

Joachim J. Krause

## Hexateuchal Redaction in Joshua

The present paper looks for a Hexateuchal redaction in Joshua, not for an original Hexateuch, i. e., a literary work that from the outset covered the exodus *and* conquest. This question is posed by Joshua 24. For in this chapter, we clearly observe the endeavor to delimit a fairly fully developed proto-Pentateuch and an equally elaborate book of Joshua as a literary unit within the larger narrative continuum, thus establishing the Hexateuch as a discrete work *ex post facto*. The latter observation is well documented and gains growing acceptance in critical scholarship. All the more apparent is the lack of studies devoted to Hexateuchal redaction of the Joshua story outside of Joshua 24. Given the determined attempt in that chapter to establish the Hexateuch as a redactional unit, and taking into account the deliberate reworking of preceding parts of the Pentateuch for this end, should one not expect that same redactor – or else some successor – to have reworked other parts of Joshua as well?

*Keywords:* Pentateuch; Hexateuch; book of Joshua; Joshua 24; Joshua 1–7

Rab Adda son of Rabbi Hanina said: “Had not Israel sinned, nothing but the five fifths of the Torah and the Book of Joshua would have been given them” (*b. Ned.* 22b).

I

The present paper<sup>1</sup> looks for a Hexateuchal redaction in Joshua, not for an original Hexateuch. To reckon with a literary work that from the outset covered the exodus *and* conquest, as do both the Documentary Hypothesis<sup>2</sup>

- 1 Read at the session on Joshua 24 at the 2015 SBL Annual Meeting in Atlanta. I wish to thank the chair Thomas Dozeman for the invitation to speak in this session, as well as the others speakers (Cynthia Edenburg, Konrad Schmid, and the respondent Thomas Römer) for the in-depth discussion. I also thank Stephen Germany for his comments on an earlier version of this paper.
- 2 See the classic expositions in J. Wellhausen, *Die Composition des Hexateuchs und der historischen Bücher des Alten Testaments* (4th ed.; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1963); A. Kuenen, *Historisch-kritische Einleitung in die Bücher des Alten Testaments hinsichtlich ihrer Entstehung und Sammlung: Vol. 1:1: Die Entstehung des Hexateuch* (Leipzig: Schulze, 1887);

and current claims for a pre-Deuteronomistic Moses-Joshua or Exodus-Conquest story,<sup>3</sup> forces one to unearth – or else to postulate – the conclusion of the alleged work in the book of Joshua.<sup>4</sup> If, on the other hand, it is acknowledged that the narrative continuum in Exodus through Joshua and

E. Albers, *Die Quellenberichte in Josua I–XII: Beitrag zur Quellenkritik des Hexateuch* (Bonn: Paul, 1891); R. Smend, *Die Erzählung des Hexateuch auf ihre Quellen untersucht* (Berlin: Reimer, 1912); and O. Eißfeldt, *Hexateuch-Synopse: Die Erzählung der fünf Bücher Mose und des Buches Josua mit dem Anfange des Richterbuches in ihre vier Quellen zerlegt und in deutscher Übersetzung dargeboten samt einer in Einleitung und Anmerkungen gegebenen Begründung* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1922).

- 3 See the various approaches in K. Bieberstein, *Josua – Jordan – Jericho: Archäologie, Geschichte und Theologie der Landnahmeerzählung Josua 1–6* (OBO 143; Fribourg: Universitätsverlag, 1995); K. Bieberstein, “Das Buch Josua und seine Horizonte,” in *Das deuteronomistische Geschichtswerk* (ed. H.-J. Stipp; ÖBS 39; Frankfurt a. M.: Lang, 2011), 151–176; K. Schmid, *Erzväter und Exodus: Untersuchungen zur doppelten Begründung der Ursprünge Israels innerhalb der Geschichtsbücher des Alten Testaments* (WMANT 81; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1999), 129–165; K. Schmid, *Literaturgeschichte des Alten Testaments: Eine Einführung* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2008), 86–91; K. Schmid, “Exodus in the Pentateuch,” in *The Book of Exodus: Composition, Reception, and Interpretation* (ed. T. B. Dozeman et al.; VTSup 164; Leiden: Brill, 2014), 27–60, here 45–46; R. G. Kratz, *Die Komposition der erzählenden Bücher des Alten Testaments* (UTB 2157; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000), passim; R. G. Kratz, “Der vor- und der nachpriesterschriftliche Hexateuch,” in *Abschied vom Jahwisten: Die Komposition des Hexateuch in der jüngsten Diskussion* (ed. J. C. Gertz et al.; BZAW 315; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2002), 295–323, here 316–322; J. C. Gertz, “Tora und Vordere Propheten,” in *Grundinformation Altes Testament: Eine Einführung in Literatur, Religion und Geschichte des Alten Testaments* (ed. J. C. Gertz; 3rd ed.; UTB 2745; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2009), 193–311, here 289–293; E. A. Knauf, *Josua* (ZBK 6; Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 2008); E. A. Knauf, “Why ‘Joshua’?,” in *Deuteronomy-Kings as Emerging Authoritative Books: A Conversation* (ed. D. V. Edelman; ANEM 6; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2014), 73–84, here 73; for the “Jerusalemite History” (JG) proposed by E. Zenger and P. Weimar, see E. Zenger (ed.), *Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (7th ed.; Studienbücher Theologie 1/1; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2008), 101–103, 179–184; cf. C. Frevel, “Deuteronomistisches Geschichtswerk oder Geschichtswerke? Die These Martin Noths zwischen Tetrateuch, Hexateuch und Enneateuch,” in *Martin Noth – aus der Sicht der heutigen Forschung* (ed. U. Rüterswörden; Biblisch-theologische Studien 58; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 2004), 60–95, here 80–86; C. Frevel, “Die Wiederkehr der Hexateuchperspektive: Eine Herausforderung für die These vom deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerk,” in *Das deuteronomistische Geschichtswerk* (ed. H.-J. Stipp; ÖBS 39; Frankfurt a. M.: Lang, 2011), 13–53, here 25–31.
- 4 In the work of the so-called Neo-Documentarians (for this label, see J. Stackert, “Distinguishing Innerbiblical Exegesis from Pentateuchal Redaction: Leviticus 26 as a Test Case,” in *The Pentateuch: International Perspectives on Current Research* [ed. T. B. Dozeman et al.; FAT 78; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011], 369–386, here 370), the problem is conspicuous by its absence; see J. S. Baden, *J, E, and the Redaction of the Pentateuch* (FAT 68; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009); J. S. Baden, *The Composition of the Pentateuch: Renewing the Documentary Hypothesis* (AYBRL; New Haven: Yale University Press, 2012); J. Stackert, *A Prophet Like Moses: Prophecy, Law, and Israelite Religion* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2014).

on to Kings is due in the first place to a comprehensive Deuteronomistic redaction of the “historical” traditions in Joshua through Kings<sup>5</sup> and the subsequent expansion of the resultant history by prefixing the origin myth of the exodus story,<sup>6</sup> the search for the old “sources” or pre-Deuteronomistic strata of Hexateuchal scope becomes obsolete.<sup>7</sup> In fact, it naturally gives way to the question of whether texts in Joshua that seem to presuppose some sort of a Hexateuch are to be explained as secondary attempts at delimiting the sextet of Pentateuch and Joshua as a literary unit.<sup>8</sup>

## II

That such attempts were made is not just a likely assumption.<sup>9</sup> There is also literary proof for it. The prooftext is, of course, Joshua 24. In this chapter

5 Following the seminal analysis of M. Noth, *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien: Die sammelnden und bearbeitenden Geschichtswerke im Alten Testament* (3rd ed.; Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1967). For a critical endorsement and a discussion of the main points of criticism leveled at the hypothesis recently, see E. Blum, “Das exilische deuteronomistische Geschichtswerk,” in *Das deuteronomistische Geschichtswerk* (ed. H.-J. Stipp; ÖBS 39; Frankfurt a. M.: Lang, 2011), 269–294, and J. J. Krause, *Exodus und Eisdodus: Komposition und Theologie von Josua 1–5* (VTSup 161; Leiden: Brill, 2014). See also D. M. Carr, *The Formation of the Hebrew Bible: A New Reconstruction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 256, 290–291.

6 Thus the influential thesis of E. Blum, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch* (BZAW 189; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1990), 7–218. According to Blum, the tradition of Moses and the exodus was developed into the pre-Priestly “D-Komposition” (KD) of the Pentateuch in the early Persian period, thus providing the already extant Deuteronomistic History with a foundational prehistory. Adopting the evidence for the late literary combination of the two essentially independent origin myths of the patriarchs in Genesis and the exodus story adduced by Schmid, *Erzväter und Exodus*, and J. C. Gertz, *Tradition und Redaktion in der Exoduserzählung: Untersuchungen zur Endredaktion des Pentateuch* (FRLANT 186; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000), the restatement in E. Blum, “Die literarische Verbindung von Erzvätern und Exodus: Ein Gespräch mit neueren Endredaktionshypothesen (2002),” in *Textgestalt und Komposition: Exegetische Beiträge zu Tora und Vordere Propheten* (ed. W. Oswald; FAT 69; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 85–121, confines this first composition of the Pentateuch to Exodus through Deuteronomy, thus crediting the subsequent “P-Komposition” (KP) with creating for the first time a Pentateuch in the full sense of the word, i. e., consisting of five fifths. In any case, according to this analysis there is neither room nor need to reconstruct the conclusion of an original Hexateuch in Joshua.

7 See further Krause, *Exodus und Eisdodus*, 4–5.

8 For the Hexateuch as a secondary redactional unit, see also E. Otto, *Das Deuteronomium im Pentateuch und Hexateuch: Studien zur Literaturgeschichte von Pentateuch und Hexateuch im Lichte des Deuteronomiumrahmens* (FAT 30; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000), and R. Achenbach, “Pentateuch, Hexateuch und Enneateuch: Eine Verhältnisbestimmung,” *ZABR* 11 (2005): 122–154.

9 Just as much as modern biblical scholars, it stands to reason that ancient redactors

we clearly observe the endeavor to delimit a fairly fully developed proto-Pentateuch and an equally elaborate book of Joshua as a literary unit within the larger narrative continuum, thus establishing the Hexateuch as a discrete work *ex post facto*.

Once held to form the bedrock of an original literary tradition comprising both exodus and conquest, the rather late provenance of Joshua 24 has been firmly established in the wake of two groundbreaking studies by John Van Seters<sup>10</sup> and Erhard Blum<sup>11, 12</sup>. In the latter, the assessment that Joshua 24 was composed in the post-exilic period comes with the aforementioned interpretation of the chapter as final piece of a comprehensive Hexateuchal redaction. This redaction sought to promote “the book of the Torah of

---

would also have felt the need for a corresponding account of Israel entering the land destined for her in conclusion to the story of leaving the house of bondage. Against the oft-repeated argument, it is quite conceivable why an exodus narrative without this seemingly indispensable ending would have been put into writing in the first place, for it is a *Moses* story just as much as the Joseph narrative as it has come down to us is the story of a family's fortune *in Egypt*. The latter's listeners and readers being well aware that Jacob's family – their fathers and mothers – were neither from Egypt originally nor would remain there forever, this information is presupposed rather than realized in the narrative as we have it in Genesis. By the same token, the exodus tradition as we have it in the Pentateuch is realized as a Moses story. But it is just as easy to see why later tradents of the narrative thus put into writing would want to complete it: Looking at the salvation history as a whole, the exodus from Egypt is complete only with the eisodus into the promised land.

- 10 J. Van Seters, “Joshua 24 and the Problem of Tradition in the Old Testament,” in *In the Shelter of Elyon: Essays on Ancient Palestinian Life and Literature in Honor of G. W. Ahlström* (ed. W. B. Barrick and J. R. Spencer; JSOTSup 31; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1984), 139–158. Van Seters attributes Josh 24 to his exilic “Yahwist.”
- 11 E. Blum, *Die Komposition der Vätergeschichte* (WMANT 57; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1984), 45–61; see also E. Blum, “Der kompositionelle Knoten am Übergang von Josua zu Richter: Ein Entflechtungsvorschlag (1997),” in *Textgestalt und Komposition: Exegetische Beiträge zu Tora und Vordere Propheten* (ed. W. Oswald; FAT 69; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 249–280, here 262–274. According to Blum, the chapter is of post-exilic origin; it is post-Deuteronomistic at any rate and probably also post-Priestly. For a discussion regarding the latter question, see Carr, *Formation*, 134–136 and now also D. M. Carr, “Strong and Weak Cases and Criteria for Establishing the Post-Priestly Character of Hexateuchal Material,” in *The Post-Priestly Pentateuch: New Perspectives on Its Redactional Development and Theological Profiles* (ed. F. Giuntoli and K. Schmid; FAT 101; Mohr Siebeck, 2015), 19–34, here 28–29.
- 12 For a history of subsequent scholarship, see E. Noort, *Das Buch Josua: Forschungsgeschichte und Problemfelder* (EdF 292; Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1998), 205–222, and E. Noort, “Josua im Wandel der Zeiten: Zu Stand und Perspektiven der Forschung am Buch Josua,” in *The Book of Joshua* (ed. E. Noort; BETL 250; Leuven: University Press; Peeters, 2012), 21–47.

God” (ספר תורת אלהים) Josh 24:26) or Hexateuch over against the five fifths of “the book of the Torah of Moses.”<sup>13</sup>

Without rehearsing the well-known findings adduced in favor of that interpretation, it is worthwhile for our present purpose to point out one characteristic technique to be observed in this redaction: the extensive employment of leitmotifs. Apart from the detailed preparation for the scene and setting of Joshua 24 given as early as Genesis 35, the motif of the bones of Joseph is foremost in this respect. The plot of land in the vicinity of Shechem where these bones are finally laid to rest according to Josh 24:32 has been purchased by his father Jacob, as we learn from Gen 33:19, which is quoted verbatim in Joshua 24. In between, the transfer of the patriarch’s remains in Gen 50:25–26 and Exod 13:19 provides clearly visible waymarks, firmly tying together the parts of the newly-established “book of the Torah of God.” Notably, in employing this leitmotif technique, the redaction marks off a Hexateuch by cross-references in both directions, backwards *and* forwards.

### III

As for Joshua 24, then, the case seems rather clear-cut. Indeed, the interpretation of that chapter as concluding a comprehensive Hexateuchal redaction enjoys, if not a consensus,<sup>14</sup> then at least broad and ever growing approval.<sup>15</sup>

<sup>13</sup> See Blum, “Knoten,” 269–272.

<sup>14</sup> For alternative positions, see among others Kratz, “Hexateuch,” 299–307; C. Frevel, “Das Josua-Palimpsest: Der Übergang vom Josua- zum Richterbuch und seine Konsequenzen für die These eines Deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerks,” *ZAW* 125 (2013): 49–71.

<sup>15</sup> Representative for the wealth of contributions, see T. C. Römer, *Israels Väter: Untersuchungen zur Väterthematik im Deuteronomium und in der deuteronomistischen Tradition* (OBO 99; Fribourg: Universitätsverlag; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990), 320–329; T. C. Römer and M. Z. Brettler, “Deuteronomy 34 and the Case for a Persian Hexateuch,” *JBL* 119 (2000): 401–419; T. C. Römer, “Das doppelte Ende des Josuabuches: einige Anmerkungen zur aktuellen Diskussion um ‘deuteronomistisches Geschichtswerk’ und ‘Hexateuch’,” *ZAW* 118 (2006): 523–548; Carr, *Formation*, 273–275, and R. Albertz, *Exodus: Vol. I: Ex 1–18* (ZBK 2.1; Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 2012), 24. See further Otto, *Das Deuteronomium im Pentateuch und Hexateuch*, passim, and Achenbach, “Pentateuch, Hexateuch und Enneateuch,” 139–153. Cf. E. Aurelius, “Zur Entstehung von Jos 23–24,” in *Houses Full of All Good Things: Essays in Memory of Timo Veijola* (ed. J. Pakkala and M. Nissinen; Suomen Eksegeettisen Seuran Julkaisuja 95; Helsinki: Finnish Exegetical Society, 2008), 95–114; Schmid, *Erzväter und Exodus*, 209–230. While affirming the closing function of Joshua 24 with regard to the preceding context, Schmid has the chapter at the same time opening the following context, thus making it a hinge of his Enneateuch.

All the more apparent is the lack of studies devoted to Hexateuchal redaction of the Joshua story outside of Joshua 24. Given the determined attempt in that chapter to establish the Hexateuch as a redactional unit, and taking into account the deliberate reworking of preceding parts of the Pentateuch for this end, should one not expect that same redactor – or else some successor – to have reworked other parts of Joshua as well? Considering the strong ties implanted precisely at the seams between originally independent traditions (namely, between the patriarchal narrative and the exodus story), the opening chapters of Joshua appear to be an apt place for such a reworking. In short, is there further evidence for Hexateuchal redaction in Joshua apart from Joshua 24?

That is the question of the present paper, and the answer is, No. To be sure, there are findings, especially in the opening chapters, which might seem to lend themselves to such an interpretation. Upon closer examination, however, it will become apparent that the texts in question are neither connected to Joshua 24 nor part of any other comprehensive redaction intending to delimit the Hexateuch as a discrete work of its own.

The findings may be distinguished into two groups. First, there is a post-Priestly revision of the Deuteronomistic conquest account comprising Joshua 2 and Joshua 7, as well as substantial portions of Joshua 3–4 and Joshua 6. Second, there are three reminiscences of the exodus in Joshua 5 that deserve our attention.<sup>16</sup> Elsewhere I have given a full analysis of the material.<sup>17</sup> In what follows, the results of that analysis will be sifted in light of the question whether or not these texts share the agenda of promoting an augmented “book of the Torah,” including Joshua, over against the five fifths of Moses.

#### IV

While the Deuteronomistic conquest account presents itself as part of a larger literary work (in my view, the Deuteronomistic History<sup>18</sup>), situated

<sup>16</sup> One might further think of Josh 8:30–35. Yet including this passage into the discussion would not yield an affirmative answer either.

<sup>17</sup> Krause, *Exodus und Eisodus*.

<sup>18</sup> Within the scope of this paper, it is neither possible nor necessary to make a decision as to the alternative option, viz. a Deuteronomistic “Länderoberungserzählung” consisting solely of Deuteronomy and Joshua, as favored by N. Lohfink, “Kerygmata des Deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerks,” in *Die Botschaft und die Boten: Festschrift für Hans Walter Wolff zum 70. Geburtstag* (ed. J. Jeremias and L. Peritt; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1981), 87–100; and G. Braulik, “Die deuteronomistische Länderoberungserzählung aus der Joschijazeit in Deuteronomium und Josua,” in *Das*

within that account and intended critically to reappraise its core message, a local revision is to be discerned. Reading the conquest account in light of the questions of a new era, this revision turns the Deuteronomistic approach toward the peoples of the land and their relationship with both Israel and Yhwh on its head. In so doing, it betrays a broad literary horizon, repeatedly harking back to the exodus tradition as found in the Pentateuch. The latter being presupposed in the state of its Priestly composition, and reference being made to Priestly and non-Priestly material alike, I employ the term post-Priestly for this revision.<sup>19</sup>

It commences with the story of Rahab in Joshua 2. Hence, this chapter serves as an anchor point for the delineation, interpretation, and dating of the revision. Key to this task is the glaring contradiction between the Rahab story and the leading principle of the Deuteronomistic conquest account. Just as Deut 20:16–17 mandates a complete annihilation of the Canaanite peoples of the land, the Deuteronomistic account presents itself as a faithful execution of this commandment. In fact, the ban becomes the benchmark of Israel's obedience in Joshua. In this context, it is a sheer provocation that the first Canaanite whom the Israelites encounter is spared from the ban together with her entire family, precisely in order to live “in the midst of Israel until this day” (Josh 6:25). This is even exacerbated by the depiction of Rahab who, being introduced as a “whore” (Josh 2:1), is presented as the incarnate stereotype of the peoples of the land as entertained in Deuteronomistic circles.<sup>20</sup>

This contradiction that makes the Rahab story “stick out” of the Deuteronomistic conquest account “like a sore thumb”<sup>21</sup> has troubled commentators for a long time. Once it is taken at its word, however, Joshua 2 turns out

---

*deuteronomistische Geschichtswerk* (ed. H.-J. Stipp; ÖBS 39; Frankfurt a.M.: Lang, 2011), 89–150; in modified form also by Otto, *Das Deuteronomium im Pentateuch und Hexateuch*, 130–155, 240–246; and W. Oswald, *Staatstheorie im Alten Israel: Der politische Diskurs im Pentateuch und in den Geschichtsbüchern des Alten Testaments* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2009), 96–120, among others. For a discussion, see Krause, *Exodus und Eisodus*, 413–415.

19 For a terminological discussion, cf. also Carr, “Cases and Criteria,” 19 n. 1.

20 Note that the episode of the Canaanite “whore” apparently is set against the foil of Num 25:1–5, the Deuteronomistic example story of Israel's seduction by Baal Peor due to “whoring” with foreign women. In marked contrast to this narrative illustration of the Deuteronomistic stereotype, according to which contact with foreign women leads to apostasy, the story of Rahab presents its heroine as a shining example in every respect. For a discussion, see J. J. Krause, “Aesthetics of Production and Aesthetics of Reception in Analyzing Intertextuality: Illustrated with Joshua 2,” *Bib* 96 (2015): 416–427.

21 Thus the pointed comment in R. G. Boling and G. E. Wright, *Joshua: A New Translation with Notes and Commentary* (AB 6; Garden City, Ny.: Doubleday, 1982), 150.

to be the deliberate statement of a later revision. Telling of Rahab's rescue, this revision creates a counter-narrative to the account of a complete annihilation of the Canaanite peoples of the land. With this precedent, the revision introduces an option which the Deuteronomistic legislation was cautious to rule out: Under certain preconditions, exemptions from the ban are permissible. According to the example of Rahab, who is presented as the role model of a gentile worshipper of Yhwh, these preconditions come down to a double confession: with the mouth to Yhwh, with the hand to Israel.<sup>22</sup>

Yet who would construe such a precedent, and why? Obviously there must have been tangible problems in the world of the author and his or her addressees that motivated such a far-reaching revision of the Deuteronomistic conquest account – problems of the sort posed by the multi-ethnic society of Persian period Yehud and its religious diversity, which was irreconcilable with the Deuteronomistic ideal of “Israelite” society.<sup>23</sup> Against this backdrop, the Rahab story proves to be a statement in identity politics. By contesting exclusivist definitions of an “Israelite society,” it aims at socially integrating Yhwh-fearing non-Israelites into the Judean population of Yehud.<sup>24</sup>

Having thus accounted for the insertion of Joshua 2 and its purpose, we now need to broaden the outlook. As the revision contests the conquest account as a whole, it seems likely to find further interventions. Most salient among them are the conclusion of the Rahab story in Josh 6:17 ff., which clearly has been inserted into the Jericho narrative,<sup>25</sup> and the following Achan story in Joshua 7, which provides a complementary comment on the

22 See also E. Assis, “The Choice to Serve God and Assist His People: Rahab and Yael,” *Bib* 85 (2004): 82–90; E. Assis, *From Moses to Joshua and from the Miraculous to the Ordinary: A Literary Analysis of the Conquest Narrative in the Book of Joshua* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 2005), 74–82.

23 The fierce quarrel regarding exogamy that is expressly treated in Ezra–Nehemiah (Ezra 9–10; Nehemiah 13), and in all likelihood is also the background of the story of Ruth, shows that this situation resulted in a controversial debate regarding contact with non-Israelites.

24 Fundamental to this interpretation, see the fresh approach to Joshua 2 taken by J. Van Seters, *In Search of History: Historiography in the Ancient World and the Origins of Biblical History* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983), 325; J. Van Seters, “Joshua's Campaign of Canaan and Near Eastern Historiography,” *SJOT* 4 (1990): 1–12, here 4. Building on his work, see also E. Blum, “Beschneidung und Passa in Kanaan: Beobachtungen und Mutmaßungen zu Jos 5 (2003),” in *Textgestalt und Komposition: Exegetische Beiträge zu Tora und Vordere Propheten* (ed. W. Oswald; FAT 69; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 219–248; Knauf, *Josua*, ad loc.; and T. C. Römer, *The So-called Deuteronomistic History: A Sociological, Historical, and Literary Introduction* (London: T&T Clark, 2007), 134, 170–172.

25 Thus already Van Seters, *In Search of History*, 325 and 327; Van Seters, “Joshua's Campaign,” 3–4.



ban.<sup>26</sup> The Deuteronomistic commandment is not simply abrogated, we now learn, but rather reappraised in a critical fashion.<sup>27</sup> In like manner, then, our revision is also responsible for a thorough reworking of the Jordan crossing in Joshua 3–4.<sup>28</sup> The clearest evidence of this is the new conclusion in Josh 4:21–24 that presents a catechetical teaching of Joshua. Here, the question is posed as to the significance of the Gilgal memorial and its reminiscence of the miraculous crossing. The following answer explains the purpose of the miracle to be the magnification and adoration of Yhwh – not only by Israel, but by all peoples: “so that all the peoples of the earth may know that the hand of Yhwh is mighty, and so that they may fear Yhwh your God forever” (Josh 4:24).

Looking at language and style, this catechesis features affinities to the confession of Rahab in Josh 2:9–11 which are so characteristic that they hardly allow any other conclusion than ascribing both texts to the same hand. This conclusion is reinforced by the theological profile of the catechesis. The aspects that distinguish it from the primary Deuteronomistic layer in Joshua 3–4 are precisely the same as those that connect it to Joshua 2. While in the latter account Rahab is presented as a role model for gentile worshippers of Yhwh, the catechesis proposes a new interpretation of the miraculous crossing of the Jordan: as a catalyst for the universal worship of Yhwh. For this end, the crossing is expressly compared to the the crossing of the sea (Josh 4:23). Just as the latter, according to its Priestly version, was meant to make Egypt “know” Yhwh (Exod 14:4, 18), so the crossing of the Jordan is meant to make the whole world “know” Yhwh (Josh 4:24a). Over against the example of Egypt, however, the peoples shall also “fear” Yhwh (Josh 4:24b). That fearing Yhwh is used here in the theological sense of worshipping Yhwh is clear from the phrase that the fear of Yhwh shall reign among the peoples forever, for “all days.” In other places this phrase is used exclusively to describe Israel’s worship of her God.

26 See e.g. R. C. Culley, “Stories of the Conquest: Joshua 2, 6, 7 and 8,” *HAR* 8 (1984): 25–44.

27 See F. A. Spina, “Reversal of Fortune: Rahab and Achan, the Israelite and the Canaanite,” *BRev* 17 (2001): 24–30, 53–54; and F. A. Spina, *The Faith of the Outsider: Exclusion and Inclusion in the Biblical Story* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 52–71. See further J. H. Stek, “Rahab of Canaan and Israel: The Meaning of Joshua 2,” *CTJ* 37 (2002): 28–48, here 44; Blum, “Beschneidung und Passa,” 223.

28 For the following, see already J. J. Krause, “Der Zug durch den Jordan nach Josua 3–4: Eine neue Analyse,” in *The Book of Joshua* (ed. E. Noort; BETL 250; Leuven: University Press; Peeters, 2012), 383–400, here 391–395.

Thus, the Jordan crossing has been “converted” by the revision. Originally a miracle of accreditation for Joshua,<sup>29</sup> it is turned into a theocentric demonstration of Yhwh’s universal might. Just as he did at the sea of reeds, Yhwh proves to be lord of the entire world at the Jordan as well. He thus glorifies himself not only in the eyes of Israel, but before all peoples – and he does so with the explicit purpose of evoking the knowledge and fear of Yhwh in these peoples. This new emphasis introduced by the revision reveals its theological substance. Apparently, the plea for the social integration of Yhwh-fearing non-Israelites is not merely born out of necessity but betrays theological reasoning with regard to universal knowledge of Yhwh.

So this is the post-Priestly revision in Joshua 2; Joshua 3–4; Joshua 6; and Joshua 7. Above I referred to it as a *local* revision. This, however, is precisely the issue at stake here. Is this a small-scale *Fortschreibung*, or should we instead reckon with a more far-reaching literary layer? In other words, is our revision part of any Hexateuchal redaction? There are at least two finds that require closer analysis in this respect, which we will consider in a moment. Demonstrable at first sight, however, is the fact that this would hardly be the same redaction as in Joshua 24.

As has long been noted, the historical retrospect in Joshua 24 is independent from the preceding narrative in Joshua.<sup>30</sup> Significantly, this is true not only for the Deuteronomistic conquest account, but also for its subsequent reworkings. Looking at our revision, the first difference to note is the attitude towards the peoples of the land. According to Joshua 24, they have been expelled, not annihilated, as the Deuteronomistic account would have it. The option of their inclusion, however, which is propagated so resolutely in Joshua 2, is out of the question in Joshua 24. Equally clear is the difference regarding the tradition of the miracle at the sea. According to its reception by our revision, Israel *crossed* the sea. Indeed, the notion of crossing introduced by the Priestly composition in Exodus 13–14 is the point of comparison for the rewritten version of Joshua 3–4. By contrast, in Joshua 24 this distinctive development of the exodus tradition is conspicuously absent.<sup>31</sup>

29 For such an interpretation of the Deuteronomistic account of the Jordan crossing, see Krause, “Zug,” 385–389.

30 See e. g. M. Noth, *Das Buch Josua* (2nd ed.; HAT 7; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1953), 137–138; and the summary in Noort, *Das Buch Josua*, 205: “Jos 24 steht einsam in der Meereslandschaft. Mit dem narrativen Teil Jos 1–12 hat es kaum Verbindungen, und wenn gleiche Themen berührt werden, dann werden diese in Jos 24 anders dargestellt [...]”

31 In the careful discussion by Carr, *Formation*, 134–136, and Carr, “Cases and Criteria,” 28–29, this aspect is not taken into account.

As a consequence, the post-Priestly revision in Joshua 2–7 cannot be part of the same Hexateuchal redaction as Joshua 24. But does it belong to any other redaction of the like? The two finds that could seem to point in such a direction are in fact those we just looked at: The striking parallel between crossing the sea and crossing the Jordan; and the pragmatics regarding gentile worshippers of Yhwh, which likewise is not without similarities in Exodus.

As for the first, it is indeed difficult to escape the impression made by the parallel of the two miraculous passages, both featuring the dry-shod crossing of a liminal body of water and both opening a new epoch in salvation history. Under that impression, it has been argued in two earlier pieces by Tom Dozeman and Jan Wagenaar that it was one and the same hand which reworked both Exodus 13–14 and Joshua 3–4, thus establishing a redactional “framework”; a Deuteronomistic hand according to Dozeman,<sup>32</sup> a Priestly hand according to Wagenaar.<sup>33</sup> It is an obvious fact that the reworked version of Josh 3–4 finds its counterpart in Exod 13–14 – expressly so in Josh 4:23 (see also 2:10a), by way of allusion in other places (4:22b; 3:13b+16a). The question remains, however, whether these affiliations are really due to *intratextual* cross connections within one and the same redactional work, as Dozeman and Wagenaar would have it, or rather to *intertextual* back references.<sup>34</sup> I would argue the latter case. As far as I can see, the Priestly composition in Exodus 13–14, which may or may not have drawn inspiration from the Deuteronomistic account of the Jordan crossing,<sup>35</sup> introduced

32 T. B. Dozeman, “The *yam-sûp* in the Exodus and the Crossing of the Jordan River,” *CBQ* 58 (1996): 407–416. See also T. B. Dozeman, *Commentary on Exodus* (ECC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009), 301–303; but cf. now T. B. Dozeman, *Joshua 1–12: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 6B; New Haven: Yale University Press, 2015), 279–281, 293–295.

33 J. A. Wagenaar, “Crossing the Sea of Reeds (Exod 13–14) and the Jordan (Josh 3–4): A Priestly Framework for the Wilderness Wandering,” in *Studies in the Book of Exodus: Redaction – Reception – Interpretation* (ed. M. Vervenne; BETL 126; Leuven: University Press; Peeters, 1996), 461–470.

34 More recently, Dozeman, *Joshua 1–12*, 279–281, 293–295 has maintained that the account of the Jordan crossing given in Josh 4:20–24 builds an *inclusio* with the crossing of the sea without making further mention of the idea that the hand responsible for this reinterpretation of Joshua 3–4 should be the same as one of the hands working on Exodus 13–14. See also Dozeman, *Joshua 1–12*, 32.

35 For the assumption that it did, see especially G. W. Coats, “The Traditio-Historical Character of the Reed Sea Motif,” *VT* 17 (1967): 253–265, here 261; G. W. Coats, “The Song of the Sea,” *CBQ* 31 (1969): 1–17, here 16–17; and B. S. Childs, “A Traditio-Historical Study of the Reed Sea Tradition,” *VT* 20 (1970): 406–418, here 414. For a discussion and further bibliography, see Krause, *Exodus und Eisodus*, 268–271.

the notion of crossing the sea,<sup>36</sup> which in turn provided the crucial point of reference for the post-Priestly revision in Joshua 3–4.<sup>37</sup> This view is corroborated by the apparent lack of further evidence for the alleged redaction which has left virtually no trace in other places or motifs.<sup>38</sup> Most notably, in contrast to the clear back references from the Jordan to the sea, there are no corresponding forward references.<sup>39</sup> Thus, I agree with Dozeman and Wagenaar that the two originally independent accounts have been reworked in order to correspond to each other, but I fail to see that this has been done by one and the same hand, let alone the hand of some Hexateuchal redactor.

Secondly, there is the pragmatics regarding gentile worshippers of Yhwh in our post-Priestly layer in Joshua, for we find something quite similar in the story of Moses' father-in-law Jethro in Exodus 18. If Rahab is the female role model for non-Israelites who worship the God of Israel, Jethro could be called her male equivalent.<sup>40</sup> In this vein, Rainer Albertz has recently ascribed both Exodus 18 and Joshua 2 to one and the same hand, that of his Hexateuchal redactor ("HexR").<sup>41</sup> To be sure, there is a close parallel. Yet the question of how to account for it remains. Common authorship is just one possible explanation and, in view of further parallels (only think of Naaman in 2 Kings 5), it might prove less likely than others. An alternative explanation is afforded by the assumption that, in post-exilic times, the topic of universal knowledge and universal worship

36 For fresh observations in favor of this time-honored thesis, see Krause, *Exodus und Eisodus*, 263–268. Note that this analysis would preclude a Deuteronomistic provenience of the alleged redaction.

37 See already Krause, "Zug," 397–400.

38 Wagenaar, "Crossing," 470 seeks to interpret the parallel wording with בַּקְצֵה + חָנָה in Exod 13:20 and Josh 4:19 as marking "the crossing of the sea and the river as the transition from the desert to the inhabitable land." Yet in absence of further, and more specific, evidence, this similarity could just as well be due to accidental lexematic choice. In any case, it is not significant enough to carry the burden of proof for a Priestly redaction of the Hexateuch.

39 This is brought out quite clearly by Dozeman, "yam-sûp," 414 himself. Asking the critical question of whether there are any reciprocal cross connections, all there is to answer is the rather general observation of a canonical reader that "Israel's passing through the יַם סוּף into the wilderness requires a conquest of the land for its completion."

40 On Jethro as a gentile worshipper of Yhwh, see the important study by V. Haarmann, *JHWH-Verehrer der Völker: Die Hinwendung von Nichtisraeliten zum Gott Israels in alttestamentlichen Überlieferungen* (ATANT 91; Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 2008), 59–99.

41 R. Albertz, "The Formative Impact of the Hexateuchal Redaction: An Interim Result," in *The Post-Priestly Pentateuch: New Perspectives on Its Redactional Development and Theological Profiles* (ed. F. Giuntoli and K. Schmid; FAT 101; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015), 53–74, here 60–61 and 67–68, see also Albertz, *Exodus* (Vol. I), 307 n. 6.

of Yhwh was treated by more than one theologian, and in more than one literary context. Considering the importance of the topic, this is only to be expected. And the evidence is in fact unequivocal. In addition to the texts cited above, one should mention Jonah 1 (the sailors), 1 Kgs 8:41–43 (the exemplary foreigner),<sup>42</sup> and of course the pioneering ideas of that great innovator known as Deutero-Isaiah.<sup>43</sup>

Hence, in absence of clear textual markers, it is far from self-evident that Exodus 18 and Joshua 2 were written by the same hand. But even if we were in a position to prove Albertz's assumption, it would still not answer the question regarding a Hexateuchal redaction. For one hand can revise two (or more) literary works. If some ancient tradent revised both Exodus and Joshua, this fact by itself neither implies that the respective units belonged to one literary work, nor that our tradent sought to establish such a work. Assuming this intention, we should expect clear indicators which would allow addressees to recognize the newly-created literary unit as such. The Hexateuchal redaction of Joshua 24 demonstrates how this would be done: leitmotif technique, back and forward references alike, and even the literary unit's self-referential mention of its title, "the book of the Torah of God."<sup>44</sup>

All things considered, I remain convinced that the post-Priestly revision in Joshua 2–7 is indeed a local revision. Admittedly, it betrays a literary horizon of Hexateuchal scope. But differently from Joshua 24, this is not due to the intention to establish some sort of a Hexateuch. In fact, harking back to exodus traditions is no end in itself here, but rather a means to another end, that of a certain religio-political pragmatics. Nevertheless, the references thus introduced function as a catalyst for more *Fortschreibung* in Joshua.

## V

This holds in particular for the parallel between the two epoch-making passages – through the sea and through the Jordan – introduced by the revision. With this parallel, the revision for the first time draws a line between

<sup>42</sup> See the relevant sections in Haarmann, *JHWH-Verehrer der Völker*.

<sup>43</sup> Yet again, the neglect in current research to consider topical and other reasons for similarities between texts, to the credit of an unduly focus on textual ones, precludes important explanatory potential from the discussion. For a methodological consideration, see Krause, "Aesthetics," 417–418.

<sup>44</sup> See also Carr, *Formation*, 279, with the important control question as to when scribal activity of Hexateuchal scope allows the conclusion that this activity meant to mark off the Hexateuch as a redactional unit.

the eisodus into the promised land and the exodus from Egypt. This then triggered a successive elaboration of the events connected with Israel's entry into the land: an enactment of the eisodus as a mirror image of the exodus. The process can be studied in Joshua 5. Judging from their literary profile,<sup>45</sup> the three reminiscences of the exodus to be found in that chapter do not stem from one hand. But all of them represent late embellishments, each of which presupposes the post-Priestly revision of the conquest account. Catalyzed by the latter, they aim at an aggadic resumption of the exodus, thus depicting its final conclusion.

At first sight, however, the three episodes present themselves as enigmatic riddles. Beginning our tour with what is presumably the oldest of the three, i. e., the report of the first Passover in the promised land (Josh 5:10–12), it might appear that at least this riddle has been solved already. From the early days of critical scholarship and until today, the majority of scholars adhered to the interpretation of Josh 5:10–12 as depicting halakhically motivated observance of Lev 23:9–14 and its commandment to offer the first fruits after the feast of Passover and mazzot. According to this view, the fact that the Israelites entered the land “just at Easter” (Wellhausen) and accordingly held Passover is because otherwise they would not have been allowed to eat of the produce of the land.<sup>46</sup> Yet this interpretation did not stand the test. First and foremost, it should be noted that the text simply does not mention a ritual offering of first fruits.<sup>47</sup> And that is hardly surprising, for in the situation depicted, there are not yet first fruits in the sense of the commandment: Lev 23:9–14 refers to the first fruit of one's *own* harvest.<sup>48</sup>

Hence the narrator's intention in having the Israelites celebrate Passover upon entering the land – 40 years to the day after the first Passover

<sup>45</sup> See below, p. 200.

<sup>46</sup> “Da man von der Frucht des Landes nicht essen darf, ohne die Erstlingsgarbe dargebracht zu haben, so war es eine Notwendigkeit, dass die Israeliten gerade zu Ostern in Kanaan einrückten [...]” Wellhausen, *Composition*, 120. See further Smend, *Erzählung*, 290; W. Rudolph, *Der 'Elohists' von Exodus bis Josua* (BZAW 68; Berlin: Töpelmann, 1938), 179; from the more recent literature, S. Ahituv, *Joshua: Introduction and Commentary* (Mikra; Jerusalem: Am Oved, 1995), 108; Bieberstein, *Josua – Jordan – Jericho*, 223, 406–408; M. N. van der Meer, *Formation and Reformulation: The Redaction of the Book of Joshua in the Light of the Oldest Textual Witnesses* (VTSup 102; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 320–322, to name but a few.

<sup>47</sup> J. A. Wagenaar, “The Cessation of Manna: Editorial Frames for the Wilderness Wandering in Exodus 16,35 and Joshua 5,10–12,” *ZAW* 112 (2000): 192–209, here 203–204 spells out the obvious.

<sup>48</sup> Not by accident, a prominent position in rabbinic halakha states that the commandment of Lev 23:9–14 was to be observed only after the complete conquest of the land. See *y. Hal.* II:1.

celebrated when leaving Egypt – is not to demonstrate their observance regarding the offering of the first fruits. The motivation behind Josh 5:10–12 is not halakhic but rather aggadic. This is indicated already by the combination with the further theme of the manna. Referring back to Exod 16:35,<sup>49</sup> Josh 5:12 states that the manna, having nourished the Israelites for 40 years, ceased in the very moment when they ate from the produce of the land during Passover. Israel's living not on the proverbial food of the desert any more, but on the fruits of the land, is a manifest symbol of the pericope's message: The desert wandering is over, the exodus is at its end.<sup>50</sup>

This message is expressly underlined by the intertextual relationship of Josh 5:10–12 with Exodus 12. The Passover at the eisodus corresponds to the Passover at the exodus. A first clue to this relationship is given in the date of the Passover. According to Josh 4:19a, the Israelites reach Gilgal on the 10<sup>th</sup> day of the 1<sup>st</sup> month, and according to Josh 5:10 it is on the 14<sup>th</sup> day of the same month that they celebrate Passover. This sequence is not only in exact accordance with the commandment concerning Passover given in Exod 12:3, 6 (preparation from the 10<sup>th</sup> day of the 1<sup>st</sup> month, feast on the 14<sup>th</sup> day of the 1<sup>st</sup> month), but is actually the only other instance for the sequence 10<sup>th</sup> of the month → 14<sup>th</sup> of the month in the religious calendar of ancient Israel. Beyond that, one must here take into account the meaning of Passover itself. According to Exodus 12 and 13, Passover and mazzot are introduced in order to commemorate the delivering deed of Yhwh at the exodus. Hence it makes sense that the Israelites celebrate Passover in Gilgal: at the end of the exodus.<sup>51</sup>

This is taken up in Josh 5:2–9. The hand responsible for this pericope has deepened the idea of the conclusion of the exodus by contrasting it with its counter-image: the failed conquest of the older generation. At first sight,

49 There is reason to assume that this verse has been inserted into Exodus 16 in order to create a point of reference for Josh 5:12. Notably, this holds not only for Exod 16:35a, as is commonly assumed, but for the verse as a whole. For a discussion and bibliography, see Krause, *Exodus und Eisodus*, 351–357.

50 Thus already M. Rose, *Deuteronomist und Jahwist: Untersuchungen zu den Berührungspunkten beider Literaturwerke* (ATANT 67; Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1981), 25.

51 “En célébrant la Pâque, la génération suivante, guidée par Josué, marque la fin de l'Exode.” M. Nobile, “Les quatre Pâques dans le cadre de la rédaction finale de Gen–2 Rois,” in *Pentateuchal and Deuteronomistic Studies: Papers Read at the XIIIth IOSOT Congress, Leuven 1989* (ed. C. Brekelmans and J. Lust; BETL 94; Leuven: University Press, 1990), 191–196, here 195. On the approach to Josh 5:10–12 taken here, see especially Blum, “Beschneidung und Passa,” 227–230; 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: Eisenbrauns, 2007), 287–303, here 292; and Knauf, *Josua*, 63, 65.

however, this story poses a riddle, too. The reintroduction of circumcision is surprising. Elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible there is not the slightest hint at either a tradition according to which the Israelites failed to circumcise their offspring while in the wilderness, as Josh 5:5 explicitly states, or at any connection between the themes of circumcision and wilderness wandering whatsoever. Owing to this state of affairs, a long-standing scholarly opinion deemed it self-evident to differentiate between an allegedly older report of the circumcision in vv. 2–3 and 8 and redactional insertions in the retrospective middle part of vv. 4–7. Originally, it was held, the story was about the introduction of the rite of circumcision through which the “disgrace of Egypt” (v. 9) – in this view, the uncircumcised Israelites’ being reviled by the traditionally circumcised Egyptians of old – was rolled away.<sup>52</sup>

Over against this literary critical separation, recent research has shown that the text of the pericope as it stands is a homogeneous, thoughtfully crafted literary piece<sup>53</sup> (in my view also including v. 9 which is still set off as secondary by most scholars<sup>54</sup>). The customary separation is based on an outdated understanding of the phrase “disgrace of Egypt,” and it fails to recognize the intention of connecting the themes of circumcision and wilderness wandering. If we seek to solve the riddle of this seemingly enigmatic text, we have to follow the clues to other texts to which this pericope alludes, too. First and foremost, this holds for the spy mission of Kadesh Barnea (Numbers 13–14 par. Deut 1:19–46; see also Deut 2:14–15). As the crisis par excellence and the turning point of the exodus, the spy mission serves as the pivot of the theological interpretation of the wilderness wandering developed in the retrospective middle part.<sup>55</sup> The reference to this intertext is marked both by significant parallels in wording and by

52 Instead of many, see V. Fritz, *Das Buch Josua* (HAT 7; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994), 56–59, citing older literature. The understanding of the cryptic “disgrace of Egypt” fundamental to this opinion has been introduced by J. Hollenberg, “Die deuteronomischen Bestandtheile des Buches Josua,” *TSK* 47 (1874): 462–506, who in turn drew on Herodotus, *Hist.* II:36–37 and 104.

53 Bieberstein, *Josua – Jordan – Jericho*, 207–210; van der Meer, *Formation and Reformulation*, 289–311; Blum, “Beschneidung und Passa,” 230–236.

54 Bieberstein, *Josua – Jordan – Jericho*, 209–210, 419–420; van der Meer, *Formation and Reformulation*, 311–315; also E. Noort, “The Disgrace of Egypt: Joshua 5.9a and Its Context,” in *The Wisdom of Egypt: Jewish, Early Christian, and Gnostic Essays in Honour of Gerard P. Luttikhuisen* (ed. A. Hillhorst and G. H. van Kooten; AGJU 59; Leiden: Brill, 2005), 3–19. Only Blum, “Beschneidung und Passa,” 233–236, opts for the inclusion of v. 9.

55 On this, see especially Assis, *From Moses to Joshua*, 109–113; E. Assis, “The Story of the Sin at Kadesh and the Book of Joshua,” *JANESCU* 31 (2009): 1–14, here 3–6.



taking up the theme of the antithesis of the two generations established in Numbers 13–14.

This antithesis is brought into a telling image by the story of the circumcision in Gilgal. The disobedience of the older generation, who in Kadesh turned back towards Egypt due to lack of faith (see Num 14:4), is symbolically illustrated by the charge of having failed to circumcise their children. Accordingly, the circumcision of the younger generation which is uncircumcised yet inculpable is presented here as the rolling away of the disgrace of Egypt. With their circumcision, the younger generation overcomes the fatal attachment of their parents to the unfree life in Egypt and the trauma of the unfinished exodus.<sup>56</sup> Hence the circumcision in Gilgal becomes the image through which both the end of the wilderness wandering and the final breakthrough to freedom are commemorated.

In so doing, the story offers a theological reflection on the long exodus in the moment of its conclusion. This interpretation is reinforced by the fact that the story recalls, just like the Passover account did, the beginning of the exodus. This becomes apparent already in the noticeable emphasis on the flint knives by which Joshua circumcises the Israelites, for this feature clearly alludes to the context of Moses' calling (cf. Exod 4:24–26).<sup>57</sup> Moreover, the collective circumcision at the eisodus into the land corresponds to a commandment at the exodus. This commandment given in Exod 12:43–50, itself a secondary expansion of the commandments concerning Passover,<sup>58</sup> declares circumcision as the main criterion for being able to participate in Passover. In presenting the circumcision in Gilgal as the preparation for the following Passover, the author of Josh 5:2–9 brings the account of the eisodus in compliance with this commandment.<sup>59</sup> In view of the context, it appears that in so doing the line drawn by the Passover pericope is underscored further: Just as at the exodus, so also at the eisodus, the Israelites celebrate Passover. And as commanded then, they are now circumcised in preparation for the feast.

That this line is not due to coincidence, but rather to deliberate authorial design, is proven by the episode of Josh 5:13–15 that stems from the same hand as 5:2–9.<sup>60</sup> All by himself in the field near Jericho, Joshua encounters

<sup>56</sup> Blum, "Beschneidung und Passa," 230–236.

<sup>57</sup> See especially P. Weimar, *Die Berufung des Mose: Literaturwissenschaftliche Analyse von Exodus 2,23–5,5* (OBO 32; Fribourg: Universitätsverlag, 1980), 287.

<sup>58</sup> See Gertz, *Tradition und Redaktion*, 57–58, with literature.

<sup>59</sup> Noort, "Disgrace of Egypt," 12: "Josh 5.2–8 is Exod 12 in action."

<sup>60</sup> For the reasons, see Krause, *Exodus und Eisodus*, 390–392.

an armed stranger. This stranger introduces himself as “commander of the army of Yhwh” – just to go on saying to Joshua what was once said to Moses: “Remove your sandal from your foot, for the place where you stand is holy.” This déjà vu of the theophany at the burning bush explicitly marks what this story is all about: The conclusion of the exodus is depicted by commemorating its beginning.

In fact, Josh 5:13–15 as a whole is conceived of as counterpart to Exod 3:1 ff.<sup>61</sup> As a result, considering this intertextual relationship is the *conditio sine qua non* for comprehending the seemingly enigmatic episode. The intertextual dimension of the text, which would go unnoticed by a hypothetical reader without knowledge of the story of Moses’ calling, becomes decisively important for a knowing reader, since the intertext presents an otherwise random episode about an uncanny encounter as a carefully crafted finale. On the one hand, Joshua appears as a “new Moses” as a new epoch dawns. On the other hand, the previous epoch is thereby brought to its final conclusion. At the burning bush the exodus began, and here it concludes.

This interpretation is confirmed by a surprising observation to be made when the three reminiscences of the exodus in Joshua 5 are brought into a synopsis. As we have seen, all three of them draw a line back to the story of the exodus. Viewed in conjunction with each other and with the preceding context, a remarkable structure comes to light:

epiphany (Exod 3)  
 Passover (Exod 12)  
     circumcision (Exod 12:43–50)  
     crossing (Exod 13–14)  
         spy mission (Num 13–14)  
         succession of Moses (Deut 1–3; 31)  
             succession of Moses (Josh 1)  
             spy mission (Josh 2)  
             crossing (Josh 3–4)  
             circumcision (Josh 5:2–9)  
 Passover (Josh 5:10–12)  
 epiphany (Josh 5:13–15)

<sup>61</sup> This is not taken into account in the customary approach, to the effect that the pericope appears to be an incomprehensible fragment of a longer text lost in transmission. See e. g. Noth, *Josua* (2nd ed.), 23; and Fritz, *Josua*, 63.

According to my analysis, this structure<sup>62</sup> is due to a successive process of scribal *Fortschreibung* and inner-biblical interpretation,<sup>63</sup> catalyzed by the first line drawn between exodus and eisodus: the depiction of the Jordan crossing as counterpart to the crossing of the sea of reeds introduced by the post-Priestly revision. The parallel of these two passages, *pars pro toto* representing exodus and eisodus, functioned as both catalyst and docking point for local insertions that gradually embellished the story of Israel's entrance into the land – according to the model of the exodus from Egypt.

Given this goal of the three reminiscences in Joshua 5, to hark back to exodus traditions is not a means here, but an end in itself. This conclusion, however, is not tantamount to an answer regarding Hexateuchal redaction in that chapter. Rather, we once again have to sift through the above results in order to see whether or not tying the eisodus to the exodus is part of an overarching endeavor to delimit the Hexateuch as a redactional unit. Again, this brings us to the question of a possible connection with Joshua 24, and in the case of Joshua 5, that could at first sight seem more likely. In earlier research, various attempts were made to ascribe at least parts of Joshua 5 to the same hand as Joshua 24, the latter being construed as part of a pre-Deuteronomistic work of Hexateuchal dimensions – i. e., the “Jerusalemite History” (JG) proposed by Erich Zenger and Peter Weimar.<sup>64</sup> Recently, Klaus Bieberstein

62 It has in part been noted already in the older research focusing on a presumed ritual reenactment of the exodus at Gilgal as part of the cult of the amphictyony; for the according observations on Josh 3–5, see especially J. A. Soggin, “Gilgal, Passah und Landnahme: Eine neue Untersuchung des kultischen Zusammenhangs der Kap. III–VI des Josuabuches,” in *Volume du Congrès Genève 1965* (ed. G. W. Anderson; VTSup 15; Leiden: Brill, 1966), 263–277. More recently, Assis, *From Moses to Joshua*, 33–119, seemingly drawing on the unpublished dissertation of G. Hauch, “Text and Contexts: A Literary Reading of the Conquest Narrative (Jos 1–11)” (Ph.D. diss., Princeton Theological Seminary, 1991), has given a full account of the material. However, he restricts himself to a synchronic description of the parallels. Since Joshua 1–5 obviously have not been written by one author, and since the earlier parts (namely the Deuteronomistic account in Joshua 1 and Joshua \*3–4) were not conceived of according to the model of the exodus, the question remains whether the observed structure can also be explained diachronically – that is, whether it can be explained as the result of deliberate design introduced in the course of the subsequent literary history of the Deuteronomistic account. Groundbreaking work on this question is owed to Bieberstein, *Josua – Jordan – Jericho*, 413–418.

63 The latter category applies to the parallel of Josh 2 with Num 13–14 (par. Deut 1:19–46) which has demonstrably not been *intended* by the author of Joshua 2 (see Krause, “Aesthetics,” 419–422), but probably been *perceived* by the subsequent author of Josh 5:2–9, 13–15 (see Krause, *Exodus und Eisodus*, 438–439).

64 See E. Zenger, *Die Sinaithetheophanie: Untersuchungen zum jahwistischen und elohistischen Geschichtswerk* (FB 3; Würzburg: Echter, 1971), 137–138 and Weimar, *Berufung*, 38–39, 246–251, 287–288, 294, 315; see further L. Schwienhorst, *Die Eroberung Jerichos*:

has approached that thesis in a new way. Contrary to his predecessors, he does not reckon with JG in Joshua 5, but interprets the reminiscences of the exodus as intertextual back references.<sup>65</sup> In so doing, however, he brings into play the idea these could be part of the same Hexateuchal redaction responsible for the colophon in Josh 24:26.<sup>66</sup> So what about Joshua 5 and 24?

First of all, it commends itself to retain the well-established distinction in Joshua 5 between vv. 2–9 and vv. 13–15, on the one hand, and vv. 10–12, on the other,<sup>67</sup> since the latter passage contrasts with the former in its markedly Priestly profile.<sup>68</sup> This profile militates against ascribing Josh 5:10–12 to the same hand as Joshua 24. Somewhat more likely, one could conceive of these verses as part of a Hexateuchal redaction of *Priestly* provenience – if the book of Joshua indeed contains such a redaction as Thomas Römer and others have proposed.<sup>69</sup> Since Joshua stands out from the rest of the Former Prophets through a substantial amount of P-like insertions, there is something to be said for this proposal.<sup>70</sup> If we were to reckon with such a redaction, strong candidates for it would be, in my view, Josh 18:1; 19:51 and 24:33. Comparing these passages with Josh 5:10–12, however, it is to be observed that the *propria* they exhibit (i. e., the Priestly מועד אהל; the עדה; and Eleazar as co-leader next to Joshua) do not figure in the Passover pericope.

So we are left with Josh 5:2–9 and 13–15, the accounts of circumcision and epiphany. None of them is mentioned in the historical retrospect of Joshua 24.<sup>71</sup> In fact, the whole concept of the wilderness wandering as a time of disobedience and the corresponding dichotomy of the two generations, part and parcel of the theological perspective offered in Joshua 5, is apparently unknown in Joshua 24. Both Joshua 5 and Joshua 24 offer a theological perspective on Israel's past, but the two perspectives are independent of

---

*Exegetische Untersuchung zu Josua 6* (SBS 122; Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1986), 81–82; but cf. Zenger, *Einleitung*, 101–103, 179–184.

65 Bieberstein, "Horizonte," 167–170. See already Bieberstein, *Josua – Jordan – Jericho*.

66 Bieberstein, "Horizonte," 170.

67 Pace Bieberstein, "Horizonte," 169 n. 58; Bieberstein, *Josua – Jordan – Jericho*, 207–210, 220–223, 397–418.

68 For a discussion and bibliography, see Krause, *Exodus und Eisodus*, 336–338, 364–372.

69 See T. C. Römer, "Pentateuque, Hexateuque et historiographie deutéronomiste: Le problème du début et de la fin du livre de Josué," *Transeu* 16 (1998): 71–86, here 85; T. C. Römer, "La fin de l'historiographie deutéronomiste et le retour de l'Hexateuque?," *TZ* 57 (2001): 269–280, here 279; and already Blum, *Studien*, 378 n. 65.

70 See also Albertz, "Canonical Alignment."

71 See also T. C. Römer, "Das deuteronomistische Geschichtswerk und die Wüstentradiitionen der Hebräischen Bibel," in *Das deuteronomistische Geschichtswerk* (ed. H.-J. Stipp; ÖBS 39; Frankfurt a. M.: Lang, 2011), 55–88, here 62–63.

each other. What is more, the idiosyncratic view on salvation history in Joshua 5 is not only independent of Joshua 24, but also of the entire biblical tradition. Elsewhere, there is no indication whatsoever to suggest that the Israelites failed to circumcise their children while in the wilderness. Lacking any preparation, this notion can only be perplexing for the addressees. In contrast to this, consider the carefully crafted leitmotifs with which the redaction of Joshua 24 prepared for its punchline. In light of this contrast, I find it difficult to see how the erratic reminiscences in Joshua 5 should be part of the same redaction as Joshua 24, or any Hexateuchal redaction.

In short, the successive embellishment of the eisdos as the mirror image of the exodus observable in Joshua 5 does not share the agenda of promoting an augmented book of the Torah over against the five fifths of Moses. Quite the contrary, by pointed allusions to and extensive verbal quotations from selected places in Exodus through Deuteronomy, Joshua 5 bears witness to the proto-canonical status that the Pentateuchal corpus has achieved by that time.

## VI

In summary, the quest for a Hexateuchal redaction in Joshua has to settle for Joshua 24. As promising as they might look on first glance, the heavily reworked opening chapters of the book offer no evidence for the hand of Joshua 24 nor for any other comprehensive, Hexateuchal redaction.

The redaction to be observed in Joshua 24 relies not merely on the final note struck in that chapter. Rather, by employing a characteristic leitmotif technique, it has reworked the preceding Pentateuchal context for its own purposes, putting up visible signposts all the way from Genesis. What is more, the literary unit thus established is not just marked off; the addressees are also put in the position to recognize it as an actual literary work. By expressly introducing its title, and notably a title employing the word “book,” the redaction makes clear its intention to establish the first six books of the Bible as one.

None of this applies either to the post-Priestly revision of the conquest account in Joshua 2–7 or to the subsequent aggadic embellishment of the eisdos in Joshua 5. To be sure, these reworkings betray a Hexateuchal horizon, or rather, a horizon of canonical *Heilsgeschichte*. But it is important to distinguish such a perspective of Hexateuchal scope from the attempt to actually delimit the Hexateuch as a discrete literary work. This caution is warranted by the way in which the aforementioned Hexateuchal horizon

is realized in the reworking of the opening chapters, namely by local insertions into an emerging book of Joshua, and by intertextual referencing of a proto-canonical Pentateuch.

This result bears telling witness to the literary material that fell into the horizon of Hexateuchal *Heilsgeschichte* in the late Persian period: the five fifths of the Torah and the book of Joshua. Hence, resolute as it was, the redaction of Joshua 24 ultimately failed to achieve its end.

Joachim J. Krause  
Eberhard Karls Universität Tübingen  
Liebermeisterstraße 14  
72076 Tübingen  
Germany  
joachim.krause@uni-tuebingen.de