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### Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AASF</td>
<td>Annales Academiae scientiarum fennicae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>Anchor Bible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABR</td>
<td><em>Australian Biblical Review</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABRL</td>
<td>Anchor Bible Reference Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOAT</td>
<td>Alter Orient und Altes Testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATANT</td>
<td>Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATD</td>
<td>Das Alte Testament Deutsch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATJ</td>
<td><em>Ashland Theological Journal</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BBB</td>
<td>Bonner biblische Beiträge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BBET</td>
<td>Beiträge zur biblischen Exegese und Theologie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEATAJ</td>
<td>Beiträge zur Erforschung des Alten Testaments und des antiken Judentum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BETL</td>
<td>Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bib</td>
<td><em>Biblica</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOSCS</td>
<td><em>Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BJS</td>
<td>Brown Judaic Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BN</td>
<td><em>Biblische Notizen</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BWAT</td>
<td>Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten Testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BWANT</td>
<td>Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BZABR</td>
<td>Beihefte der Zeitschrift für altorientalische und biblische Rechtsgeschichte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BZAW</td>
<td>Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBET</td>
<td>Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBQ</td>
<td><em>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ConBOT</td>
<td>Coniectanea biblica: Old Testament Series</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PENTATEUCH, HEXATEUCH, OR ENNEATEUCH?


DJD  Discoveries in the Judaean Desert

DSD  Dead Sea Discoveries

EdF  Erträge der Forschung

ErIsr  Eretz-Israel

ETL  Ephemerides theologicae lovanienses

ETR  Etudes théologiques et religieuses

EvQ  Evangelical Quarterly

EvT  Evangelische Theologie

FAT  Forschungen zum Alten Testament

FB  Forschung zur Bibel

FOTL  Forms of the Old Testament Literature

FRLANT  Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments

GAT  Grundrisse zum Alten Testament

HAR  Hebrew Annual Review

HAT  Handbuch zum Alten Testament

HCOT  Historical Commentary on the Old Testament

HKAT  Handkommentar zum Alten Testament

HSM  Harvard Semitic Monographs

HSS  Harvard Semitic Studies

HTKAT  Herders theologischer Kommentar zum Alten Testament

HTR  Harvard Theological Review

HUCA  Hebrew Union College Annual

IBS  Irish Biblical Studies

ICC  International Critical Commentary


Int  Interpretation

JBL  Journal of Biblical Literature

JBTh  Jahrbuch für Biblische Theologie

JETS  Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society

JJS  Journal of Jewish Studies

JRH  Journal of Religious History

JSOT  Journal for the Study of the Old Testament

JSOTSup  Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series

JTS  Journal of Theological Studies
KAT  Kommentar zum Alten Testament
KHC  Kurzer Hand-Commentar zum Alten Testament
LHB  Library of Hebrew Bible
MdB  Le Monde de la Bible
NICOT  New International Commentary on the Old Testament
OBO  Orbis biblicus et orientalis
OBT  Overtures to Biblical Theology
Or  Orientalia (NS)
OTL  Old Testament Library
OTS  Old Testament Studies
OtSt  Oudtestamentische Studiën
RB  Revue biblique
RelSRev  Religious Studies Review
RevQ  Revue de Qumrân
SAA  State Archives of Assyria
SBAB  Stuttgarter biblische Aufsatzbände
SBLDS  Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series
SBLMS  Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series
SBLSCS  Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies
SBLSS  Society of Biblical Literature Semeia Studies
SBLSymS  Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series
SBLWAW  Society of Biblical Literature Writings from the Ancient World
SBS  Stuttgarter Bibelstudien
SBT  Studies in Biblical Theology
SFSHJ  South Florida Studies in the History of Judaism
SJOT  Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament
SOTSMS  Society for Old Testament Studies Monograph Series
STDJ  Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah
TB  Theologische Bücherei: Neudrucke und Berichte aus dem 20. Jahrhundert
TCS  Texts from Cuneiform Sources
ThW  Theologische Wissenschaft
Tru  Theologische Rundshau
TSK  Theologische Studien und Kritiken
UF  Ugarit-Forschungen
VAB  Vorderasiatische Bibliothek
VF  Verkündigung und Forschung
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VT</td>
<td><em>Vetus Testamentum</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT Sup</td>
<td><em>Supplements to Vetus Testamentum</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WBC</td>
<td><em>Word Biblical Commentary</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WdF</td>
<td><em>Wege der Forschung</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WMANT</td>
<td><em>Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WUNT</td>
<td><em>Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZA</td>
<td><em>Zeitschrift für Assyriologie</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZABR</td>
<td><em>Zeitschrift für altorientalische und biblische Rechtgeschichte</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAH</td>
<td><em>Zeitschrift für Althebräistik</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAW</td>
<td><em>Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZBK</td>
<td><em>Zürcher Bibelkommentare</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZTK</td>
<td><em>Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The identification of literary works in the Pentateuch and the Former Prophets is a hallmark of the modern historical-critical interpretation of the Hebrew Bible. B. de Spinoza rejected the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch in part through his identification of a literary Enneateuch, which he suspected was written by Ezra.¹ The identification of a Hexateuch by source critics provided the literary context for identifying the authors of the separate documents, J, E, and P, who were thought to tell a narrative in which the promise of the land at the beginning of the story was fulfilled by the conquest of the land in Joshua. In the same way, the separation of the books from Genesis through Kings into a Tetrateuch (Genesis–Numbers) and a Deuteronomistic History (Deuteronomy–Kings) supported Martin Noth’s detection of the exilic Deuteronomistic historian.² In each case, the identification of literary works was linked to theories about the literary history of the Pentateuch and the Former Prophets.

The breakdown of both source criticism and the tradition-historical approach of Martin Noth in more recent interpretations of the Pentateuch and the Former Prophets has forced scholars to reevaluate the criteria for identifying literary works in the formation of the Hebrew Bible. The emergence of redaction criticism has intensified the problem of defining the boundaries of literary works, since this model of composition attributes a more formative role to editors, now seen as the authors of literary works, than is the case in either source criticism, where the focus is on the source documents J, E, and P, or in tradition history, where the Tetrateuch and the Deuteronomistic History are identified as separate “blocks,” themselves in turn constructed of formerly oral or written thematic units. The most recent redaction-critical contributions concerning the composition of the Pentateuch and the Former Prophets demonstrate that it is no longer possible to interpret these bodies

of literature as though they were separate and independent literary works. At the same time, these studies also raise new problems in determining what criteria are important for identifying a literary work in the composition of the Pentateuch and the Former Prophets. When, for example, is a redaction part of a larger programmatic composition and when is it simply an isolated addition; how does a redactional composition influence the identification of more traditional sources; how does the emergence of separate books relate to larger redactional compositions? Are we able to detect literary strategies that indicate the beginnings and endings of formerly “independent” literary works within Genesis–Kings? And, finally, if we read Genesis–Kings as a unified literary Enneateuch, does 2 Kgs 25 present an adequate ending? The canonical shape of the Hebrew Bible suggests that this is not the case.

The present volume is intended to explore anew the composition history of the Pentateuch and the Former Prophets without either presupposing the classical theories of the sources—“JEDP” and the Deuteronomistic History, “DtrH”—or excluding them. The nature of the volume is therefore exploratory and open-ended. The papers are the fruit of a two-year consultation, in 2007–8, between the Pentateuch Section and the Deuteronomistic History Section of the Society of Biblical Literature, during which members from each group shared research on the central question of how to identify literary works in the Pentateuch and the Former Prophets. We have organized the articles into two sections. The first comprises a series of essays on the broad methodological problems of identifying literary works in the Pentateuch and the Former Prophets. The second section is made up of case studies, in which authors explore a variety of different literary relationships between the Pentateuch and the Former Prophets.

The Methodological Studies

The discussion of the appropriate methodology for identifying literary works in Genesis through Kings is wide-ranging and open-ended. The articles gathered in this section explore a variety of methodologies, while often concluding their essays with probing question that invite further research. Konrad Schmid reviews the history of scholarship that has led to the dominant view of the late twentieth century that the Tetrateuch/Pentateuch is a distinct literary work from the Deuteronomistic History. The essays of Thomas Römer and Erhard Blum explore in different ways the problem of how interpreters determine what compositional and literary features provide evidence for identifying a literary work. David Carr broadens the lens by suggesting a more empirical comparison of Chronicles and Samuel–Kings as a springboard to evaluating the relationship between the Pentateuch and the
Former Prophets throughout their history of composition. These essays on methodology can be summarized in the following manner.

Konrad Schmid, in “The Emergence and Disappearance of the Separation between the Pentateuch and the Deuteronomistic History in Biblical Studies,” analyzes the history of research that has resulted in the scholarly separation of the Pentateuch (in fact, the Tetratauch) from the Deuteronomistic History, in the interpretation of Genesis through Kings. He reviews, in particular, the pivotal research of Martin Noth, who advanced two related arguments that have influenced the identification of literary works in contemporary scholarship: namely, the absence of the traditional sources J, E, and P in the book of Joshua, on the one hand; and the lack of Deuteronomistic editing in the Tetratauch, on the other. The result has been the clear literary separation of the Tetratauch from the Deuteronomistic History. This strict separation was further strengthened by the scholarly compromise between Gerhard von Rad and Martin Noth that allowed the model of the Hexateuch and the model of the Deuteronomistic History to coexist throughout the twentieth century, even though the two models were not really compatible with one another. Finally, Schmid traces the breakdown of both theories in current research, which has led to proposals of new literary works that combine the Pentateuch and the Former Prophets in a variety of different ways within the larger literary framework of the Enneateuch.

Thomas Römer, in “How Many Books (teuchs): Pentateuch, Hexateuch, Deuteronomistic History, or Enneateuch?” notes the recent shift in scholarly interest from recovering the oldest literary sources in the Pentateuch and Former Prophets to identifying the latest redactions that have shaped that literature. He notes that the change in focus is accompanied by an interest in the question of how major literary works were formed and whether they may be identified. Römer explores the past and present arguments for the existence of the Hexateuch, the Deuteronomistic History, and the Enneateuch, noting how the explanations for different literary works are tied to distinct models of the formation of the Hebrew Bible. After taking the reader through a range of recent proposals on the identification of the Pentateuch, Hexateuch or Enneateuch, Römer concludes by exploring three important questions for recognizing literary works in the Pentateuch and Former Prophets: First, what are the criteria for identifying the beginnings and endings of literary works? Second, how were scrolls produced and stored in the Second Temple period, and what insight does this provide towards identifying literary works? And, third, how can a researcher control the methodology of redaction criticism in order to distinguish comprehensive editorial revisions that are related to the formation of literary works from more limited additions to specific texts?

Erhard Blum, in “Pentateuch–Hexateuch–Enneateuch? Or: How Can One Recognize a Literary Work in the Hebrew Bible?” begins his article with
the truism that “in order to understand a text, one must know where it begins and ends.” The remainder of the article, however, illustrates just how difficult it is to identify beginnings and endings of literary works in the Pentateuch and Former Prophets, and how the answers to these questions depend on many factors beyond the text itself. Blum explores a variety of literary and thematic links that connect the books of Genesis through Kings, while also distinguishing the Pentateuch as the Torah of Moses. He concludes that this simultaneity of independence and continuity is, in fact, an essential structural element of the written canon. This variety of literary relationships between books gives rise to a methodological problem, noted also by Römer: How is the interpreter able to determine when inner-canonical links represent merely intertextual repetition of motifs between books, and when they indicate more programmatic intratextual redaction, wherein the compositional repetitions are intended to create a literary work? Blum applies the distinction between inter- and intratextual repetitions to the recent studies by E. Aurelius and R. Kratz, before going on to explore the function of the internal (autoreferenza) references to the “Torah” within the Pentateuch as an indicator of a literary work.

David M. Carr, in “Empirical’ Comparison and the Analysis of the Relationship of the Pentateuch and the Former Prophets,” moves the methodological problem of recognizing literary works in the Pentateuch and the Former Prophets in a different direction. Rather than exploring the internal literary relationships between the Pentateuch and the Former Prophets, which is the focus of the studies by Blum and Römer, he compares the overlapping historical narratives in Samuel–Kings and Chronicles for clues that may provide insight into the relationship between the Pentateuch and the Former Prophets. Building on the research of Jeffrey Tigay, Carr defines this approach as “empirical,” which he characterizes as a sustained focus on the comparison of documents from the ancient Near East, in order to understand the growth of texts. The empirical comparison yields insights concerning three factors in the growth of texts that may assist in interpreting the relationship of the Pentateuch and the Former Prophets: first, an oral-written dynamic in transmission; second, a trend toward expansion and harmonization in the transmission of tradition; and, third, at least in the sections where Chronicles and Samuel–Kings overlap, indications that the author of Chronicles was likely using an earlier form of Samuel–Kings. When these insights are applied to a study of the relationship between the Pentateuch and the Former Prophets, Carr suggests that they may also “provide additional evidence of authorial work that binds the Torah to the Former Prophets, ‘harmonizing’ the one with the other in ways consonant with modes used in many other examples of documented growth of ancient tradition.”
The broader methodological essays are complemented by case studies, in which authors explore the literary relationship between the Pentateuch and the Former Prophets though the interpretation of specific texts. The essays are wide-ranging and explorative in nature. The topics include: the P source and supports for the identification of a literary Hexateuch; the emergence of the nine books of the Enneateuch from more comprehensive redactions; the function of Gen 2–4 and 2 Kgs 24–25 as a framing device in the creation of an Enneateuch; the literary relationship between the story of the golden calf of Exod 32 and the calves of Jeroboam in 1 Kgs 12; the relationship between the sequence of intercessions by Moses in Exod 32–34 and the enneateuchal literature; the distinct literary function of Joshua in the MT and the LXX canons; the question of the literary connections between the story of the Egyptian bondage in Exod 1–15 and that of the forced labor of Solomon in 1 Kgs 1–12; and the arguments against the Deuteronomistic History hypothesis that emerge from the interpretation of the judgment speeches in 1 and 2 Kings.

Suzanne Boorer, in “The Envisioning of the Land in the Priestly Material: Fulfilled Promise or Future Hope?” addresses the long-debated issue of whether there is Priestly material in the book of Joshua; and, if so, whether it represents a literary source or a redaction. Boorer reviews past arguments in favor of interpreting the Priestly source as ending in Joshua, so as to create a literary Hexateuch. She focuses in particular on the most debated texts, which include Josh 4:19; 5:10–12; 14:1–2*; 18:1; and 19:51. Boorer argues that, although there is some similarity in style, these texts contrast with the Priestly source in Genesis–Numbers. She concludes from this that the P source lacks the theme of the fulfillment of the promise of the land and, instead, pictures its future realization. According to Boorer, “it might be imagined that later redactors are responsible for the P-like texts in Joshua, perhaps in an attempt to align the return to the land in postexilic times with Pg's vision and perhaps in this way at some stage to represent an attempt to formulate a Hexateuch.”

Christoph Levin, in “On the Cohesion and Separation of Books within the Enneateuch,” begins his essay by noting the literary problem that confronts any reading of the Enneateuch, which is that “the great biblical work contained in the books of Genesis to Kings constitutes a continuous unit”; and yet, it is “obvious that the Enneateuch is a collection, which brings together diverse material.” How does the interpreter account for these two literary facts in evaluating the coherent story of creation to exile and the present division of the nine individual books of the Enneateuch? The question is complicated by the limited size of ancient scrolls, which could not possibly accommodate the whole text of Genesis to 2 Kings. Levin's essay explores a process of
growth by which the early redactional versions of the tradition, such as the
exilic Yahwist narrative, or the Deuteronomistic History, were separated sec-
ondarily into distinct scrolls or books as the tradition grew. Levin evaluates
the diverse criteria by which the original redactions were broken into separate
scrolls by interpreting the caesurae between Samuel and Kings, Judges and
Samuel, Joshua and Judges, Deuteronomy and Joshua, Genesis and Exodus,
Exodus and Leviticus, Leviticus and Numbers, and finally Numbers and Deu-
teronomy. He concludes that the narrative coherence of the material is based
on the unity of the first redactions and that the fact that the Enneateuch was
separated into nine books was due to the technical requirement of the scrolls.
This hypothesis leaves no room for an original Hexateuch, a work compris-
ing Exodus to Joshua, a narrative consisting of Deuteronomy and Joshua, or
a Deuteronomistic History composed only of the books of Samuel and Kings.

Cynthia Edenburg, in “From Eden to Babylon: Reading Gen 2–4 as a Par-
adigmatic Narrative,” begins with a careful literary comparison of the stories
of Eden and Cain. She finds that the stories exhibit the same structure and
similar language, which leads her to the conclusion that together the stories
deal with two different types of tests, the failure of which leads in each case to
exile and alienation. Edenburg proposes that “the purpose of the two stories
is to establish an exemplar for the pattern carried out in the rest of the biblical
narrative,” for which the thematic inclusio is the description of the Babylonian
conquest and exile in 2 Kgs 24:1–25:21. This inclusio that thus brackets the
“Primary History” raises the methodological question of how to determine
whether the repetition “signifies that Genesis to Kings were conceived as a
compositional unit or Enneateuch?” Edenburg seeks an answer to the ques-
tion by reviewing research on the production of scrolls; the concept of the
“book” in the ancient world; recent theories on the independent composition
of the primeval history; and the “block” paradigm for understanding the com-
position of the Pentateuch.

Michael Konkel, in “Exod 32–34 and the Quest for an Enneateuch,”
explores whether literary connections between Exod 32–34 and Genesis
through 2 Kings support the identification of an Enneateuch. Konkel focuses
on three intercessions of Moses in Exodus 32–34: (1) at the summit of Mount
Sinai during the worship of the golden calf (Exod 32:11–13); (2) at the base
of the mountain after the destruction of the golden calf and the tablets (Exod
32:31–32); and (3) after the extended dialogue between Moses and the Deity
in Exod 33 (Exod 34:8–9). Konkel explores the innerbiblical ties between
these three texts and Genesis through 2 Kings from two methodological per-
spectives. First, he investigates the innerbiblical links through the synchronic
study of a range of specific texts (e.g., Exod 32:2, 8, 10, 12, 13, 26–29; 33:1–13,
4–6, 8–9) that indicate literary connections throughout Genesis–2 Kings (e.g.,
Gen 6:7–8; 12:2, 7; 13:14–17; 17; 22:17; Deut 33:8–11; 34:4; Judg 2:1–5; and
1 Kgs 12:28; 2 Kgs 23:26; 24:3–4). Second, he applies a diachronic analysis to four texts (Exod 32:7–14; 32:26–29; 33:1–11; 34:8–10) that are often attributed to a late Deuteronomistic redaction. Konkel concludes that the texts represent the work of a single author, who is combining both Priestly and Deuteronomistic material. Such an identification of authorship could support the view that the redactor is working within the literary framework of the Enneateuch, but Konkel concludes that no such literary work can be identified. Instead, the intertextual references between Exod 32–34 and Kings actually support the notion of the separation of the Pentateuch from the Former Prophets.

Thomas Dozeman, in “The Book of Joshua as an Intertext in the MT and the LXX Canons,” begins his study by noting the pivotal role of the book of Joshua for identifying literary works, because of its central location as an intertext between the Pentateuch and the Former Prophets. A. Kuenen and J. Wellhausen located the conclusion of the pentateuchal narrative in Joshua’s fulfillment of the promise of land, thus conceptualizing the Hexateuch; while Martin Noth detached the composition of Joshua from these sources, proposing instead the existence of two distinct literary works: the Tetrateuch and the Deuteronomistic History. The ambiguity over the appropriate context for interpreting Joshua, illustrated by Wellhausen and Noth, intensified with the emergence of redaction criticism, according to Dozeman; this resulted in part from divergent views concerning the final form of Joshua, which in turn influenced the understanding of the redactor’s literary horizon as the basis for identifying the larger literary work. Dozeman notes that the problem of determining the final form of Joshua is compounded by the significantly different versions of the book in the MT and the LXX canons, where Joshua is also related differently to the Pentateuch and the Former Prophets. The study underscores that the redaction-critical approach must determine which final form of Joshua will be the starting point for interpreting the composition of the book, since this decision will influence the identification of the literary works—Pentateuch, Hexateuch, Enneateuch, or Deuteronomistic History.

Christoph Berner, in “The Egyptian Bondage and Solomon’s Forced Labor: Literary Connections Between Exod 1–15 and 1 Kgs 1–12?” examines the parallel motifs and similar narrative traits in the story of the exodus and that of the forced labor of Solomon, which led to the revolt of Jeroboam. Do these correspondences denote an original literary Enneateuch, or are the parallels simply later literary allusions to the Exodus in the story of Solomon? Berner concludes that the literary evidence for both motifs is more complex than is widely held, and that a unified picture of the Egyptian bondage and of Solomon’s forced labor does not exist. Instead, both texts exhibit a complex literary development, in which both stories developed independently. Berner therefore concludes that “there is not one single instance in which it could be
demonstrated that one of the passages in Exodus and 1 Kings pertaining to
the topic of servitude was composed in light of an enneateuchal intertext.”

Felipe Blanco Wißmann, in “‘He Did What was Right’: Criteria of Judg-
ment and Deuteronomism in the Books of Kings,” examines the judgment
texts in the books of Kings—texts in which prophets, kings, or the Deity are
presented as evaluating the actions of rulers. The speeches in these texts are
intended to provide interpretations of the narrative, according to Wissmann,
and thus express the authors’ or redactors’ views of history and theology,
termed “historiosophy,” which provides a means for interpreting the literary
origin and history of composition of the books of Kings. A comparison of the
judgment speeches to nonbiblical texts suggests that the earliest forms of the
speeches come from the Neo-Assyrian period, when Judean scribes used ele-
ments of Assyrian royal ideology to create the Urdeuteronomium, which was
intended to function in a “subversive manner.” A more detailed interpretation
of central features of the judgment speeches—including the motifs of doing
right or evil in the eyes of Yhwh, the fathers, the high place, foreign gods, the
sin of Jeroboam, or the law—indicates that the judgment formulas in Kings
do not derive from Deuteronomy and that Deuteronomy was not part of the
same literary entity as Kings; thus, this analysis calls into question the Deuter-
onomistic History hypothesis. Blanco Wissmann concludes, instead, that “the
literary context of the books of Kings within the history of biblical theology
should be the place that it acquired already in the Jewish canonical tradition
of the Tanakh: among the prophets.”

This overview already indicates the diversity of approaches represented
here; it is our hope that the essays in this volume will provide a resource for
further research on the important and central question of how we identify
literary works in the composition of the Pentateuch and the Former Prophets.
While this volume does not argue for one specific model in order to explain
the formation of Genesis–Kings, it nevertheless points out that the traditional
delimitations or identifications of “J,” “E,” “D,” and “P” and the strict separa-
tion between Tetrataueh and Deuteronomistic History, can no longer be taken
for granted. The traditional divisions may be supported to some extent by
further research, but there may also emerge a clear need to abandon at least
some of these assumptions to gain a plausible image of the literary growth of
Genesis–Kings.
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