On the Cohesion and Separation of Books within the Enneateuch

*Christoph Levin**

Single Books or Large Redactional Units?

As the retelling of the history of Israel, the great biblical work contained in the books of Genesis to Kings constitutes a continuous unit. The sequence of events which begins with the creation of the world and ends with the Babylonian exile can at no point be rationally broken off and begun afresh. Spinoza already drew attention to this fact in the eighth chapter of his *Tractatus theologico-politicus* of 1670: "These books are so intertwined with one another that from this alone we can perceive that they contain the account of only a single historian."[1]

At the same time, however, it is obvious that the Enneateuch is a collection, which brings together diverse material with a multiform previous history. The selection, arrangement, and assembly have been made intentionally, and it makes sense to ascribe this work to one or several redactions. That is what Spinoza did when he traced back the whole Enneateuch to Ezra, as its presumed author.

Recently, the great redaction-historical hypotheses are being called in question. Attention is focused on blocks of tradition, such as the Primeval History, the history of the patriarchs, the Joseph story, the exodus tradition, the conquest of the promised land, the stories about the Judges, and the account of the monarchical era. These are supposed to have been put together only at a late stage, and then in several steps. Thus the Deuteronomistic His-

---

1. "Hi enim libri ita invicem connectuntur, ut ex hoc solo dignoscere possimus eos non nisi unam unius historici narrationem continere." Benedictus de Spinoza, *Opera I: Tractatus theologico-politicus* (ed. G. Gawlik and F. Niewöhner; Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1979), 298.

tory is said to have originally comprised only the books of Samuel and Kings: "The beginning lies in Samuel–Kings."[2] For the narrative about the conquest of the land in the books of Deuteronomy and Joshua a separate redaction is postulated, which created an independent work.[3] The book of Judges was supposedly interposed later between Joshua and Samuel, in order to establish the connection between Deuteronomy and Joshua, on the one hand, and Samuel and Kings, on the other.[4] With regard to the Tetrateuch, there is a growing widespread view that the book of Genesis was not separated from the rest but was made to precede it at some later point.[5] What all these hypotheses come down to is that the narrative sequence as a whole was not a starting point; it was a terminus. According to Reinhard Kratz, the complex as a totality is no earlier than the Torah, which developed out of the First Commandment: "If we remove this presupposition and take away the connecting links based on it, the whole historical construction collapses into loose, disconnected individual parts."[6]

It is doubtful whether this revival of the Fragment Hypothesis constitutes an advance in our knowledge. That the narrated material is made up of different and formerly independent units was never in dispute. But if the whole structure is accounted for merely as the outcome of later literary combinations, then a problem solved by the earlier redaction-historical hypotheses,

---

2. Reinhard G. Kratz, *The Composition of the Narrative Books of the Old Testament* (trans. J. Bowden; London: T&T Clark; New York: Continuum, 2005), 158. In current research this opinion is increasingly shared. See also Ernst Würthwein, "Erwägungen zum sog. deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerk," in idem, *Studien zum Deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerk* (BZAW 227; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1994), 1–11.

3. See esp. Norbert Lohfink, "Kerygmata des Deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerks," in *Die Botschaft und die Boten: Festschrift für Hans Walter Wolff zum 70. Geburtstag* (ed. J. Jeremias and L. Perlitt; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1981), 87–100, esp. 92–96; repr. in idem, *Studien zum Deuteronomium und zur deuteronomistischen Literatur II* (SBAB 12; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1991), 125–42, esp. 132–37.

4. See esp. Kratz, *The Composition of the Narrative Books*, 191.

5. See esp. Konrad Schmid, *Erzväter und Exodus: Untersuchungen zur doppelten Begründung der Ursprünge Israels innerhalb der Geschichtsbücher des Alten Testaments* (WMANT 81; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1999); Kratz, *Composition*, 281; Jan Christian Gertz, "The Transition between the Books of Genesis and Exodus," in *A Farewell to the Yahwist? The Composition of the Pentateuch in Recent European Interpretation* (ed. T. B. Dozeman and K. Schmid; SBLSymS 34; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006), 73–87. Schmid, *Literaturgeschichte des Alten Testaments: Eine Einführung* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2008), 158–59, presents a short summary of this position wherein the shortcuts are clearly seen. Contrary to all of them see Christoph Levin, "The Yahwist and the Redactional Link between Genesis and Exodus," in Dozeman and Schmid, *A Farewell to the Yahwist?* 131–41.

6. Kratz, *The Composition of the Narrative Books*, 155.

returns. The course of the historical events as they are presented is not in itself self-evident, but is rather to a large degree fictitious: "A gigantic structure such as this, the whole conforming to one single plan, does not grow up naturally of its own accord."[7] Gerhard von Rad established this principle, and we do not refute his insight by ignoring it. It is highly unlikely that the overall historiographical concept came into being only through the subsequent linking together of books, which were for the most part already independent.

In pentateuchal research of the mid-twentieth century, scholars explored the possibility that the sequence followed a traditional pattern, which supposedly had its *Sitz im Leben* in the *memoria* used in the cult.[8] This solution has simply proved untenable. The credal formulas, which, it had been assumed, provided the original structure for this pattern, have proved to be late summaries. They do not precede the redactional compilations; they presuppose them, and without them are inconceivable.[9] The cohesion of the whole can be explained only in the light of redaction history. Spinoza's conclusion is still valid.

However, Martin Noth had already disputed the existence of redactions that encompassed the entire Enneateuch from the outset by cutting the ground from under the feet of earlier attempts to trace the sources of the Pentateuch as far as the books of Kings.[10] His hypothesis of a Deuteronomistic History comprising the books of Deuteronomy to Kings excludes the possibility that

---

7. Gerhard von Rad, "The Form-Critical Problem of the Hexateuch," in idem, *The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays* (trans. E. W. Trueman Dicken; Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1966; repr. London: SCM Press, 1984), 1–78, p. 52.

8. See von Rad, "The Form-Critical Problem of the Hexateuch," 3–8 and 50–53.

9. See esp. Wolfgang Richter, "Beobachtungen zur theologischen Systembildung in der alttestamentlichen Literatur anhand des 'Kleinen geschichtlichen Credo,'" in *Wahrheit und Verkündigung* (ed. L. Scheffczyk et al.; Paderborn: Schöningh, 1967), 1:175–212; Brevard S. Childs, "Deuteronomic Formulae of the Exodus Traditions," in *Hebräische Wortforschung* (ed. B. Hartmann et al.; VTSup 16; Leiden: Brill, 1967), 30–39, esp. 39.

10. For the book of Joshua this detection of pentateuchal materials follows from the earlier hypotheses concerning the Hexateuch. See Abraham Kuenen, *An Historico-Critical Inquiry into the Origin and Composition of the Hexateuch: Vol. 1* (trans. P. H. Wicksteed; London: Macmillan, 1886; Dutch original 1861; 2d ed. 1885); and Julius Wellhausen, *Die Composition des Hexateuchs* (4th ed.; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1963; originally published 1876–1878)—both of them rather hesitantly. For sources in Judges, see esp. Karl Budde, *Die Bücher Richter und Samuel, ihre Quellen und ihr Aufbau* (Gießen: Ricker, 1890); followed by George F. Moore, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Judges* (ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1895); Charles Fox Burney, *The Book of Judges with Introduction and Notes* (London: Rivingtons, 1918); Otto Eißfeldt, *Die Quellen des Richterbuches* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1925). For Samuel and Kings see esp. Immanuel Benzinger, *Jahvist und Elohist in den Königsbüchern* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1921); Gustav Hölscher, "Das Buch der Könige, seine Quellen und seine Redaktion," in *Eucharistērion: Studien zur Religion und*

the Enneateuch came into being as a single historical work. In at least one point there must be a secondary join, rather than a secondary division. Noth detected this caesura between the books of Numbers and Deuteronomy. There is a sound argument in favor of this theory, even apart from Noth's hypothesis: at the beginning of the book of Deuteronomy we find in chapters 1–3 the most extensive recapitulation link in the books of the Enneateuch. This great bridge would not exist unless it had been required by some deep gulf.

The Size of the Scrolls

One possible objection to continuous redactions rests on the compass of the present text. It would seem reasonable to expect that a work which emanated from a redaction would, as a literary unit, have comprised a single scroll. The extent of today's text of the Enneateuch, or even of only the Tetrateuch and the Deuteronomistic History, exceeds by far the compass of any scrolls known to us. The Isaiah scroll from Qumran is the longest ancient biblical manuscript extant, and it could accommodate not more than a quarter of today's Torah. The finished Enneateuch is more than six times longer than the longest book in the Bible, the Psalms.[11] It may well be that "judging by the manufacture of the ancient scrolls … a scroll that would accommodate a whole text of the size of Genesis to 2 Kings was not an impossibility."[12] But the fact that the sequence of historical events was distributed over nine books shows that any such major scroll was unknown to the Second Temple scribes. "In the circumstances of the period in which these works first appeared … there was no possibility whatsoever of containing them on only one scroll."[13] "The fact that the biblical books, and even the smallest of them, were kept from the outset on separate scrolls is also a conclusive proof of the basic rule,

---

Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments: Hermann Gunkel zum 60. Geburtstage (ed. H. Schmidt; 2 vols.; FRLANT 36; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1923), 1:158–213.

11. See the arguments about the size of the scrolls in Konrad Schmid, "Buchtechnische und sachliche Prolegomena zur Enneateuchfrage," in *Auf dem Weg zur Endgestalt von Genesis bis II Regum* (ed. M. Beck and U. Schorn; BZAW 370; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2006), 1–14, esp. 5–9; idem, "Une grande historiographie allant de Genèse à 2 Rois a-t-elle un jour existé?" in *Les dernières rédactions du Pentateuque, de l'Hexateuque et de L'Ennéateuque* (ed. T. Römer and K. Schmid; BETL 203; Leuven: Peeters, 2007), 35–45.

12. Schmid, *Erzväter und Exodus*, 29. In Qumran a few number of scrolls were found that contain more than one book of the Torah, such as 4QGen-Exodᵃ, 4QpalaeoGen-Exodˡ, 4QExod-Levᶠ, 4QLev-Numᵃ. These are exceptions. See Emanuel Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (2d ed.; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001), 203–4.

13. Menahem Haran, "Book-Size and the Device of Catch-Lines in the Biblical Canon," *JJS* 36 (1985): 1–11, esp. 2.

that each complete work was to be written on its own scroll."[14] Taking these two preconditions together, we must conclude that the first redactional form of the historical works—which form the basis of the Enneateuch—must have been considerably shorter than the present text in its full extent.

From this it follows that Reinhard Kratz's theory turns the literary history upside down: "Insight into the gradual growth of the Deuteronomistic redaction in (Deuteronomy) Joshua–Kings removes the basis from Noth's hypothesis."[15] The very opposite is true: The "gradual growth" of the Deuteronomistic History—as well as of the Yahwist's History and the Priestly Code—is the presupposition without which these redactional units are quantitatively inconceivable.

The individual books (or complexes of books) did not precede the literary growth; they are its outcome. The joins show "that the division of Genesis to 2 Kings into books must be earlier than the conclusion of the productive shaping of the text."[16] Indeed it must have been very much earlier. In relation to the literary process as a whole, the division was already made early on, then in its turn becoming the presupposition for further growth.[17] As soon as the material from one scroll was distributed between two, there was again room for new literary expansions, until the text had grown so much that it was once more distributed between separate scrolls.

In this process the division between the books was not made programmatically but followed practical criteria. It was intended to make the continually expanded scroll or scrolls manageable once more. During the copying process, the text was broken off at a particular place, and a new scroll was begun, deviating from the *Vorlage*. This very likely did not take place in a single act. Each of these caesuras follows its own rules. The division of Samuel and Kings into two books each, took place for the first time only in the Septuagint. This does not exclude the possibility that the sequence of separate single books created a meaningful division of epochs as we find it today.

---

14. Menahem Haran, "Book-Size and the Thematic Cycles in the Pentateuch," in *Die Hebräische Bibel und ihre zweifache Nachgeschichte* (ed. Erhard Blum et al.; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1990), 165–76, esp. 166.

15. Kratz, *The Composition of the Narrative Books*, 216. Cited affirmatively by Jan C. Gertz, "Kompositorische Funktion und literarischer Ort von Deuteronomium 1–3," in *Die deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerke: Redaktions- und religionsgeschichtliche Perspektiven zur "Deuteronomismus"-Diskussion in Tora und Vorderen Propheten* (ed. M. Witte et al.; BZAW 365; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2006), 103–23, esp. 107.

16. Schmid, *Erzväter und Exodus*, 31.

17. The conclusion of Haran, however, proves to be wrong: "There should be no doubt that this fivefold division was imprinted in this work from its very beginning" ("Book-Size and the Thematic Cycles in the Pentateuch," 172).

The condition for the distribution of the material between several scrolls was that the pragmatic connection was preserved in the process. Consequently the gaps between the books which had newly come into being had to be bridged by way of links in the content. In several cases what had gone before was recapitulated in the succeeding scroll.

However, here we must differentiate. The recapitulations could serve both to bridge secondary divisions and to create original connections which did not previously exist. These two possibilities are not even mutually exclusive. For today's narrative complex, it is not absolutely necessary that the beginning was, so to speak, an Enneateuch torso. That this was so is in fact highly improbable. To this extent, the recent theories are not from the outset unjustified; they merely exaggerate the state of affairs. Even Noth's hypothesis did not presuppose one single major composition but two: the Tetrateuch, Genesis to Numbers, on the one hand, and the Deuteronomistic History, Deuteronomy to Kings, on the other. Here it was assumed that in the book of Deuteronomy the two works were dovetailed, since the death of Moses in Deut 34 was still assigned to the narrative in the Tetrateuch. In this way the term "Pentateuch" also retained its justification.

Thus, we have to scrutinize each individual link in order to decide whether the link was intended to bridge some connection that had broken down, or whether its purpose was to establish for the first time a connection that had not hitherto existed. We shall first work backwards from the book of Kings to the book of Deuteronomy, and then forward from the book of Genesis to the book of Numbers, finishing with the transition between Numbers and Deuteronomy.

Samuel and Kings

The caesura between the books of Samuel and Kings is clearly secondary. It splits up a single preredactional work: the collection of narratives about the kings, which describe the presuppositions and circumstances under which the rule of David was passed on to Solomon. Solomon's accession to the throne, with which the new book begins in 1 Kgs 1, is the final point of a development that commences in 2 Sam 10–12 with Solomon's birth.[18] It was preceded by the story of Sheba's rebellion in 2 Sam 20, which was originally the final text in this series of events.

---

18. See Leonhard Rost, *The Succession to the Throne of David* (trans. M. D. Rutter and D. M. Gunn; Sheffield: Almond Press, 1982).

2 Sam 20 [Succession narrative: The rebellion of Sheba]
    2 Sam 21:1–14 [Burial of Saul and Jonathan]
        2 Sam 21:15–22 [David's heroes fighting against the Philistines]
           2 Sam 22 [David's song of deliverance (quoting from Ps 18)]
           2 Sam 23:1–7 [David's last words]
        2 Sam 23:8–39 [David's mighty men]
    2 Sam 24 [David's census and punishment. He finds the place to build the temple.]

    1 Kgs 1–2 [Succession narrative: Solomon ascends to the throne.]

Today no fewer than four chapters have been appended to 2 Sam 20, forming an "appendix"[19] to the David account in the books of Samuel. This appendix was added only after the books had been separated. It presupposes that extra sheets have been tacked on to the now separate Samuel scroll. The additional columns contain a whole sheaf of material. "2 Sam. 21–24 is full of additions, which gradually accumulated after Dtr.'s history had been divided into separate books."[20] "These chapters … are composed of different elements; 21:1–14 belongs together with 24:1–25; 21:15–22 is related to 23:8–39; left over in the middle are the two songs 22:1–51 and 23:1–7."[21]

This convoluted process of growth must have extended over a considerable period: "2 Sam. 21:1–14 and 24:1–25 were the first passages to be added, as we can tell from the thematic connection between 24:1a and 21:1–14."[22] The story about David's census in 2 Sam 24 refers at the beginning to the story about the fate of the house of Saul in 2 Sam 21:1–14. "This connection was later broken by the interposition of the anecdotes and lists of David's 'mighty men' (2 Sam. 21:15–22 and 23:8–39). This latter complex of traditional material, held together by its subject matter, was then split in two when the poetic passages (ch. 22 and 23:1–7) were inserted";[23] that is, David's song of deliverance (which repeats Ps 18), and David's last will.

Taken together, these six large sections amount to no less than 139 Masoretic verses. From this it can be deduced that the books of Samuel and Kings had been separated long before the end of the literary process.

---

19. Julius Wellhausen, *Die Composition des Hexateuchs*, 263.
20. Martin Noth, *The Deuteronomistic History* (trans. J. Doull et al.; JSOTSup 15; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1981); trans. of *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien: Die sammelnden und bearbeitenden Geschichtswerke im Alten Testament* (Halle: Niemeyer, 1943; 2d repr. ed., 1957; 3d repr. ed.: Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1967), 124 n. 3.
21. Wellhausen, *Die Composition des Hexateuchs*, 260.
22. Noth, *The Deuteronomistic History*, 124–25 n. 3.
23. Noth, *The Deuteronomistic History*, 125 n. 3.

Judges and Samuel

(a) At present the opinion is gaining ground that the Deuteronomistic History originally consisted only of the books of Samuel and Kings. "The beginning of the Deuteronomistic redaction does not lie in Deuteronomy but in Samuel–Kings and from here extends forwards into (Genesis–)Deuteronomy, Joshua and Judges."[24] The most important reason for this view is that in the book of Judges the religious practice of the Israelites seems to be subjected to a different standard from that enjoined in the books of Kings for the religious practice of the kings. "Whereas in Samuel–Kings the First Commandment has become the criterion for assessing the kings only at a secondary stage and has replaced … the criterion of the unity of the kingdom and the cult, in Deuteronomy itself as in Joshua and Judges, more or less from the beginning it is the criterion of the 'Deuteronomistic' … revisions."[25] The cyclical outline of history also differentiates the book of Judges from the books of Samuel and Kings, with their linear presentation. Consequently von Rad had already maintained: "It is difficult to think that the editing of the Book of Judges and that of the Book of Kings could have taken place as a single piece of work."[26]

However, the redactor did not have a free hand everywhere; he was dependent on the tradition he used. For the account of the era of the Judges, which is his own redactional invention, he arranged the material freely; for the period of the monarchy, on the other hand, the course of events was fixed by the progress of history as it is documented in the annals of the kings, specifically in the excerpts of these annals which provide the framework of the account. Nevertheless, even in the case of the kings of Judah, the redaction created a cyclical order of eras alternating between godliness and apostasy. Sin was dominant in the case of Rehoboam (1 Kgs 14:22) and Abijam (15:3), Jehoram (2 Kgs 8:18) and Ahaziah (8:27), and among the last kings from Jehoahaz (23:32) to Zedekiah (24:19). Godliness ruled from Asa (1 Kgs 15:11) to Jehoshaphat (22:43) and from Jehoash (2 Kgs 12:2) to Jotham (15:34).[27]

---

24. Kratz, *The Composition of the Narrative Books*, 158. Earlier, see esp. Würthwein, "Erwägungen zum sog. deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerk."

25. Kratz, *The Composition of the Narrative Books*, 157–58.

26. Gerhard von Rad, *The Theology of Israel's Historical Traditions* (trans. D. M. G. Stalker; vol. 1 of *Old Testament Theology*; New York: Harper, 1962), 347.

27. See Christoph Levin, "Die Frömmigkeit der Könige von Israel und Juda," in *Houses Full of All Good Things* (ed. J. Pakkala and M. Nissinen; Publications of the Finnish Exegetical Society 95; Helsinki: Finnish Exegetical Society; and Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2008), 129–68, esp. 160.

With regard to the nature of the offences, the difference between Judges and Kings is not as great as has been maintained. In the books of Kings, too, the earliest Deuteronomistic redaction already reports the introduction of foreign cults; i.e., the worship of Baal (1 Kgs 16:31–32; 22:53; 2 Kgs 8:18, 27; 10:28), and of "the host of heaven" (2 Kgs 21:3bβγ).[28] On the other hand, in the book of Judges the sin is only occasionally described more precisely as an infringement of Yнwн's claim to sole allegiance (Judg 2:11; 10:6).[29] In most cases sin remains undefined (Judg 3:12; 4:1; 6:1; 13:1) and is only judged according to its consequence, the historical disaster.

(b) If the Deuteronomistic History had begun with 1 Sam 1, the caesura between the books of Judges and Samuel would mark not a secondary division but a secondary amalgamation. In that case it would be surprising that the fusion should have been made by way of a simple parataxis, for—in just the same way as in 1 Kgs 1, but in marked contrast to Deut 1–3, and also in distinction from Exod 1 and Judg 1—a recapitulation of what must have gone before is missing. "In the whole sequence of the historical books, 1 Sam 1:1 offers for the first time after Gen 1:1 a completely independent beginning to the narrative."[30] This abrupt beginning is one reason for the theory that the work of the Deuteronomist originally began in 1 Sam 1. But that is to judge by appearances, since of course the stories about Samuel and Saul belong within the whole sequence of the Israelite history. From this standpoint the book of Samuel lacks an exposition. The fact that the context is not recapitulated therefore actually speaks against 1 Sam 1 being a new beginning, and in favor of a secondary literary cut.

On the other hand the book of Judges presses emphatically forward to the introduction of the monarchy: "In those days there was no king in Israel; every man did what was right in his own eyes" (ʾîš hayyāšār bĕʿênāyw yaʿăśeh) (Judg 17:6; RSV)—that is to say, not in the eyes of Yнwн. The thrust of this judgment, which touches closely on the usual Deuteronomistic judgment about godliness, is that the king is needed to put in order the Israelites' relationship to God. Interpreted in this light, the narrative relating the establishment of the sanctuary in Dan in Judg 17–18 provides a reason for the demand for a

---

28. These notes were later given a comprehensive expansion. The kings were accused in lavish detail of violating the First Commandment, see Levin, "Die Frömmigkeit der Könige von Israel und Juda," 138–51. Kratz, on the other hand, believes that all the mentions of apostasy are later additions (*The Composition of the Narrative Books*, 162), including 1 Kgs 16:31; 2 Kgs 10:28; 21:3. He provides no literary-critical reasons for his view (see pp. 165, 166, 169).

29. Texts such as Judg 2:1–5; 2:12–3:7; 6:7–10, 25–32; 8:24–27, 33–35; 10:6*, 10b–16 were added only later.

30. Schmid, *Erzväter und Exodus*, 31.

king.[31] The prelude to the introduction of the monarchy, which the redaction has constructed in 1 Sam 8, links up explicitly with the era of the Judges.[32] "If we disregard the secondary division of the books, we have to extend the Deuteronomistic era of the Judges to the emergence of the monarchy (1 Sam 8–12)."[33]

(c) That the books originally formed a literary unit is even more evident on the level of the preredactional sources than on the level of the redaction:

> Judg 13–16 [The *wayĕhî ʾîš* collection (1): The Samson narratives]
> Judg 17–18 [The *wayĕhî ʾîš* collection (2): The founding of the sanctuary at Dan]
> 　　Judg 19 [The story about the Levite's concubine]
> 　　　　Judg 20 [Benjamin and Israel at war]
> 　　　　　　Judg 21 [Wives for the Benjaminites]
>
> 1 Sam 1–3 [The *wayĕhî ʾîš* collection (3): The Samuel narratives] …
> 1 Sam 9:1–10:16 [The *wayĕhî ʾîš* collection (4): The Saul narratives]

The stories about Samson (Judg 13–16), about the setting up of the sanctuary in Dan (Judg 17–18), about the childhood of Samuel (1 Sam 1–3), and about Saul (1 Sam 9–14) all start off in a very similar way: *wayĕhî ʾîš (ʾeḥad) min …ûšĕmô …* "There was a (certain) man of … whose name was …" (Judg 13:2; 17:1; 1 Sam 1:1; 9:1). In the Old Testament this narrative beginning is confined—apart from the two secondary examples Judg 19:1b und Job 1:1—to these four narrative complexes.[34] Since in addition these follow immediately upon one another, it is virtually certain that they belonged to a common preredactional compilation. That would also explain why some of the material does not fit in with the intention of the whole as we have it today; for example, the stylization of Samson the hero as deliverer. "It is easier to understand how a story like that of Samson should have been included in the Deuteronomic Book of Judges, if the author found it in the earlier work on which he based his own, than to imagine that he introduced it for himself from some other source."[35]

---

31. See Timo Veijola, *Das Königtum in der Beurteilung der deuteronomistischen Historiographie* (AASF 198; Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1977).

32. See Veijola, *Das Königtum*, 68.

33. Veijola, *Das Königtum*, 28.

34. The beginning of the Job narrative joins together the same building blocks but in a different style: *ʾîš hāyâ bĕ … … šĕmô* "There was once a man in … whose name was …." The beginning of the narrative in Judg 19:1b imitates 17:1: *wayĕhî ʾîš … bĕ* "There was a man … in …." Here, too, the differences predominate.

35. Moore, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Judges*, xx. Noth, *The Deuteronomistic History*, 52, on the other hand considers "the possibility that the Samson

Traces of the compiler are still evident: Samson's birth (Judg 13) has been put in front of the earlier Samson traditions,[36] just as the promise of Samuel's birth (1 Sam 1) has been made to precede the birth of Samuel, and the story about Saul and the asses (1 Sam 9:1–10:16) has been placed before the stories about Saul's kingdom (which begin with 1 Sam 11). Everything suggests that this compilation was incorporated by the redaction into a single undivided work. If today it is distributed between the books of Judges and Samuel, this shows that the books were separated at a secondary stage.

(d) In this case, too, the division of the books has made it possible to add an appendix to the separate book of Judges. Again this appendix has grown to a considerable size. The story about the establishment of the sanctuary in Dan (Judg 17–18) was probably not yet part of the expansion. It is not just that the beginning of the story shows that it is part of the earlier compilation itself; in addition, the story is fitted into the conception of the Deuteronomistic redaction by way of the note 17:6 (= 18:1a) stating that at that time Israel lacked a king and that consequently everyone did whatever pleased himself (and not Yнwн).

The chapters of Judg 19–21 are different. The narratives about the shameful act at Gibeah, about the fight of the Israelites against Benjamin, and about the rape of the women for the benefit of the Benjaminites are strongly dependent on other biblical traditions, which they modify in midrashic style.[37] The concept of the people of God, which is premised here, belongs to the latest phase of Old Testament literary history. The foundation itself is already close to Chronicles, as Wellhausen rightly pointed out. As Walter Groß remarks, "It is a late postexilic testimony of scribal work."[38] The three chapters, containing 103 Masoretic verses in all, were added only after the books had been separated; and in addition, these chapters themselves evidently developed in several stages.

---

stories were not added to Dtr.'s account until later." Noth was followed by Hartmut Gese, "Die ältere Simsonüberlieferung (Richter c. 14–15)," *ZTK* 82 (1985): 261–80, esp. 261–62; Markus Witte, "Wie Simson in den Kanon kam—Redaktionsgeschichtliche Beobachtungen zu Jdc 13–16," *ZAW* 112 (2000): 526–49; and others. However, the additions of the Deuteronomistic editor in Judg 13:1, 5b; 15:20; 16:31 irrefutably show that the Samson cycle was part of the Deuteronomistic History right from the beginning.

36. See also Judg 6:11–24 as a prologue to the Gideon narratives. The original narratives began in 6:33.

37. See Wellhausen, *Die Composition des Hexateuchs*, 229–33. Burney, *The Book of Judges*, 444–45, demonstrates in detail the dependence on Gen 19 and 1 Sam 11.

38. Walter Groß, *Richter* (HTKAT; Freiburg: Herder, 2009), 879. See also Uwe Becker, *Richterzeit und Königtum* (BZAW 192; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1990), 257–99.

Joshua and Judges

The fact that the books of Joshua and Judges were once joined is shown by the double account of Joshua's death. A book of Judges subsequently interposed between the books of Joshua and Samuel would certainly not have repeated this report. A. Graeme Auld rightly stresses: "It is more than likely that in the original Deuteronomist's conception his short transitional passage linking his account of Joshua to that of the Judges appeared but once."[39] When today's book begins with the words: *wayěhî 'aḥărê môt yěhôšua'* "After the death of Joshua," and only then goes on to recount that Joshua died, it is a crass contradiction which can only be explained by the secondary separation of the books.

The original report of Joshua's death must therefore be the one given in Judg 2:7–10; this can also be shown by details in the text.[40] The account was anticipated in Josh 24:29–31 in order to provide a conclusion for the now separate book, in the same way that the book of Deuteronomy ends with the death of Moses. The beginning of today's book of Judges follows the pattern of the book of Joshua. "The first four words of Jud. i 1, *wyhy 'ḥry mwt yhwš'*, appear to have been modelled on the corresponding words of the book of Joshua. It is likely therefore that they at least belong to this later editorial stage of 'book' division."[41] The transition is an imitation of the transfer of leadership from Moses to Joshua.

> Josh 11:23b And the land had rest from war.
>> Josh 12 [The kings defeated by Joshua]
>>> 13:1–21:42 [The distribution of the land]
>> 21:43–45 [Another summary of the conquest, repeating 11:23b with regard to Josh 12]
>>> Josh 22 [The tribes east of the Jordan]
>> Josh 23 [Joshua's charge to Israel]
>> 24:1–2, 15–18, 22 [At Shechem, the Israelites elect Yʜwʜ as their God.]
> 24:28 Then Joshua sent the people away, every man to his inheritance.
>> 29 After these things Joshua the son of Nun, the servant of Yʜwʜ, died, being a hundred and ten years old. 30 And they buried him in his own inheritance at Timnath-serah, which is in the hill country of Ephraim, north of the mountain of Gaash. 31 And Israel served Yʜwʜ all the days of Joshua, and all the days of the elders who outlived Joshua and had known all the work which Yʜwʜ did for Israel. [= Close to the book of Joshua]

---

39. A. Graeme Auld, "Judges I and History: A Reconsideration," *VT* 25 (1975): 261–85, esp. 263.

40. See Auld, "Judges I and History," 264.

41. Auld, "Judges I and History," 265.

> 32 [The bones of Joseph=link to the end of the book of Genesis.]

> Judg 1:1 After the death of Joshua the Israelites inquired of Yнwн, Who shall go up first for us against the Canaanites, to fight against them? [= New book-heading]
> 1:2–36 [Because the narrative sequence of the chapter depends wholly on v. 1, its oldest parts are already later than the separation of the books.]

> 2:1 Now the angel of Yнwн went up from Gilgal. … And he said, I brought you up from Egypt, and brought you into the land that I had sworn to give to your fathers. … 2 And you shall make no covenant with the inhabitants of this land; tear down their altars. … 6 Then Joshua sent the people away. And the people of Israel went every man to his inheritance to take possession of the land. [V. 6 is recapitulating Josh 24:28 in order to knot the narrative thread.]

> 2:7 And the people served Yнwн all the days of Joshua. … 8 And Joshua the son of Nun … died at the age of one hundred and ten years. 9 And they buried him within the bounds of his inheritance in Timnath-heres, in the hill country of Ephraim, north of the mountain of Gaash.

Once again, the join shows that the separation took place relatively early on; for the entirety of Judg 1—that is, the account of the occupation of the land by the tribe of Judah (1:1–20), the capture of Bethel (1:22–26), and the list of notes which place on record the failures to settle Canaan (1:21, 27–36)—is dependent on the book's present heading, and is inconceivable without it. The attempt to restrict the redactional join between the books to the four words *wayĕhî 'aḥărê môt yĕhôšuaʿ*, "After the death of Joshua,"[42] cannot be supported by literary-critical criteria. Why is Joshua suddenly missing, so that the Israelites are compelled to question Yнwн directly? The conclusion would be that the very basis of Judg 1 is already bound up with the redactional process in which the Hexateuch and the book of Judges were separated. "It is not unlikely that this new preface is contemporaneous with the division of the long Deuteronomistic History into the now familiar separate books."[43]

In the framework of the newer Documentary Hypothesis, Judg 1 has sometimes been thought to be the account of the conquest in source J.[44] Although mistaken, this conclusion could nevertheless be based on solid

---

42. Thus most recently argued by Mareike Rake, *"Juda wird aufsteigen!" Untersuchungen zum ersten Kapitel des Richterbuches* (BZAW 367; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2006), 131–33, along with many others before (see ibid. 132 n. 420).

43. Auld, "Judges I and History," 285.

44. See esp. Eduard Meyer, "Kritik der Berichte über die Eroberung Palästinas," *ZAW* 1 (1881): 117–46; Budde, *Die Bücher Richter und Samuel, ihre Quellen und ihr Aufbau*, 1–89.

observation, since Judg 1 is related to the non-Priestly sections of the book of Genesis. There, too, the land is presented as populated by the Canaanites,[45] there too the precedence of Judah is stressed,[46] and it is in Gen 50:8 that the term "the house of Joseph" (Judg 1:22, 23, 35) originates.

Prior to the division of the books, the "compositional nexus" was Judg 2:1–5, which was subsequently inserted between the account of the conquest and the death of Joshua, as can be detected from the resumptive repetition of Josh 24:28 in Judg 2:6. "The Mal'ak episode has demonstrably not been constituted as the end and theological interpretation of Judg 1."[47] The literary horizon of the scene in Bochim belongs to another level. It is intended to link the Tetrateuch's historical account with the Deuteronomistic History. In Judg 2:1, the angel, who is none other than the angel of Exod 3:2, points to the promise in Exod 3:17, which he quotes word-for-word,[48] in order to establish that it has been fulfilled through the conquest described in Josh 2–11. This reminder is followed in v. 2a by the admonition not to enter into any alliance with the people of the country, indeed to destroy their cultic places. The Israelites are to cut themselves off completely from the other inhabitants of the country.[49] This is in sharp contrast to the original form of the Deuteronomistic History, for which all the inhabitants of the country are understood to be Israelites. And as in the Deuteronomistic History (and in sharp contrast to the Yahwist's History, see Gen 12:7–8; 13:18; 28:10–19), the Israelites are to destroy the many altars in the country, in order to obey the command for the centralization of the cult according to Deut 12. Thus Judg 2:1–6 constitutes a compromise full of tension, the aim of which is to balance the theological programs of the two histories.

In addition, in the case of the books of Joshua and Judges, the division has made it possible to expand the last part of the previous scroll considerably—that is to say, the part which later became the book of Joshua. Only a very minimal part of this account is the work of the Deuteronomistic editor. He notes the end of the occupation in Josh 11:23b: "And the land had rest from war." "Dtr. has already (Jos. 11:23a^b) mentioned the distribution of the conquered area among the tribes—briefly, to be sure, but in terms suggesting

---

45. Gen 12:6; 13:7; 24:3, 37; 34:30; 50:11.

46. Gen 37:26–27; 38:27–30; 43:3–5, 8–10; 44:14–34; 46:28.

47. Erhard Blum, "Der kompositionelle Knoten am Übergang von Josua zu Richter: Ein Entflechtungsvorschlag," in *Deuteronomy and Deuteronomic Literature* (ed. M. Vervenne and J. Lust; BETL 133; Leuven: Peeters, 1997), 181–212, esp. 182.

48. This explains the imperfect *'a'ăleh*, which in fact must be read as a preterite (LXX: ἀνεβίβασα).

49. This is possibly the first occurrence of the commandment not to join into a covenant with the inhabitants of the country. The other instances, Deut 7:1–6; Exod 34:12–15, and Exod 23:23–33, may depend on this.

that he has finished with the topic."[50] After that Joshua dismisses the people to their homes: "And Joshua sent the people away, every man to his inheritance" (24:28). Then he dies (Judg 2:7–10).

Some of the expansions still presuppose that the books formed a single unit. The list of the defeated kings in Josh 12 is an expansion of 11:23. It is linked with the summary in 21:43–45, which substantially repeats and emphasizes 11:23. This was probably followed by the assembly in Josh 24, at which Joshua binds the people to Yhwh as its God.[51] Later on, Joshua's testament in Josh 23 was interpolated, and in this Joshua makes the fulfillment established in 21:43–45 the occasion for a warning to the people before he dies. The model was the aged Abraham, cf. Gen 24:1. Once again, the literary horizon also includes the book of Genesis.

It was only after the books had been separated that the report of the distribution of the land in Josh 13:1–21:42 and ch. 22 was interpolated. In order to fit it into the course of events, the augmenter anticipated and repeated in 13:1 the scene of 23:1.[52] The ten chapters contain a number of passages that are parallel to the report of the conquest in Judg 1. Mareike Rake has shown (contrary to Graeme Auld and others) that for the most part Judg 1 was the source text for the Joshua parallels, not vice versa.[53] Since, as we saw above, Judg 1 came into being in connection with the separation of the books, or as a consequence of the separation, we must deduce that Josh 13–22* was added only after the books had been divided. The expansion as a whole comprises 303 Masoretic verses, exactly the same length as the first twelve chapters of the book. That means that, apart from the last two chapters, half of today's book came into being after the separation. Once again we see that it was the separation into independent books that provided the precondition for the later growth of the text.

Deuteronomy and Joshua

Since Joshua's assumption of office is closely related to the death of Moses (Josh 1:1–2, 5b), and is also prepared for in Num 27:12–23 and Deut 31:1–8, in this case, too, the separation of the books is unquestionably secondary. "At

---

50. Noth, *The Deuteronomistic History*, 40.

51. For the earliest form of this chapter, see Reinhard Müller, *Königtum und Gottesherrschaft* (FAT 2/3; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), 215–31, esp. 224. See also Uwe Becker, "Endredaktionelle Kontextvernetzungen des Josua-Buches," in Witte et al., *Die deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerke*, 139–61.

52. See Noth, *The Deuteronomistic History*, 40–41.

53. See the detailed discussion by Rake, *"Juda wird aufsteigen!"* 34–60.

any rate, Josh 1 is certainly not the beginning."[54] It is even doubtful whether the separation ever took the form of a specific act. To continue with a new scroll after the death of Moses could at some point have taken place simply as a matter of course, since for the later picture of the history, the beginning of Joshua's official leadership clearly meant the start of a new epoch.

> Deut 34:5* And Moses died there, 6* and was buried. [= End of the Yah-wist's History]
>
>> 9 And Joshua the son of Nun was full of the spirit of wisdom, for Moses had laid his hands upon him; so the Israelites obeyed him, and did as Yнwн had commanded Moses. [= Link to the separate book of Joshua]
>>
>>> 10 And there has not arisen a prophet since in Israel like Moses, whom Yнwн knew face to face, 11 none like him for all the signs and the wonders which Yнwн sent him to do in the land of Egypt, to Pharaoh and to all his servants and to all his land, 12 and for all the mighty power and all the great and terrible deeds which Moses wrought in the sight of all Israel. [= Close to the Torah, added later]
>
> Josh 1:1 After the death of Moses Yнwн said to Joshua the son of Nun, Moses' minister, 2 Moses my servant is dead; now therefore arise, go over the Jordan, you and all the people, into the land which I am giving to them.
>
>> 3 Every place that the sole of your foot will tread upon I have given to you, as I promised to Moses. [= Refers to the promises of the land in Deuteronomy in order to link the separated books]
>
> 5b As I was with Moses, so I will be with you; I will not fail you or forsake you. … 2:1 And Joshua the son of Nun sent two men secretly from Shittim as spies, saying, Go, view the land. [Here the narrative thread of Num 20:1aβb; 25:1a; Deut 34:5*–6* is picked up. This may be the narrative link of the Yahwist's and the Deuteronomist's Histories.]

As casually as this caesura may have come about, its consequence is far-reaching—even if this consequence made itself felt only at a much later time. It was thus that "the Book of the Torah of Moses" (*sēper tôrat mōšeh*, Josh 8:31; 23:6; 2 Kgs 14:6; Neh 8:1) came into being as an independent, outstanding part of the canon.[55] The consequences appear most clearly in the history of the textual transmission. In the books of Genesis to Deuteronomy the text has, largely speaking, been transmitted without great deviations; from Josh 1 onwards, on the other hand, the Hebrew text at once begins to show a consid-

---

54. Noth, *The Deuteronomistic History*, 12.

55. See esp. Erhard Blum, "Pentateuch–Hexateuch–Enneateuch? Oder: Woran erkennt man ein literarisches Werk in der Hebräischen Bibel?" in Römer and Schmid, *Les dernières rédactions du Pentateuque, de l'Hexateuque et de L'Ennéateuque*, 67–97, esp. 71–72.

erable amount of additional material compared with the Greek. The writer's attitude has changed: outside the Torah, concern for a topical thrust has been given rather more scope, over against the desire to conserve,[56] because the religious dignity of the text was less.

The join between the books was bridged at a later point by the addition of Deut 34:9, a reference to Joshua as Moses' successor, following the latter's death. The praise of Moses as *the* wholly incomparable prophet, which ends the Torah in vv. 10–12, is the addition of a later hand and already presupposes the existence of the Pentateuch. On the other side of the join, by quoting Deut 11:24, Josh 1:3–4 establishes a link with Deuteronomy's promises of the land.

In the case of Deuteronomy, too, the possibility emerged of expanding the now separated scroll. But of course, the report of Moses' death still had to end the book, so that later additions have to be looked for in the previous chapters. What come into question as expansions of this kind are passages that reflect a "pentateuchal" perspective. One such passage is in all probability Moses' blessing in Deut 33, "which is not related to anything that comes before or after it."[57] The Song of Moses in 32:1–43 may likewise have been added, including its frame in 31:27b–30; 32:44–45, and the later introduction in 31:16–22.[58]

Genesis and Exodus

To turn now to the beginning of the Enneateuch: The books of Genesis and Exodus were also separated at a later point. It is true that with the Joseph story in Gen 37; 39–45, and the stories about Moses in Exod 2–4, two independent complexes have undoubtedly met each other. But these preredactional compositions had already been redactionally linked at the time when the books were separated. The link even existed at several levels: on the one hand at the level of the Priestly Code (which today is widely accepted as being a continuous source and which spans at least the books of Genesis and Exodus); and before that at the level of the Yahwist's History, which in the framework of its historical conception brought the story of Joseph and the Moses story into a narrative sequence for the first time. This means that the separation of the books was also preceded by the redactional linking of these

---

56. For this antagonism, which guides the textual transmission, see the famous statement of Martin Noth, *Die Welt des Alten Testaments* (4th ed.; Berlin: Töpelmann, 1962), 267.

57. Noth, *The Deuteronomistic History*, 35.

58. See also Reinhard G. Kratz, "Der literarische Ort des Deuteronomiums," in *Liebe und Gebot: Studien zum Deuteronomium* (ed. R. G. Kratz and H. Spieckermann; FRLANT 190; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000), 101–20, esp. 102–3.

two historical works in the so-called "final redaction" (R) or, more precisely, the "redaction R[JP]."

> Gen 50:1 J: Then Joseph threw himself on his father's face, and wept over him and kissed him. … 7 And Joseph went up to bury his father, … 10 and he observed a time of mourning for his father for seven days. …[59] 14 And Joseph returned to Egypt … after he had buried his father. … 22b P: And Joseph lived for one hundred and ten years. …
>
>> 25 So Joseph made the Israelites swear, saying, When God comes to you, you shall carry up my bones from here. [= link to Josh 24:32]
>
> 26 J: Then Joseph died, R[JP]: being one hundred and ten years old.
>> He was embalmed and placed in a coffin in Egypt. [= link to Josh 24:32]
>
> Exod 1:1 These are the names of the sons of Israel who came to Egypt with Jacob, each with his household: 2 Reuben, Simeon, Levi, and Judah, 3 Issachar, Zebulun, and Benjamin, 4 Dan and Naphtali, Gad and Asher. 5 The total number of people born to Jacob was seventy. Joseph was already in Egypt. 6 Then Joseph died, and all his brothers, and that whole generation. 7 But the Israelites were fruitful and prolific; they multiplied and grew exceedingly strong; so that the land was filled with them. [= New book heading and link to the previous history, quoting from Gen 35:22-26; 46:26-27; 47:27; 50:22a, 26a]
>
> 8 J: Now a new king arose over Egypt, who did not know Joseph. 9 He said to his people, Look, the Israelite people are more numerous and more powerful than we. 10 Come, let us deal shrewdly with them, or they will increase. … 11 Therefore they set taskmasters over them to oppress them with forced labor. … 12 But the more they were oppressed, the more they multiplied and spread, so that [the Egyptians] came to dread the Israelites. 13 P: The Egyptians became ruthless in imposing tasks on Israelites, 14 and made their lives bitter with hard service in mortar and brick and in every kind of field labor. They were ruthless in all the tasks that they imposed on them.

In the Yahwist's history, the Joseph story, which originally ended with the message to Jacob that "Joseph is still alive" (Gen 45:26aα), is continued by way of Joseph's reencounter with his father (46:29–30) and Jacob's move to Egypt (47:1a, 5a, 6a, 11*); the aim of the continuation is to link the patriarchal narratives with the exodus story. One presupposition, without which the

---

59. The report about the burial in Gen 50:12–13 is generally assigned to P. But it has meanwhile emerged that this report already presupposes the combination of J and P. See Christoph Levin, "Abraham erwirbt seine Grablege (Genesis 23)," in *"Gerechtigkeit und Recht zu üben" (Gen 18, 19)* (ed. R. Achenbach and M. Arneth; BZABR 13; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2009), 96–113, esp. 107.

combination of the material would not have been possible, is that after his death Jacob was brought back to the land of the promise in order to be buried there (47:29a, bβ, 30b–31a). Once Joseph has sworn to ensure this, Jacob dies (47:31b): "Then Joseph fell on his father's face, and wept over him, and kissed him. And Joseph went up to bury his father, and he made a mourning for his father seven days. And Joseph returned to Egypt after he had buried his father. Then Joseph died. Now there arose a new king over Egypt, who did not know Joseph" (Gen 50:1, 7a, 10b, 14aα*, b, 26aα; Exod 1:8). This sequence is certainly redactional but constitutes a self-contained order of events.

On the level of the Priestly Code, a continuous thread begins only with Exod 1:13–14. It continues unaltered in Exod 2:23aβb–25; 6:2–7:13. In Gen 50, on the other hand, the combining redaction R^JP has taken over only Jacob's age (110 years) from the Priestly Code (Gen 50:22b P), attaching it to the Yahwist's account with the help of 50:26aβ R^JP. We can see this procedure at work in other passages, too.[60] Thus, no more than remnants of the Priestly Code's stories about the patriarchs have remained[61]—although this does not mean that we should have to conclude that the source P never existed.

The severance between the books was made after the account of the death of Joseph. This caesura corresponds to that of the books of Deuteronomy and Joshua, which conclude with the death of Moses or Joshua, respectively; at this point, too, the division leads to a structuring of the epochs, which makes good sense. Later, the motif of Joseph's bones, Gen 50:25, 26b, also establishes a link with the end of the conquest in Josh 24:32, which draws a frame around the Hexateuch.

In order to heal the split between Genesis and Exodus, a new beginning was put in front of the book of Exodus. This recapitulates the events in the book of Genesis in so far as these are essential for an understanding of the now independent book. Under the heading, "These are the names of the Israelites who came to Egypt with Jacob," the list of Jacob's sons in Gen 35:22b–26 is repeated.[62] The style is reminiscent of the Priestly Code. But that is deceptive: the list is a later quotation.[63] It is immediately followed by a recollection

---

60. See Gen 16:3aβγ, 16; 21:2b, 4–5; 25:19–20, 26b; 41:46a; 47:28.

61. See esp. Rolf Rendtorff, *The Problem of the Process of Transmission in the Pentateuch* (trans. J. J. Scullion; JSOTSup 89; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1990).

62. The frequent assertion that Exod 1:1–5 is a recapitulation of Gen 46:8–27 (e.g., Gertz, *Tradition und Redaktion in der Exoduserzählung*, 349) is clearly wrong; see Christoph Levin, "Das System der zwölf Stämme Israels," in idem, *Fortschreibungen: Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament* (BZAW 316; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2003), 111–23, esp. 118.

63. See Christoph Levin, *Der Jahwist* (FRLANT 157; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993), 315; and see previously, Georg Fohrer, *Überlieferung und Geschichte des Exodus* (BZAW 91; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1964), 9; and others. The number given of "seventy

in v. 6 of the end of the now-detached book of Genesis: the death of Joseph (Gen 50:26aα).[64] The statement about the increase of the people in v. 7 substantially repeats Gen 47:27 and at the same time anticipates Exod 1:9b.[65] This verse is a striking mixture of the language of P and J, showing that at this time the Yahwist's history and the Priestly Code had already been combined.

Once again the separation has made it possible to expand the latter part of the previous book, this time the book of Genesis. One such expansion is clearly the list of the Israelites who have migrated to Egypt, Gen 46:8–27, which is an extended anticipation of Exod 1:1–4.[66] Jacob's blessing in Gen 49:1–28a, b*, which presupposes the system of the twelve tribes—in fact, a very late development—may also be seen as an expansion of this kind; its purpose would be to round off the book of Genesis, which as a result may be read as an independent account of the beginnings of God's people.

Exodus and Leviticus

The caesura between the books of Exodus and Leviticus comes between the account of the building of the tabernacle, on the one hand, and that of its consecration through the first sacrifices, on the other. The fact that this separation is secondary emerges unequivocally from the wilderness itinerary. The narrative, which is broken off at the end of Exod 34, is continued in Num 10:11.

> Exod 35:1–39:31 [The completion of the tabernacle, inserted after the separation of the books.]
>
> Exod 39:32 P Thus all the work of the tabernacle of the tent of meeting was finished; and the Israelites had done according to all that Yнwн had commanded Moses; so had they done. … 42 According to all that Yнwн had commanded Moses, so the Israelites had done all the work. 43 And Moses saw all the work, and behold, they had done it; as Yнwн had commanded, so had they done it. And Moses blessed them.

---

persons" (v. 5a) was added later, together with v. 1bβ. It is taken from Gen 46:26–27. The method of numbering there is slightly modified: Jacob himself is no longer included.

64. See Levin, *Jahwist*, 315, followed by Gertz, *Tradition und Redaktion in der Exoduserzählung*, 363.

65. Erhard Blum, "Die literarische Verbindung von Erzvätern und Exodus," in *Abschied vom Jahwisten: Die Komposition des Hexateuch in der jüngsten Diskussion* (ed. J. C. Gertz et al.; BZAW 315; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2002), 118–56, esp. 145–48, has clearly shown, contrary to Gertz, *Tradition und Redaktion in der Exoduserzählung*, 352-57, and Schmid, *Erzväter und Exodus*, 70–71, that Exod 1:7 does not belong to the Priestly Code.

66. See Levin, *Der Jahwist*, 305.

40:1-16 [anticipates Lev 8–10 in order to connect the separated books (Exod 35:1–39:31 still not present, at this stage).]

40:17 P And in the first month in the second year, on the first day of the month, the tabernacle was erected.

40:18–33 [Details of the tabernacle, as completed according to Exod 25–31]

40:34–38 [anticipates the wanderings in the desert, Num 9–10]

Lev 1–7 [Laws of the offerings, probably inserted after the separation of the books.]

Lev 8–10 P [The consecration of the priests. The first offering]

The text that preceded the severance between Exodus and Leviticus was the note concerning the completion, in Exod 40:17: "And in the fifth month in the second year, on the first day of the month, the tabernacle was erected." Compared with this note, the detailed listing in vv. 18–33 is already an addition. By repeated reminders, this passage looks back to the instructions given to Moses in Exod 25–31, "as Yнwн has commanded Moses" (vv. 19b, 21b, 23b, 25b, 27b, 29b, 32b). It can be detected here that at this time the detailed account of the building of the tabernacle in Exod 35–39 was not yet in existence.[67]

The instruction for the consecration in 40:1–16 was also still missing. This passage is later than vv. 18–33, and is not concerned solely with the tabernacle, which is to be adorned with the furnishings that have been prepared; vv. 12–16 also anticipate the anointing of Aaron, which is reported in Leviticus 8. Martin Noth rightly suggests, "Perhaps even the division of the Pentateuch into 'books' had already taken place, so that the need arose to bring the theme of the furnishing of the sanctuary to an end of some kind at the end of the Book of Exodus."[68] Right at the end of the present book, in 40:34–38, a glance forward to the journeyings in the wilderness was added, thus establishing a narrative link with Num 9.

At the time when the books were separated, the account of the construction of the tabernacle in Exod 35–39 was undoubtedly still missing. These 176 Masoretic verses were added very late. The fluid form of the text in these chapters is striking, compared with the Samaritan Pentateuch and the Septuagint. Since Exod 40:12–16 points forward to Lev 8, in order to bracket together the books of Exodus and Leviticus, this suggests the further possibil-

---

67. It was Julio Popper, *Der biblische Bericht über die Stiftshütte* (Leipzig: Hunger, 1862), who first recognized that Exod 35–40 is secondary to Exod 25–31. The main arguments are set forth by Brevard S. Childs, *The Book of Exodus* (OTL; London: SCM Press, 1974), 533–37.

68. Martin Noth, *Exodus: A Commentary* (trans. J. S. Bowden; OTL; London: SCM Press, 1962), 283.

ity that the sacrificial laws Lev 1–7 were put at the beginning of Leviticus after this book had already become independent.

Leviticus and Numbers

The caesura between the books of Leviticus and Numbers is evidently dependent on the Holiness Code in Lev 17–26, the end of which in Lev 26, with blessings and curses, forms a natural break.

> Lev 11–15 [Prescriptions concerning purity, some of them possibly inserted after the separation of the books]
> Lev 16 P [The Day of Atonement]
> Lev 17–26 [Holiness Code, possibly inserted after the separation of the books]
>> Lev 27 [Law concerning vows (= annexes to the separate book)]
>
>> Num 1–8 [The order of the camp. Law of the Levites, and other legal material. At least some of this material was inserted after the separation of the books.]
> Num 9–10 P+J [Resumption of the wanderings in the desert]

"The chapters Lev. xvii.–xxvi. … form a work of a peculiar character by themselves, … which harmonises but little with the Priestly Code."[69] In tradition history this law book occupies a central position between Deuteronomy, the book of Ezekiel, and the Priestly Code. Whether it was once independent or originated from the outset as a supplement to its context is debated.

It is usually assumed that it was the Priestly Code into whose literary context the Holiness Code was inserted. That can neither be proved nor disproved, the less so since it is only with difficulty that the original substance of the Priestly Code can be distinguished from either the additions introduced into it while it was still independent, or from the expansions that were added after it was redactionally linked with the other Pentateuch source.[70] But that a new scroll would have been begun after the conclusion of Lev 26 with its blessing and curse seems so obvious that we can even consider whether the separation of the books may have gone hand in hand with the interpolation of Lev 17–26. Today the final sentence Lev 26:46: "These are the statutes and ordinances and laws that Yhwh established between himself and the Israelites

---

69. Julius Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Israel* (trans. J. S. Black and A. Menzies; Edinburgh: Black, 1885), 376.

70. See Martin Noth, *Leviticus: A Commentary* (trans. J. E. Anderson; OTL; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1965), 13.

on Mount Sinai through Moses," constitutes something like a summing up of the Sinaitic legislation in general.

After the separation of Leviticus from the book of Numbers, the final chapter was added as an appendix: "For the appended chapter on dedicatory gifts (ch. 27), one can only surmise that the Pentateuch's division into 'Books' was already projected and that it was simply placed as an isolated fragment at the end of a 'Book.'"[71]

NUMBERS AND DEUTERONOMY

Among all the examples that have to be examined here, the transition between the books of Numbers and Deuteronomy presents a special case. Here, unity such as that which obtains between the material of Samuel and Kings, or between the books of Judges and Samuel, is lacking. There is no earlier redactional thread, such as links Josh 24:28 with Judg 2:6, and Gen 50:26aα with Exod 1:8. There is no direct connection, as obtains between Deut 34:5–6* and Josh 1:1. And there is no bridge comparable with that between Exod 40:12–16 and Lev 8, and between Exod 40:34–38 and Num 9–10.

Instead, Deut 1–3 presents an unusually expansive recapitulation of the events that have gone before, in Num 11–32. Surprisingly, this recapitulation is not stated from the narrator's perspective but is given the form of a speech made by Moses. It assumes the style of the law book that follows in Deuteronomy.

> Num 20:1aβb J^Q And the people stayed in Kadesh; and Miriam died there, and was buried there. . . .
> Num 22–24 J^{Q+R} [The Editor of the Yahwist's History inserted the story of Balaam into the itinerary of the wilderness.]
> Num 25:1b J^Q And Israel dwelt in Shittim. . . .
> > Num 25–32 [Narrative and legal material inserted later]
> > > Num 33–36 [Annexes after the separation of the books.]
>
> > Deut 1:1a These are the words that Moses spoke to all Israel beyond the Jordan. [= Heading to insert Deuteronomy into the sequence of history]
> > > Deut 1–3 [The narrative of Num 11–32 is resumed as part of Moses' speech to the people.]
> > > [The Corpus of Deuteronomy]
> > > Deut 31–33 [Preparations for Moses' death]
> > Deut 34:5* J^Q And Moses died there, 6* and was buried. [= End of the Yahwist's History]

---

71. Noth, *Leviticus*, 14.

The heading, "These are the words that Moses spoke to all Israel beyond the Jordan," shows that the purpose is to incorporate Moses' speech, which then follows, into the sequence of historical events.[72] The style of the heading already suggests that in this case the narrative continuity has been created, not disrupted. Even in its shortest form this was never "the heading only for the legislative and parenetic core of Deuteronomy, but always already provided the link between that and the literary outline of the early history, from the journeyings through the wilderness to the conquest."[73] That linkage is the very reason why the preceding events described in Num 11–32 are recapitulated in Moses' speech. As a rule, here Deuteronomy is the receptive part.[74] That does not exclude the possibility that in terms of their details the parallels might also have been harmonized in the reverse direction.

Earlier research assumed that the pentateuchal sources continue, following Moses' address. This view was seemingly contradicted by Martin Noth's hypothesis that the Deuteronomistic History begins in Deut 1. But the earlier view remains correct, even though it has emerged that the Priestly Code has no share in Deut 34.[75] The note concerning the death of Moses in Deut 34:5*–6* may be linked with the note about Israel's sojourn in Shittim in Num 25:1a, just as Miriam's death is linked with the sojourn of the Israelites in Kadesh in Num 20:1aβb.[76] It is at just this point that the narrative about the conquest begins; in Josh 2, Joshua sends out the spies *from Shittim* to Jericho. The notes about the death of Miriam in Kadesh and the death of Moses in Shittim probably marked the end of the Yahwist's History.[77] It is possible that traces of the link between the Yahwistic and the Deuteronomistic redactions might be found in Deut 34 and Josh 2. Of course the precise way in which these two threads are interwoven requires further investigation, and it may

---

72. Lothar Perlitt, *Deuteronomium* (BKAT 5.1; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1990), 4.

73. Perlitt, *Deuteronomium*, 6.

74. See Perlitt, *Deuteronomium*, 38; Timo Veijola, *Das fünfte Buch Mose: Deuteronomium Kapitel 1,1–16,17* (ATD 8.1; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004), 16; Gertz, "Kompositorische Funktion und literarhistorischer Ort von Dtn 1–3," 112.

75. Cf. Lothar Perlitt, "Priesterschrift im Deuteronomium?" *ZAW* 100 (1988) Supplement: 65–88, esp. 76–86.

76. Kratz, "Der literarische Ort des Deuteronomiums," 119 n. 73.

77. Wellhausen, *Die Composition des Hexateuchs*, 116: "It is worth mentioning that J suddenly breaks off after Balaam's blessing. It is only in Num 25:1–5 and Deut 34 that we might perhaps claim to find some traces of this marvellous narrative book." Similarly Levin, *Der Jahwist*, 50; idem, "The Yahwist: The Earliest Editor in the Pentateuch," *JBL* 126 (2007): 209–30, esp. 217.

never be possible to clarify this process completely.[78] About the fact of the link there can be no doubt.

If it is correct that the thread of the history runs in some way or other from Num 25 to the book of Joshua by way of Deut 34, then the Deuteronomic law can only have been inserted into the course of the historical events at a later point. The Deuteronomistic History did not begin with the book of Deuteronomy. That may also be assumed for an external reason: for if the Deuteronomistic History had included the Deuteronomic law from the very beginning, it would have been too extensive for a single scroll. Noth's hypothesis—in this respect—requires correction, and the earlier Hexateuch hypotheses are—in this respect—right. That does not mean, however, that we should carry the pentateuchal sources forward into the historical books, as was usual before Noth, any more than it means that we should dispute the existence of the Deuteronomistic History.

The historicization of the Deuteronomic law, which is the outcome of its incorporation into the sequence of historical events, is undoubtedly secondary; and with it the Moses fiction, too.[79] If the centralization of the cult was the occasion for the creation of the Deuteronomic law, which all the evidence suggests, then it is in the wrong place in the present form of the account: in the land of Moab before the conquest and long before the building of the Temple. In the light of its original intention, the Deuteronomic law for its part is unsuited as a program for life in the promised land.[80]

On the other hand the historicization must already have taken place early on, for it is presupposed by commandments such as Deut 17:14–20; 18:9–22; 19:8–10, 14; and 26:1–15. For later tradition, the fact that the Deuteronomic law was not proclaimed on Sinai like all other laws presented a great difficulty (see Deut 5:3; 28:69); but the account could no longer be moved. As an expedient, the Decalogue of Exod 20:2–17 was therefore repeated later in Deut 5:6–21, in order to demonstrate the identity between the Deuteronomic law and the law given on Sinai.[81] In this way, the Deuteronomic law like the Sinaitic one is presented as an interpretation of the Decalogue.

In view of these considerations, the case of Deut 1–3 presents the paradoxical possibility that the books of Numbers and Deuteronomy were

78. Blum, "Pentateuch–Hexateuch–Enneateuch?" 80–82, points out, over against Kratz, that the connection between Num 25:1a and Josh 2:1 is neither smooth nor without an alternative.

79. The suggestion that Deuteronomy was created for its context (Kratz, *The Composition of the Narrative Books*, 123–24) can be ruled out.

80. See Christoph Levin, *Die Verheißung des neuen Bundes* (FRLANT 137; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1985), 85–87.

81. See Levin, *Die Verheißung des neuen Bundes*, 97.

separated *in order* to be linked together. The purpose of the book's new beginning was to fit the Deuteronomic law into the sequence of historical events. The beginning of the book of Deuteronomy is in fact both independent and nonindependent. When, in the debate about Deut 1–3, these two possibilities are supposed to be mutually incompatible, an alternative is maintained which is no alternative at all. Since the Deuteronomic law was fitted into the historical framework early on, however, we have to reckon with the possibility that the historical narrative that follows the original heading of Deut 1:1 was later expanded considerably.

Again, the preceding book has received extensive additions. The latest additions to the Torah found a home in the book of Numbers rather than in Deuteronomy, as the final sentence in Num 36:13 shows: "These are the commandments and the ordinances which Yhwh commanded by Moses to the Israelites in the plains of Moab by the Jordan at Jericho." This notice locates the proclamation of the subsequently added commandments at the same place as the proclamation of Deuteronomy. How much was added between Num 25:1b and 36:13 before the books were separated, we neither can nor must decide. All that is unequivocally clear is that Num 33–36 no longer found an echo in Deut 1–3.

Conclusions

1. The fact that the Enneateuch was distributed between nine individual books was due to the technical requirements of the scrolls; the process of division was at the same time the precondition for further gradual literary growth.

2. The individual books cannot have preceded this growth, nor can the distribution of the material have taken place in one or several acts after the growth was complete. The idea that the text of the Enneateuch was at the end divided proportionately between different scrolls is as wrong as the suggestion that the material was distributed between different scrolls from the outset.[82] "The usual division of this historical complex into 'books' … was undoubtedly a secondary process in the history of the tradition."[83]

3. The narrative coherence of the material is based on the coherence of the first redactions. Therefore, the original form of the text, which the first redactions produced, must have been very much shorter than what we have today. There must have been room for these initial versions on a single scroll.

4. The obviously secondary character of the separation of the books is incompatible with all kinds of hypotheses maintained among exegetes, concerning preliminary stages of the Enneateuch. At no time was there an

---

82. Contrary to Haran, "Book-Size and the Device of Catch-Lines in the Biblical Canon."

83. Noth, *The Deuteronomistic History*, 4.

original Hexateuch from Genesis to Joshua; or a work comprising the books of Exodus to Joshua; or a narrative about the conquest consisting of Deuteronomy and Joshua; or a Deuteronomistic History composed only of the books of Samuel and Kings.

5. At the same time, the possibility that the Enneateuch goes back to a foundational single work is excluded, since the first two redactions, the Yahwist in Genesis to Numbers (+ Deuteronomy) and the Deuteronomist in (Deuteronomy +) Joshua to Kings, diametrically contradict each other in their attitudes to the place of the cult. For the Deuteronomistic redaction, the central sanctuary in Jerusalem is the principal norm. Its aim is the reinstatement of the Davidic dynasty in order that it should restore the temple. The Yahwist redaction, on the other hand, upholds the concerns of Diaspora Judaism, and proclaims the omnipresence of the God Yʜwʜ, so that his worship might be made possible worldwide. The occasionally expressed opinion that the Yahwist "approximates to the Deuteronomic-Deuteronomistic form of tradition and to its literary work,"[84] or even that it builds on the Deuteronomist,[85] is out of the question. There must therefore be a "compositional nexus" in today's total work, a point at which the two first redactions are bound together.[86] If it is correct that the death of Moses still belongs to the Yahwist's History, this nexus must for preference be looked for in proximity to that event. This does not rule out the possibility that the end of the Yahwist's History (which had probably even then been united with the Priestly Code) and the beginning of the Deuteronomistic History had been intertwined.

6. The Tetrateuch, for its part, rests on the linking of two redactional works, the Yahwist's History and the Priestly Code. In the context of the growth of the text as a whole, these must have been linked very early on, and space must originally have been found for both of them on one and the same scroll.[87] Recent literary-critical investigations have shown that the bulk of the text was added *after* the two Pentateuch sources had been amalgamated.[88]

7. The eight caesuras between the nine books differ very considerably from one another. The transitions between the books of Exodus and Leviticus,

---

84. Hans Heinrich Schmid, *Der sogenannte Jahwist: Beobachtungen und Fragen zur Pentateuchforschung* (Zurich: Theologischer Verlag, 1976), 167.

85. Martin Rose, *Jahwist und Deuteronomist: Untersuchungen zu den Berührungspunkten beider Literaturwerke* (ATANT 67; Zurich: Theologischer Verlag, 1981).

86. This is the grain of truth in Blum's interpretation of Judg 2:1–5; see his "Der kompositionelle Knoten am Übergang von Josua zu Richter."

87. The thesis, recently renewed by Raik Heckl, *Moses Vermächtnis: Kohärenz, literarische Intention und Funktion von Dtn 1–3* (Arbeiten zur Bibel und ihrer Geschichte 9; Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2004), that Deut 1–3 did not yet presuppose the Priestly Code, greatly overestimates the age of the *Vorlage* in Num 11–32.

88. See *pars pro toto* Christoph Levin, "Die Redaktion Rᴶᴾ in der Urgeschichte," in Beck und Schorn, *Auf dem Weg zur Endgestalt von Genesis bis II Regum*, 15–34, esp. 18–23.

and between Leviticus and Numbers, are made almost casually. These books have no individually constituted beginnings. The same is true of the books of Samuel and Kings. The caesuras between the books of Genesis and Exodus and between Joshua and Judges are different. The books of Exodus and Judges were in each case given a new beginning, and the book of Joshua a new ending.[89] The transition between Deuteronomy and the book of Joshua following the death of Moses marks a clear caesura, but not necessarily a deliberately constructed commencement for a new book. The expansive beginning of the book of Deuteronomy should probably be viewed as an exception.

8. In the case of each of the caesuras, the preceding scroll has been expanded by addenda after the separation. These expansions are most extensive in the book of Joshua (chs. 13–22). But they are extremely pronounced in the books of Exodus (chs. 35–39; 40*), Numbers (chs. 33–36), Judges (chs. 19–21), and Samuel (chs. 21–24), as well. These expansions show that in the growth process seen as a whole, the books were separated relatively early on.

9. Since the separation of the books is at once the *result* of the literary growth and the *condition* which made the literary growth possible, the books have been separated successively. The question about the sequence in which the caesuras were made is a necessary question but one difficult to answer. It would seem that Genesis and Exodus were divided quite early, since the book of Genesis presents itself as a clearly defined entity, and was from early on relatively extensive. Joshua and Judges also seem to have been separated quite early; for the cross-connections between Joshua 24 and Genesis 50 show that a Hexateuch as point of reference had already existed for some time. The separation of Leviticus and Numbers could be earlier than the separation of Exodus and Leviticus.

10. Since the separation of the books was primarily undertaken for technical reasons, we have to consider the paradoxical possibility that books were separated in order that the material could be combined. For, if large amounts of material were to be joined, this was only possible if that material was distributed over several scrolls, which had then for their part to be linked in terms of content. This may have been the case with the Holiness Code in Lev 17–26: its interpolation may have led to the separation of the books of Leviticus and Numbers. The other such instance is the interpolation of the Deuteronomic law, which must also in some way or other have gone hand in hand with the linking of the Tetrateuch to the Deuteronomistic History. The question of whether Deut 1–3 marks an independent beginning or a secondary bridge is perhaps a false alternative: the beginning of this book may have functioned as both at the same time.

---

89. Erhard Blum, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch* (BZAW 189; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1990), 363, notes the comparability of the two book transitions.