

PENTATEUCH, HEXATEUCH, OR ENNEATEUCH?

SBL

Society of Biblical Literature



Ancient Israel and Its Literature

Steven L. McKenzie, General Editor

Editorial Board

Suzanne Boorer

Victor H. Matthews

Thomas C. Römer

Benjamin D. Sommer

Nili Wazana

Number 8

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

PENTATEUCH, HEXATEUCH, OR ENNEATEUCH?

Identifying Literary Works in
Genesis through Kings

edited by

Thomas B. Dozeman
Thomas Römer
Konrad Schmid

Society of Biblical Literature
Atlanta

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

Copyright © 2011 by the Society of Biblical Literature

All rights reserved. No part of this work may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying and recording, or by means of any information storage or retrieval system, except as may be expressly permitted by the 1976 Copyright Act or in writing from the publisher. Requests for permission should be addressed in writing to the Rights and Permissions Office, Society of Biblical Literature, 825 Houston Mill Road, Atlanta, GA 30329 USA.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Pentateuch, Hexateuch, or Enneateuch : identifying literary works in Genesis through Kings / edited by Thomas Dozeman, Thomas Römer, and Konrad Schmid.

p. cm. — (Society of Biblical Literature : ancient Israel and its literature ; v. 8)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-1-58983-542-9 (paper binding : alk. paper) — ISBN 978-1-58983-543-6 (electronic format)

1. Bible. O.T. Pentateuch—Criticism, interpretation, etc. 2. Bible. O.T. Former Prophets—Criticism, interpretation, etc. I. Dozeman, Thomas B. II. Römer, Thomas, 1955- III. Schmid, Konrad, 1965- IV. Society of Biblical Literature. V. Title. VI. Series.

BS1225.52.P465 2011

222'.06—dc22

2011008513

Typeset by Upper Case Textual Services
www.uppercasetext.com

Printed on acid-free, recycled paper
conforming to ANSI/NISO Z39.48-1992 (R1997) and ISO 9706:1994
standards for paper permanence.

CONTENTS

Abbreviations	vii
Introduction	1
<i>Thomas B. Dozeman, Thomas Römer, and Konrad Schmid</i>	

METHODOLOGICAL STUDIES

The Emergence and Disappearance of the Separation between the Pentateuch and the Deuteronomistic History in Biblical Studies	11
<i>Konrad Schmid</i>	
How Many Books (<i>teuchs</i>): Pentateuch, Hexateuch, Deuteronomistic History, or Enneateuch?	25
<i>Thomas Römer</i>	
Pentateuch–Hexateuch–Enneateuch? Or: How Can One Recognize a Literary Work in the Hebrew Bible?.	43
<i>Erhard Blum</i>	
“Empirical” Comparison and the Analysis of the Relationship of the Pentateuch and the Former Prophets.	73
<i>David M. Carr</i>	

CASE STUDIES

The Envisioning of the Land in the Priestly Material: Fulfilled Promise or Future Hope?	99
<i>Suzanne Boorer</i>	
On the Cohesion and Separation of Books within the Enneateuch	127
<i>Christoph Levin</i>	

From Eden to Babylon: Reading Genesis 2–4 as a Paradigmatic Narrative.	155
<i>Cynthia Edenburg</i>	
Exodus 32–34 and the Quest for an Enneateuch	169
<i>Michael Konkel</i>	
The Book of Joshua as an Intertext in the MT and the LXX Canons	185
<i>Thomas Dozeman</i>	
The Egyptian Bondage and Solomon’s Forced Labor: Literary Connections between Exodus 1–15 and 1 Kings 1–12?	211
<i>Christoph Berner</i>	
“He Did What was Right”: Criteria of Judgment and Deuteronomism in the Books of Kings.	241
<i>Felipe Blanco Wißmann</i>	
Bibliography	261
Contributors List.	287
Index of Modern Authors.	289
Index of Ancient Sources	295

ABBREVIATIONS

AASF	Annales Academiae scientiarum fennicae
AB	Anchor Bible
ABD	<i>Anchor Bible Dictionary</i> . Ed. D. N. Freedman. 6 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1992
ABR	<i>Australian Biblical Review</i>
ABRL	Anchor Bible Reference Library
AOAT	Alter Orient und Altes Testament
ATANT	Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments
ATD	Das Alte Testament Deutsch
ATJ	<i>Ashland Theological Journal</i>
BBB	Bonner biblische Beiträge
BBET	Beiträge zur biblischen Exegese und Theologie
BEATAJ	Beiträge zur Erforschung des Alten Testaments und des antiken Judentum
BETL	Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium
<i>Bib</i>	<i>Biblica</i>
BIOSCS	<i>Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies</i>
BJS	Brown Judaic Studies
BKAT	Biblischer Kommentar. Altes Testament. Edited by M. Noth and H. W. Wolff
BN	<i>Biblische Notizen</i>
BWAT	Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten Testament
BWANT	Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament
BZABR	Beihefte der Zeitschrift für altorientalische und biblische Rechtsgeschichte
BZAW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
CBET	Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology
CBQ	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
ConBOT	Coniectanea biblica: Old Testament Series

- DDD* *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible*. Edited by K. van der Toorn, B. Becking, and P. W. van der Horst. Leiden: Brill, 1995
- DJD* Discoveries in the Judaeen 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
- IDB* *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*. Edited by G. A. Buttrick. 4 vols. Nashville, 1962
- 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*

KAI	<i>Kanaanäische und aramäische Inschriften</i> . H. Donner and W. Röllig. 3 vols. 2d ed. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1966–1969; 5th ed (vol. 1), 2002
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
<i>Or</i>	<i>Orientalia</i> (NS)
OTL	Old Testament Library
OTS	Old Testament Studies
OtSt	Oudtestamentische Studiën
RB	<i>Revue biblique</i>
<i>RelSRev</i>	<i>Religious Studies Review</i>
<i>RevQ</i>	<i>Revue de Qumrân</i>
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
<i>SJOT</i>	<i>Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament</i>
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
<i>TRu</i>	<i>Theologische Rundschau</i>
<i>TSK</i>	<i>Theologische Studien und Kritiken</i>
<i>UF</i>	<i>Ugarit-Forschungen</i>
VAB	Vorderasiatische Bibliothek
<i>VF</i>	<i>Verkündigung und Forschung</i>

VT	<i>Vetus Testamentum</i>
VTSup	Supplements to <i>Vetus Testamentum</i>
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary
WdF	Wege der Forschung
WMANT	Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
ZA	<i>Zeitschrift für Assyriologie</i>
ZABR	<i>Zeitschrift für altorientalische und biblische Rechtsgeschichte</i>
ZAH	<i>Zeitschrift für Althebräistik</i>
ZAW	<i>Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>
ZBK	Zürcher Bibelkommentare
ZTK	<i>Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche</i>

INTRODUCTION

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

1. Benedict de Spinoza, *A Theologico-Political Treatise and, A Political Treatise* (trans. R. H. M. Elwes; New York: Dover, 1951), 7 et passim.

2. Martin Noth, *The Deuteronomistic History* (trans. J. Doull et al.; JSOTSup 15; Sheffield: University of Sheffield Press, 1981; 2d ed., 1991); trans. of *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien: Die sammelnden und bearbeitenden Geschichtswerke im Alten Testament* (Halle: Niemeyer Verlag, 1943; repr. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1967); *ibid.*, *Josua* (HAT 7; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1971).

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 questions 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 Tetrateuch) 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 Tetrateuch, on the other. The result has been the clear literary separation of the Tetrateuch 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 CASE STUDIES

The broader methodological essays are complemented by case studies, in which authors explore the literary relationship between the Pentateuch and the Former Prophets through 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 secondarily 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 Deuteronomy. 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 comprising 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 Paradigmatic 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 question 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 composition 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 perspectives. 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 Judgment 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 elements 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 Deuteronomistic 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 separation between Tetrateuch 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.

Thomas B. Dozeman
Thomas Römer
Konrad Schmid