order to
anchor his new sight of the immigration history in the book of Deut. Apart
from this secure instance, the HexR perhaps contributed to Deut 34 the de-
tailed description of the promised land, which YHWH showed Moses just
before his death (vv. 1bβ–3), because it diverges from the Dtr. announcement
(Deut 3:27) and reminds of Gen 13, where Abraham is shown the country (cf.
vv. 10, 12, 15).

E. OTTO, *Deuteronomium 4,44–11,32* (HThK.AT; Freiburg, Basel, and Wien: Herder,
2012).

[44] See T. RÖMER, *Israels Väter: Untersuchungen zur Väterthematik im Deuteronomium
und in der deuteronomistischen Tradition* (OBO 99; Fribourg: Universitätsverlag and
Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990), 196–206, 251–256, 269–271, 390–394.

[45] See ALBERTZ, "Schlüsseltext" (see n. 15), 34–38; IDEM, "Numeri" (see n. 38), 336–
338, and cf. T.C. RÖMER, "Das Buch Numeri und das Ende des Jahwisten: Anfragen zur
'Quellenscheidung' im vierten Buch des Pentateuch," in *Abschied vom Jahwisten: Die
Komposition des Hexateuch in der jüngsten Diskussion* (ed. J.C. Gertz et al.; BZAW 315;
Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 2002), 215–231.

[46] Cf. the study of R. EBACH, *Das Fremde und das Eigene: Die Fremdendarstellungen
des Deuteronomiuns im Kontext israelitischer Identitätskonstruktionen* (BZAW 471; Berlin
and New York, 2014), 72–73.

5. The HexR in Joshua

Josh 2:1a, 9aβ–11, 23–24; 3:1, 5, 9–11, 13*(only *ᵃdôn kål-hā'āræṣ*); 4:21–5:1, 13–15; 6:17–19, 22–23, 24b–25; 7:1, 5b–26; 24:1–32.		
Integrated material:		
Rahab story	Josh 2: ... 1b–9aα, 12–22...	
Judg 2:7–9	Josh 24:29–31	pulled forward for constructing the end of an era

With regard to the book of Joshua there is only a growing consensus that Josh 24:1–32 belongs to the HexR.[47] Anyhow, one should expect that a redaction, which was interested to include the book of Joshua into Israel's authoritative history and legislation, should have left more traces in it. Recently Blum and some of his pupils have pointed out that the Rahab story in Josh 2 constitutes a later addition to the Dtr. book of Joshua, because it breaks up the temporary chain of three days between Joshua's speech (Josh 1:10–11) and the march through the Jordan (3:2–3) and does not really contribute to the progress of the conquest narration.[48] To the same layer they reckon some related passages of the Jordan, the Jericho and the Achan story,[49] but they remain undecided to which redactional layer they should assign them.[50] After it was possible to attribute a much more extended body of texts to the HexR, a decision becomes easier: The pious confession of the non-Israelite whore Rahab in Josh

---

[47] The verse Josh 24:33, which mentions the death and burial of the High Priest Eleazar, is a later priestly addition, which belongs – as all other so-called priestly passages of the book of Joshua – to a very late alignment of the book with the Pentateuch, after the latter has become canonized, see R. ALBERTZ, "The Canonical Alignment of the Book of Joshua," in *Judah and the Judeans in the Fourth Century B.C.E.* (ed. O. Lipschits *et al.*; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2007), 287–303.

[48] See E. BLUM, "Beschneidung und Passa in Kanaan: Beobachtungen und Mutmaßungen zu Jos 5," in *Freiheit und Recht* (ed. C. Hardmeier *et al.*; FS F. Crüsemann; Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2003), 292–322; V. HAARMANN, *JHWH-Verehrer der Völker: Die Hinwendung von Nichtisraeliten zum Gott Israels in den alttestamentlichen Überlieferungen* (AThANT 91; Zürich: TVZ, 2008), 100–131; J.J. KRAUSE, *Exodus und Eisodus: Komposition und Theologie von Josua 1–5* (VT.S 161, Leiden and Boston, 2014), 415–441.

[49] Thus with some variation Josh 3:1, 5, 9–11; (4:6–7); 4:21–5:1; 6:17–25* and 7:1, 5b–26.

[50] Cf. BLUM, "Beschneidung" (see n. 48), 319; IDEM, "Pentateuch" (see n. 3), 390 and 402; KRAUSE, *Exodus* (see n. 48), 424–427.

2:9–11 does not only generally reminds of Jethro's praise of YHWH in Exod 18:10–11, which was formulated by the author of the HexR, but also gives a retrospective view on the events from the miracle at the Reed Sea up to the defeat of Sihon and Og as this author loved to insert into the salvation history (Exod 18:1–12; Num 20:14–21; Josh 24:1–32). It was shown above that probably nobody other than the author of the HexR inserted the Sihon and Og story in the emerging book of Numbers.[51] Moreover, if one notices that Josh 2:9 refers not only to the song of Moses (Exod 15:15b, 16) inserted by the HexR, but also cites just a sentence, which was probably formulated by the redactor himself ("the inhabitants of Canaan/of the country dispaired") and repeated in Josh 2:24, there will be no doubt that it was the HexR, who inserted the Rahab story in order create a link between the books Exodus, Numbers, and Joshua and provide Israel's salvation history with a second example of a pious and helpful stranger. The verses Josh 2:1, 23–24; 3:1 serve for connecting the Rahab story with the Dtr. context.[52] Thus, also the place name *Šiṭṭîm* belong to the late redaction.

While the original story about Israel's crossing of the Jordan (Josh 3:2–4:20) belongs to the DtrH, some of its secondary passages, namely 3:5, 9–11, 13*; 4:21–5:1,[53] can be assigned to the HexR as well because they draw many parallel lines to former events in Israel's salvation history. In 3:5 the redactor stresses the miraculous impact of the event reminding of the divine miracles in Egypt (Exod 3:20) and at the Sinai (19:10, 14). The Israelites should sanctify themselves before the crossing as they had done for the theophany at Sinai, because it would imply an encounter with the divine. In his speech (Josh 3:9–13), he unfolded the sense of the miracle: It would prove the presence of the lively God in the midst of Israel; thus, the skeptical question of Exod 17:7 would clearly be answered in the affirmative. Moreover, it would be an encouraging sign that YHWH was ready to drive the foreign inhabitants out of the country (Josh 3:10). By naming YHWH "the lord of all the earth" (Josh 3:11, 13*; cf. Ps 97:5; Mic 4:13; Zech 4:14) the HexR stressed the universal horizon of Israel's conquest of Palestine as it was already shown by the hymn Exod 15:6–18, which he had included. In his epilog (Josh 4:21–24) the redactor explicitly states that Israel's conquest aims at YHWH's recognition

---

[51] The only difference that Josh 2:10 speaks of the *ḥerǣm* not mentioned in Num 21:21–35 can be explained by fact that the HexR also has to include the theological perspective of the events given in Deut 2:26–3:7.

[52] The end of the Rahab story is integrated in the Jericho story Josh 6:17–19.22–23.24b–25 and therefore reformulated by the HexR. The motif of the red cord (2:18, 21) does not play a role any longer.

[53] Josh 3:5 is a doublet to 3:6; Josh 3:9–11 constitutes a speech of Joshua within a speech of YHWH; Josh 4:21–24 represents a second lesson for the children after 4:6–7.

by all people of the earth (v. 24).[54] Here he pointed out that the two miracles, the draining of the Reed Sea and the draining of the Jordan (v. 22–23), constitute the two central events of Israel's salvation history, parallelizing Israel's exodus from Egypt and its eisodus into the promised land.[55] From this insight it is clear why he had emphasized the events at the Reed Sea so much by decorating them with Moses' song. The verse Josh 5:1 referring back to 2:11 and 4:23 tells the miracle's frightening effect among the inhabitants of the country and serves as transition to the conquest stories.

Having the redactor's intention of parallelizing Israel's eisodus with its exodus in mind, one may ask, whether the strange little scene of Josh 5:13–15, where Joshua met the captain of YHWH's army, does not come from the HexR, too. Conspicuously, verse 15 verbally refers back to Exod 3:5, that means to Moses' encounter with the divine at the burning bush. The open scene serves as a secondary introduction to the story of Jericho; it intends to reveal the theological background of the coming events. Grammatically, it starts with the same construction (*wayy^ehî* + prep. + inf.cs.) Josh 5:1, with regards to content it could follow this verse, which speaks of the reaction of the kings of the country and would make Joshua's suggestion that he could have met an enemy (v. 13) understandable. A strong argument for the HexR is the fact that the stranger's depiction "and he had a drawn sword in his hand" (Josh 5:13) verbally accords with the portrayal of the angel, who opposed Balaam on his ride to Balak (Num 22:23, 31). The Balaam story seems to have been included by just this redaction. In the concept of the HexR the link between the Balaam story and the little scene makes sense: While Israel's first victories (Num 21:21–35; 22:2) provoked a new assault of the Moabites, which could not totally be prevented by YHWH's angel, but only turned to Israel's best, the arrival of the captain of YHWH's army finally marks the very end the period of threats and the beginning of a period of salvific victories (cf. the *'attâ* in Josh 5:14). As Moses' theophany at the burning bush (Exod 3:1–6) has signified a change from hardness to liberation, thus the angliophany experienced by Joshua indicates a change from threat to victory. Again, the redactor parallelized the exodus and the conquest story. On the level of the HexR, the strange little scene in Josh 5:13–15 becomes much better understandable.

Reworking the Jericho story in Josh 6:17–19, 22–23, 24b–25, the author of the HexR demonstrated, on the one hand, that in contrast to all the population of the conquered city, which was totally devoted to destruction (v. 21), Rahab

---

[54] This aim would become even clearer expressed, if one is ready to change the vocalization from *yirā 'tæm* to *yir'ātām*.

[55] Because only the priestly version knows a crossing of the Reed Sea, the HexR refers especially to its terminology of draining (*yabbāšâ* Josh 4:22 cf. Exod 14:16, 22, 29; 15:19); cf. also the use of *yābeš* hi. in Josh 2:10; 4:23(2×); 5:1.

and her non-Israelite family were exempted from the *heræm* and got the right
of abode within Israel because she had shown solidarity with the Israelite
people (v. 25). On the other hand, he emphasized that the Israelites them-
selves were obliged to reserve the *heræm* for YHWH; especially the precious
parts of the booty belonging to the deity, and no Israelite should steal it (v.
18–19). In order to underline the importance of Israel being obedient to
YHWH's demands, the same author[56] added the Achan story as a counterpart
(Josh 7:1, 5b–26). In his view, Israel suffered the defeat against Ai told in the
given Dtr. version of the book (vv. 2–5a), only because Achan had stolen
some precious objects from the *heræm* (v. 11). Because of this failure Joshua
has to complain bitterly (7:7–9) as Moses did before (Exod 5:22–23; 32:11–
13). After the guilty person had been found and punished and the stolen
goods had been given back to the deity (Josh 7:16–23), YHWH's anger was
abated (v. 26). It may be that the author of the HexR had arranged the begin-
ning of the conquest story in this way, because the Exodus story, too, knows
of the failure (Exod 5) and Israel's disobedience (32–34). In any case, he
intended to show that not only the sin of the entire people (Exod 32), but also
that the disobedience of one of its members (Josh 7) could jeopardize the
entire salvation history.

As far as I currently see, the HexR did not intervene in the book of Joshua
between chapters 8–23.[57] That he created a new end to the book in Josh 24 is
widely accepted. Today there is a growing consensus that this chapter, which
presupposes not only most of the priestly editing, but most of the six books in
their present form, is of a late, probably a post-exilic origin.[58] As done before
in a shorter way (Exod 18:1–12; Num 20:14–21; Josh 2:9–11), the redactor
provides his work with a broad retrospective view of Israel's entire salvation
history beginning with the fathers beyond the Euphrates, passing to the libe-
ration from Egypt and ending with the conquest of the land (Josh 24:2–13).
Not by chance, he mentioned a little more in detail those events that he had
contributed or commented, the conquest of Transjordan (v. 8), the protection
from Balaam (vv. 9–10) and the conquest of Jericho (v. 11). The redactor
presented the salvation history in a way that all the groups which were in-
volved, the patriarchs beyond the Euphrates, the fathers in Egypt and the

---

[56] See the correspondence of the rare expression *māsas l^ebab* "the heart melted away"
with regard to foreign peoples (Josh 2:11; 5:1) and to Israel (7:5b).

[57] Up to now, I am not sure, who inserted the report about the distribution of land in
Josh 13–19*.

[58] See the groundbreaking study of M. ANBAR, *Josué et l'alliance de Sichem* (Josué
24:1–28) (BETL 25; Frankfurt: Lang, 1992); RÖMER and BRETTLER, "Deuteronomy 34"
(see n. 3), 409–413; ACHENBACH, "Pentateuch" (see n. 3), 139–153; and E. BLUM, "Der
kompositionelle Knoten am Übergang von Josua zu Richter: Ein Entflechtungsvorschlag,"
in *Textgestalt und Komposition: Exegetische Beiträge zu Tora und Vordere Propheten* (ed.
IDEM; FAT 69; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 249–280, here 262–266.

present generation in the land of the Amorites, partly venerated foreign deities. Thus, it culminates in making an unambiguous decision for YHWH (vv. 14–24). The redactor combines this covenant making at Shechem with the creation of a book, called "book of the law of God" (v. 25–26). As shown by Blum, "these words", which Joshua wrote down in it, are not restricted to the statutes and ordinances, mentioned in v. 25, but refer to all of what is told and ordered before, from Genesis to Joshua.[59] Thus, the note about how the *sepær torat* '*ælohîm* was written constitutes a self reference to the creation of the Hexateuch. Therefore, it seems very probable that the redactor wanted to classify his work as a distinguished literary unit of its own. For this reason he also integrated Judg 2:7–9 in his work, which reported about Joshua's death and burial in order to construct a clear conclusion of an era (Josh 24:29–31; cf. Gen 50:24–26). Telling finally about the burial of Joseph's bones at the place (Josh 24:32) already bought (Gen 33:19) and obtained by Jacob (48:22) he finally stated that Israel's foundation history has actually come to its conclusion.

The relations between several passages singled out for the HexR have been noticed before; many of them have been assigned to the source E in the past.[60] Nearly all those passages, which according to Rainer Kessler's study explicitly survey the entire Pentateuch, are among them.[61] One criticism of the Elohistic source was the objection that those scattered passages did not show a narrative coherence. The thesis, that these passages did not belong to an ongoing source but to a punctual redaction, explains the present findings much better.

6. The date of the HexR

In the current discussion the date of the HexR is disputed. While Otto reckons with an earlier date, just after the priestly source and some of its compliments (Gen 1–Lev 16*) were completed, Blum thinks of a later date, towards the end of the formation of the Pentateuch. The textual reconstruction shown

---

[59] See BLUM, "Connection" (see n. 5), 99–101, pointing to Jer 45:1; 51:60–61; Blum, "Knoten" (see n. 58), 262–274.

[60] Cf. e.g. the corresponding passages listed by M. NOTH, *Überlieferungsgeschichte des Pentateuch* (2nd ed.; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1948), 38–39, for the Elohist: Gen 15:13–16*; 33:19–20; 35:1–5; 48:17–22; 50:15–26; Exod 3:4b, 6, 9–14, (15); 13:17–19; 18:1–11*, 12–27; Num 20:14–21*; 21:21–31, (33–35); 22:2. Other scholars, who reckon with a Hexateuch, often included Josh 24 among the Elohistic passages.

[61] R. KESSLER, *Die Querverweise im Pentateuch: Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Untersuchung der expliziten Querverbindungen innerhalb des vorpriesterlichen Pentateuchs* (Diss. theol. Heidelberg, 1972), 310–324, listed Gen 15:13–16; 46:1–5a; 48:21; Num 20:14–16.

above allows a more founded decision. According to these results the HexR does not only presuppose the early priestly layer (PB[1]) as shown in Exod 1:1–8, 15:1–21, and 17:1; 18; 19:1–2, but also the post-priestly late Dtr. layer D as demonstrated in Gen 15, Exod 4:1–17, and 33. Moreover, it even presupposes the later priestly layer of the book of Numbers (PB[3]), which postdates D, as shown in Num 20. Of course, the HexR also presupposes the Dtr. version of the books of Joshua and Judges as it became apparent in Josh 3–4 and 24. Only the latest edition of the book of Numbers available e.g. in Num 25–36, which we may call a Pentateuchal redaction (PentR) seems to postdate the HexR. Thus that HexR reconstructed above actually belongs to the very late phase of the formation of the Pentateuch. If we connect the implementation of the Pentateuch with the Mission of Ezra and prefer the later possible date in the year 398 BCE, the HexR will belong to the second half of the 5th century. Taking the observation into consideration that HexR support a concept of Israel, which comprises all the twelve tribes including the Northern ones, we are entitled to date it after the time of Nehemiah (445–432 BCE), who had supported the Judean autonomy, instead. Since the HexR show some sympathy for the Samarians locating the last gathering of the people at Shechem (Josh 24:1),[62] it should be dated to that period, when the Joiada, the High Priest of Jerusalem, started a policy of reconciliation with Sanballat, the governor of Samaria (Neh 13:28). During this period, according to the archaeological results, the Samarian temple on Mount Garizim was also built (perhaps about 425 BCE). Since some letters from Elephantine (TAD A.7–9) again testify a more exclusive Judean policy under the High Priest Jehohanan from the year 410 onwards,[63] the HexR should probably be dated during the years between 430 and 410 BCE.

7. The concerns of the HexR

As long as the textual basis of the HexR is not finally established, any description of the concerns of the HexR remains preliminary. From the passages attributed to it so far, the following concerns can be distinguished.

---

[62] This tendency was already discovered by BLUM, "Knoten" (see n. 58), 266; RÖMER and BRETTLER, "Deuteronomy 34" (see n. 3), 413–414; OTTO, "Deuteronomiumstudien III" (see n. 9), 102–104.

[63] Cf. ALBERTZ, *Exodus I* (see n. 11), 314. For a more detailed historical reconstruction see R. ALBERTZ, "The Controversy about Judean versus Israelite Identity and the Persian Government: A New Interpretation of the Bagoses Story (Jewish Antiquities XI.297–301)," in *Judah and the Judeans in the Achaemenid Period. Negotiating Identity in an International Context* (ed. O. Lipschits et al.; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2011), 483–504.

1. The author of the HexR intended to define Israel's foundation history in its full length from the patriarchs up to the conquest and the distribution of the promised land. In difference to the Dtr. concept of the "Lawbook of Moses" (*sepær tôrat mošæh*), which was restricted to the lifetime of Moses (Josh 1:8; 23:6; cf. Deut 31:9–13 and others), he developed the idea of "Lawbook of God" (*sepær tôrat 'ælohîm*; Josh 24:26; cf. Neh 8:18), which emphasized the importance of returning to and living in the promised land.

2. The author of the HexR intended to provide Israel's foundation history with a better structure. He more clearly divided it into different periods, the period of the patriarchs (Gen 12–50), the period of the exodus from Egypt (Exod 1–13), the period of the wandering through the wilderness (Exod 13–Num 20), and the period of conquest (Num 21–Josh 12). For this purpose he created several foresights (Gen 15:13–17a; Exod 13:17–19; 15:13–18) and retrospectives (Exod 15:1–12; 18:1–12; Num 20:14–21; Deut 23:5b–6; Josh 2:9aβ–11; 24:1–13), which rounded those periods and linked them together. Parallelizing Israel's exodus from Egypt and eisodus into the promised land, he made the two crossings of water, the crossing of the Reed Sea and the crossing of the Jordan, the central miraculous events of the salvation history (Exod 14–15; Josh 3–4).

3. Although the author of the HexR distinguished more than other redactors between different periods within Israel's foundation history, he intended to elaborate the continuation and development of the divine revelations through it. Therefore, he expanded and reworked existing revelation scenes (Exod 3:4b, 6a, 12aβ–15; 33:18–23). He deliberately alternated between the different divine designations (*'ælohîm, hā'ælohîm,* and *yhwh* and others) in order to focus on different aspects of the divine identity (cf. Gen 48:21; 50:24, 25; Exod 3:12–15; 13:17–18; 18:1, 11–12; 33:19).

4. With regard to the multi-religious situation in the Persian empire in general and in the provinces of Judah and Samaria in particular, the author of the HexR, on the one hand, emphasized that all people of Israel, whether they have come from Mesopotamia, Egypt or other regions in order to live in the promised land, are requested to convert to an exclusive veneration of YHWH (Josh 24:14–24) and to obey the law of God (Josh 7; 24:25–26).

5. On the other hand, the author of the HexR pleaded for good relations towards the foreign neighbors of the Israelites. As far as they show respect to YHWH and solidarity to his people, they should be invited to live together with Israel and profit from its goods (Exod 18; Num 10:28b–32; Josh 2; 6:22–25).

6. For some reasons, which are not yet totally clear, the Hexateuch was not accepted as the authoritative version of Israel's foundation history and binding legislation for a longer period. It might be that the Diaspora Jews refused to accept the confessional status of living in the promised land, or the Persian authorities had some reservations against the aggressive conquest stories of

the book of Joshua. In any case, with Ezra's mission the Pentateuch, finally reworked and ending with the death of Moses, was given an authoritative status by the Judean and Samarian communities. While the book of Joshua was excluded and thus the parallelism between exodus and eisodus got lost, all other compositional and theological devices, by which the HexR structured and shaped Israel's foundation history within the remaining five books, were saved and became authoritative as well.