

Hebrew Bible and Ancient Israel

2

Volume 6
2017

Joshua 24

Thomas B. Dozeman

Introduction: The Current State of Scholarship
on Joshua 24 145–147

Konrad Schmid

Jews and Samaritans in Joshua 24 148–160

Cynthia Edenburg

Joshua 24: A Diaspora-oriented Overriding
of the Joshua Scroll 161–180

Joachim J. Krause

Hexateuchal Redaction in Joshua 181–202

Thomas Römer

The Date, Composition and Function of Joshua 24
in Recent Research. A Response to Joachim J. Krause,
Cynthia Edenburg, and Konrad Schmid 203–216

Ville Mäkipelto

The Four Deaths of Joshua: Why the Septuagint is Pivotal
for the Study of Joshua 24 217–242

New Projects

Emanuel Tov, The Publication of the *Textual History of the Bible* in Light of the Progress in Textual Scholarship 245–258



Mohr Siebeck

Introduction

Thomas B. Dozeman

The Current State of Scholarship on Joshua 24

Joshua 24 has been an important text throughout the modern critical period of biblical research. Interpreters have long pondered the reasons for the double ending to the book of Joshua: The two farewell speeches in Joshua 23 and 24 raise a series of literary questions about the relationship of the two texts and the compositional history of the book of Joshua as a whole. The extended review of salvation history in Joshua 24 raises a host of additional literary and traditional-historical questions about the relationship of this text to the Pentateuch. Abraham Kuenen long ago concluded, “Joshua 24 is full of references to earlier narratives and consequently has most important bearing upon the criticism of the Pentateuch.”¹

But the relationship of Joshua 24 to the Pentateuch has remained uncertain and thus a point of debate for both source critics and tradition-historians. Source critics, like Julius Wellhausen for example, used the content of Joshua 24 to reclaim pieces of the Elohist source throughout the Hexateuch, even though his contemporaries noted that the language resisted a clear identification with the source.² Gerhard von Rad evaluated Joshua 24 as ancient tradition that represented the Hexateuch in an abbreviated form,³ but later interpreters, such as Lothar Perlitt⁴ and John Van Seters,⁵ rejected the tradition-historical argument of von Rad, arguing instead that Joshua 24 was a late literary development. The uncertainty over the origin and authorship

1 A. Kuenen, *A Historico-Critical Inquiry into the Composition of the Hexateuch* (trans. P.H. Wicksteed; New York: Macmillan and Co., 1886; repr. Eugene: Wipf and Stock, 2017), 155.

2 J. Wellhausen, *Die Composition des Hexateuchs und der historischen Bücher des Alten Testaments* (2nd ed.; Berlin: G. Reimer, 1899), 135.

3 G. von Rad, *The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays* (Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1966).

4 L. Perlitt, *Bundestheologie im Alten Testament* (WMANT 36; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1969), 239–284.

5 J. Van Seters, “Joshua 24 and the Problem of Tradition in the Old Testament,” in *In the Shelter of Elyon: Essays on Ancient Palestinian Life and Literature in Honor of G. W. Ahlström*, (ed. W.B. Barrick and J.R. Spencer; JSOTSup 31; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1984), 139–158.

of Joshua 24 and its relationship to the Pentateuch has given rise to a rich history of source and tradition-historical interpretations that is summarized well in the articles of Konrad Schmid and Cynthia Edenburg.

The articles in the present volume of *Hebrew Bible and Ancient Israel* represent the current state of redaction-critical interpretations of Joshua 24. The articles originate from a session on Joshua 24 at the 2015 Annual Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature in Atlanta, GA, sponsored by the Joshua–Judges Section. The session included presentations by Konrad Schmid, Cynthia Edenburg, and Joachim Krause, with Thomas Römer providing a summary response. In addition to providing helpful overviews of the present state of redaction-critical research on Joshua 24 in general, the articles also map out new avenues of interpretation with regard to the date of composition, literary form, and the intended function of this important text.

The authors clarify the different ways in which the emergence of redaction criticism has reframed many of the traditional questions concerning Joshua 24, including the double ending in Joshua 23 and 24; the literary relationship between Joshua 24 and the Pentateuch; and date of composition, which each author locates in the Persian period. Joachim Krause notes the broad hexateuchal context of the redaction of Joshua 24 as compared to the more narrow scope of other, late redactions in Joshua 2; 3–4; and 7 in “Hexateuchal Redaction in Joshua.” In “Jews and Samaritans in Joshua 24,” Konrad Schmid focuses on the setting of Shechem to examine the possible relationships between Judeans and northern Samaria in the post-exile from the late 6th to the early 4th centuries B.C.E. Cynthia Edenburg investigates the ways in which Joshua 24 may be directed to the broader relationship of diaspora Jews in Yehud-Samaria in “Joshua 24: A Diaspora-oriented Overriding of the Joshua Scroll.” In his response, Thomas Römer, underscores the range of similarities between the different contributions, while also raising a series of questions concerning the literary function of Joshua 24 within the Hexateuch and the social function of the text within the Persian period.

During the question and answer period of the session on Joshua 24 at the 2015 Annual Meeting of the Society of Bible Literature, the question was raised about the relationship of redaction and textual criticism to the literary evaluation of the text. This question is important, since the MT and the LXX diverge significantly at the conclusion of Joshua 24, suggesting that the differences between the two versions go beyond mistakes in textual transmission and represent, instead, the intermixing of textual and literary criticisms in the formation of Joshua 24. The result is that the MT and the LXX versions create distinct literary works, which may provide further insight into the redaction-critical history of Joshua 24. In “The Four Deaths of Joshua:

Why the Septuagint is Pivotal for the Study of Joshua 24,” Ville J. Mäkipelto explores possible ways in which the incorporation of textual criticism may influence the redaction-critical study of Joshua 24. This article likewise originated at the 2015 Annual Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature, but in a session separate from the Joshua–Judges section.

Konrad Schmid

Jews and Samaritans in Joshua 24

This article collects the evidence for a post-Priestly dating of Joshua 24 in the fifth century BCE and interprets the specific setting and concept of this text in the context of the contemporaneous rivalries and interactions between Jews and Samaritans. Joshua 24 opts for a theocratic constitution for all Israel. The choice of Shechem as the location for this scene shows that the North is not the exclusive, but a very prominent addressee of Joshua 24.

Keywords: Joshua 24, Samaritans, Shechem, Hexateuch, Priestly Document

The time and setting of the ceremony at Shechem in Joshua 24 is placed sometime during the 11th century B.C.E.; that is its narrated setting in the biblical story. No Jews or Samaritans existed at that time. Nevertheless, it is worthwhile to ask about “Jews and Samaritans in Joshua 24,” when keeping in mind the needed restraints. Asking this question does not refer to the world in the narrative of Joshua 24, but rather to the world of the narrators behind Joshua 24.

A distinction between biblical and historical Israel – or, put differently, between the world in the narrative and the world behind the narrative – belongs to the most important tools of biblical criticism.¹ The approach of this paper to Joshua 24 pertains not to its biblically evoked scenery, but to the way this scenery resonates with the alleged historical background of its authors. As will become clear later on, Joshua 24 was authored in a period when Jews and Samaritans existed side by side in the Levant. On this level, it is possible to ask how Jews and Samaritans are portrayed in Joshua 24.

But how are we to determine the historical background of Joshua 24?² The text is an extraordinarily high-profile one in biblical studies that has

1 Cf., e.g., R. G. Kratz, *The Composition of the Narrative Books of the Old Testament* (trans. J. Bowden; London: T&T Clark, 2005); C. Levin, *The Old Testament: A Brief Introduction* (trans. M. Kohl; Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005); idem, *Historical and Biblical Israel* (trans. P. M. Kurtz; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015); K. Schmid, *The Old Testament: A Literary History* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2012).

2 For the following considerations see also K. Schmid, “Die Samaritaner und die Judäer: Die biblische Diskussion um ihr Verhältnis in Josua 24,” in *Die Samaritaner und die*

been treated by multiple monographs and addressed even more frequently in articles and essays.³ There is a correspondence between scholars' intense discussion of this chapter and the diversity of opinion about its literary-historical location and the ability to evaluate it historically.

The prominent narrative location of Joshua 24 at the conclusion of the conquest or, even more, at the conclusion of the hexateuchal salvation history (whose summary is in Josh 24:2–13), has always played an important role in the literary-historical evaluation of the chapter. The classic pentateuchal model of the 19th century understood Joshua 24 as the conclusion of "E."⁴ Those who disputed the existence of "E," whether in the book of Joshua specifically or in general, assigned Joshua 24 to "J"⁵ as its concluding text.

Bibel: Historische und literarische Wechselwirkungen zwischen biblischen und samaritanischen Traditionen / The Samaritans and the Bible: Historical and Literary Interactions between Biblical and Samaritan Traditions (ed. J. Frey et al.; Studia Judaica / Studia Samaritana 7; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2012), 21–49.

- 3 Cf., e. g., G. Schmitt, *Der Landtag von Sichem* (AzTh I/15; Leipzig: EVA, 1964); H. Mölle, *Der sogenannte Landtag zu Sichem* (FB 42; Würzburg: Echter, 1980); W. T. Koopmans, *Joshua 24 as Poetic Narrative* (JSOTSup 93; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1990); M. Anbar, *Josué et l'Alliance de Sichem (Josué 24:1–28)* (BET 25; Frankfurt a. M.: Peter Lang, 1992); E. Noort, "Zu Stand und Perspektiven: Der Glaube Israels zwischen Religionsgeschichte und Theologie: Der Fall Josua 24," in *Perspectives in the Study of the Old Testament and Early Judaism* (ed. F. García Martínez and E. Noort; VTSup 73; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 82–108; R. G. Kratz, "Der vor- und der nachpriesterschriftliche Hexateuch," in *Abschied vom Jahwisten: Die Komposition des Hexateuch in der jüngsten Diskussion* (ed. J. C. Gertz et al.; BZAW 215; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2002), 295–323; R. Müller, *Königtum und Gottesherrschaft: Untersuchungen zur alttestamentlichen Monarchiekritik* (FAT II/3; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), 217–236; M. Popovič, "Conquest of the Land, Loss of the Land: Where Does Joshua 24 Belong?," in *The Land of Israel in Bible, History, and Theology: Studies in Honour of Ed Noort* (ed. J. van Ruiten and C. J. de Vos; VTSup 124; Leiden: Brill, 2009), 87–98; C. Frevel, "Die Wiederkehr der Hexateuchperspektive. Eine Herausforderung für die These vom deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerk," in *Das deuteronomistische Geschichtswerk* (ed. H.-J. Stipp; ÖBS 39; Frankfurt a. M.: Peter Lang, 2011), 13–53. See also T. Römer, "Das doppelte Ende des Josuabuches: Einige Anmerkungen zur aktuellen Diskussion um 'deuteronomistisches Geschichtswerk' und 'Hexateuch,'" ZAW 118 (2006): 523–548, 535 n. 39.
- 4 E. g., C. Steuernagel, *Das Buch Josua* (2nd ed.; GHK I,3/2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1923), 297–298; H. Holzinger, *Das Buch Josua* (KHC VI; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1901), 95; J. Wellhausen, *Die Composition des Hexateuchs und der historischen Bücher des Alten Testaments* (3rd ed.; Berlin: Reimer, 1899), 133; R. Smend Sr., *Die Erzählung des Hexateuch auf ihre Quellen untersucht* (Berlin: Reimer, 1912), 334–339; Schmitt, *Landtag*, 30; see further the presentation of scholarship in Koopmans, *Joshua 24*, 105–106. The linguistic indicators in Joshua 24 that were used for the assignment to "E" are also compiled in Koopmans, *Joshua 24*, 106–107 (cf. Schmitt, *Landtag*, 30).
- 5 W. Rudolph, *Der "Elohists" von Exodus bis Josua* (BZAW 68; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1938), 244–252. This thesis was revived by John Van Seters for his "J" ("Joshua 24 and the Problem of Tradition in the Old Testament," in *In the Shelter of Elyon: Essays on Ancient Palestinian Life and Literature in Honor of Gösta W. Ahlström* [JSOTSup 31; eds.

It was also popular to explain Joshua 24 as a mix of these two sources, thereby attributing it to “JE.”⁶ In other words, Joshua 24 could apparently be assigned to nearly any source, so it comes as no surprise that these proposals remained unconvincing.

The traditional assessment of Joshua 24 within the matrix of the documentary hypothesis completely changed in the wake of Martin Noth’s *Überlieferungsgeschichtlichen Studien*, published in 1943,⁷ when his thesis of a Deuteronomistic History from Deuteronomy to 2 Kings began to prevail.⁸ The upshot was that the texts in Joshua (and of course Judges through Kings as well) were to be explained without reference to pentateuchal sources.⁹ However, the question of Joshua 24’s literary-historical location became no easier. Within the Deuteronomistic History hypothesis, the problem of the relationship between the two farewell speeches in Joshua 23 and Joshua 24 moved to the forefront. If, as generally accepted, Joshua 23 was “Deuteronomistic” and Joshua 24 no longer had anything to do with “J” or “E,” then how was one to classify the latter chapter? Noth himself was puzzled, especially after being convinced in his *Geschichte Israels* or *History of Israel* from 1950 that one could find rather ancient traditional material on the 12-tribe amphictyony. He changed his mind multiple times about Joshua 24,¹⁰ without ever reaching a convincing solution.

Noth’s uncertainty on Joshua 24 was preserved in the scholarship after him. With its claim that Joshua 24 contains material about the so-called Diet

W.B. Barrick and J.R. Spencer; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1984], 139–158; idem, *In Search of History: Historiography in the Ancient World and the Origins of Biblical History* [New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983], 336–337), who, however, shares little more with Rudolph’s “Yahwist” than the name.

6 Noth still holds to this in idem, *Das System der zwölf Stämme Israels* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1930), 67, cf. 133–140. See further the presentation by Koopmans, *Joshua* 24, 107–108, who also presents the traditional reasons for source criticism, 108–109.

7 M. Noth, *Überlieferungsgeschichtlichen Studien* (Stuttgart: Niemeyer, 1943); or for the English translation, see *The Deuteronomistic History* (JSOTS 15; Sheffield: JSOT, 1981).

8 Cf. C. Frevel, “Deuteronomistisches Geschichtswerk oder Geschichtswerke? Die These Martin Noths zwischen Tetrateuch, Hexateuch und Enneateuch,” in *Martin Noth – aus der Sicht heutiger Forschung* (ed. U. Rütterswörden; BTSt 58; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2004), 60–95; C. Levin, “Nach siebzig Jahren: Martin Noths Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien heute,” *ZAW* 125 (2013): 72–92.

9 Cf. Schmitt, *Landtag*, 26; L. Perliß, *Bundestheologie im Alten Testament* (WMANT 36; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1969); J.P. Floß, *Jahwe dienen – Göttern dienen: Terminologische, literarische und semantische Untersuchung einer theologischen Aussage zum Gottesverhältnis im Alten Testament* (BBB 45; Köln: Peter Hanstein, 1975), 368–370; V. Fritz, *Das Buch Josua* (HAT I/7; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994), 237.

10 Cf. M. Noth, *Das Buch Josua* (HAT I/7; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1938), 101 (= [2nd ed.; Tübingen: Mohr, 1953], 139); idem, *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien*, 9 n. 1.

of Shechem (“Landtag zu Sichem”) or the origin of the amphictyony,¹¹ the classical solution receded into the background, though the spectrum of proposed dates for Joshua 24 remained extremely broad in scholarship for the remainder of 20th-century. The chapter was still positioned by some in the period of the monarchy.¹² Following Lothar Peritt’s groundbreaking work on covenant theology in the Old Testament, others presumed that Joshua 24 arose from Deuteronomism.¹³ In recent scholarship, however, the number of voices supporting the appraisal that it is a postexilic text has increased.¹⁴ But the confusing polyphony of scholarly opinions should not be overestimated.

Current scholarship on Joshua 24 has shown with a degree of probability bordering on certainty that this text neither preserves historically reliable memories of the time it narrates nor belongs to the pre-exilic period in terms of its literary history. This conclusion is impaired by the uncertainty and controversy surrounding composition-critical procedures in Joshua 24,¹⁵ but one can assume with confidence that either the entire text or at least essential portions of it stem from the postexilic period. In light of the

-
- 11 See M. Noth, *Geschichte Israels* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1950), 89–132; Schmitt, *Landtag*; H. Ringgren, “Der Landtag in Sichem,” in *Nachdenken über Israel, Bibel und Theologie: Festschrift für Klaus-Dietrich Schunck* (ed. H. M. Niemann et al.; BEAT 37; Frankfurt a. M.: Peter Lang, 1994), 89–91.
- 12 D. S. Sperling, “Joshua 24 Re-Examined,” *HUCA* 58 (1987): 119–136. Sperling suggests the northern kingdom, perhaps under Jeroboam II.
- 13 Peritt, *Bundestheologie*. Regarding Peritt’s argument, see E. Blum, “Der kompositionelle Knoten am Übergang von Josua zu Richter: Ein Entflechtungsvorschlag,” in *Deuteronomy and Deuteronomistic Literature: Festschrift für C. H. W. Brekelmans* (ed. M. Vervenne and J. Lust; BEThL 133; Leuven: Peeters, 1997), 181–212, here 197–198; S. Kreuzer, *Die Frühgeschichte Israels in Bekenntnis und Verkündigung des Alten Testaments* (BZAW 178; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1989), 208–213 (on him as well, see Blum, “Knoten,” 201 n. 85).
- 14 J. L’Hour, “L’alliance de Sichem,” *RB* 69 (1962): 5–36, 161–184, 350–368; A. D. H. Mayes, *The Story of Israel between Settlement and Exile: A Redactional Study of the Deuteronomistic History* (London: SCM Press, 1983), 51; Anbar, *Josué*; T. Römer, *Israels Väter: Untersuchungen zur Väterthematik im Deuteronomium und in der deuteronomistischen Tradition* (OBO 99; Fribourg: Universitätsverlag, 1990), 325–326; R. Müller, *Königtum und Gottesherrschaft: Untersuchungen zur alttestamentlichen Monarchiekritik* (FAT II/3; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004); U. Becker, “Endredaktionelle Kontextvernetzungen des Josua-Buches,” 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), 139–161; M. Popovič, “Conquest of the Land, Loss of the Land: Where Does Joshua 24 Belong?,” in *The Land of Israel in Bible, History, and Theology: Studies in Honour of Ed Noort* (ed. J. van Ruiten and C. J. de Vos; VTSup 124; Leiden: Brill, 2009), 87–98; E. A. Knauf, *Das Buch Josua* (ZBK 6; Zürich, 2008), 191–199.
- 15 Cf. on this the discussion in Römer, “Ende”; C. H. Gibling, “Structural Patterns in Jos 24,1–25,” *CBQ* (1964): 50–69; see Römer, *Israels Väter*, 540 n. 89.

diffuse state of scholarship, this apparently bold position can be substantiated as follows.

Of primary importance is the literary horizon of Joshua 24. Verses 2–4 name the triad of the patriarchs, and vv. 19–20 refer to Israel’s apostasy. Joshua 24 accordingly seems to look back to Genesis and forward to the book of Kings – a tremendously broad literary horizon that spans the first nine books of the Hebrew Bible.

Especially striking is the note in Josh 24:32 on the burial of Joseph’s bones, which concludes a narrative thread beginning in Gen 50:25 and found again in Exod 13:19.¹⁶ The parallelism between Joseph and Joshua in the 110 years of their lives needs also to be mentioned here. With regard to the narrative setting of Joshua 24 at Shechem, one can also suppose that a reference back to Gen 12:6, 8 is present – namely, Abraham’s construction of an altar in Shechem.¹⁷ The salvation history ends where it first began.

If one follows mainstream European scholarship on the Pentateuch – or maybe the Hexateuch, where the assumption is that this hexateuchal thread from the patriarchs to the conquest belongs to the end rather than to the beginning of the narrative books’ literary history¹⁸ – then the horizon of Joshua 24 speaks decidedly against an early date.

This position is further substantiated by some tradition-historical and redaction-historical observations. In terms of theological history, the main concern of the chapter – namely, the call to serve YHWH and to renounce other gods – can hardly be older than the first commandment of the Decalogue, which itself presupposes not only the Shema Israel, traditionally dated to the Josianic period, but also the literary and functional core of Deuteronomy.¹⁹

16 On this cf. M. Witte, “Die Gebeine Josefs,” in *Auf dem Weg zur Endgestalt von Genesis bis II Regum*: Festschrift für Hans-Christoph Schmitt zum 65. Geburtstag (ed. M. Beck and U. Schorn; BZAW 370; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2006), 139–156.

17 Finally, the casting aside of the “foreign gods” from “beyond the river” in Josh 24:13–28 refers back to the renunciation scene in Gen 35:1–5, esp. 35:2b, 4. However, Gen 24:2b, 4 is likely a post-Joshua 24 corrective to this pro-Samaritan perspective. On this see below.

18 Cf. the overview in R. G. Kratz, “Der vor- und der nachpriesterschriftliche Hexateuch,” in *Abschied vom Jahwisten: Die Komposition des Hexateuch in der jüngsten Diskussion* (ed. J. C. Gertz et al.; BZAW 215; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2002), 295–324; T. B. Dozeman and K. Schmid (eds.), *A Farewell to the Yahwist? The Composition of the Pentateuch in Recent European Interpretation* (ed. T. B. Dozeman and K. Schmid; SBLSS 34; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006); and J. C. Gertz, *T&T Clark Handbook of the Old Testament: An Introduction to the Literature, Religion and History of the Old Testament* (London: T&T Clark, 2012), 237–272.

19 Cf. Kratz, “Der vor- und der nachpriesterschriftliche Hexateuch,” 295–323.

On the issue of innerbiblical affiliations in Joshua 24, the reception of the Priestly document is of preeminent importance for dating this chapter. Indeed, Josh 24 contains striking indications of a familiarity with Priestly language: הר שער as Esau's place of residence (Josh 24:4) otherwise appears only in Gen 36:8–9, a text that is usually accorded to "P."²⁰ The designation ארץ כנען (Josh 24:3) is also a term that is used especially in the Priestly document in Genesis.²¹ Particularly the expression כל ארץ כנען is characteristically Priestly, since it designates the further settlement areas of all of Abraham's descendants in the Levant, namely the Edomites and the Arabians, according to Gen 17:8.

The prominent mention of Aaron in Josh 24:5 (cf. v. 33) would be difficult to explain without the Priestly version of the exodus.²² The beginning of v. 5 could possibly be a literary addition, since it is not in the LXX. Finally, the depiction of the miracle at the Sea in Josh 24:6–7 indicates that this text engages an edition of Exod 14 that is interlaced with "P"²³ (cf. רדף Exod 14:4, 8–9, 23 "P"; פרש/רכב Exod 14:9, 17–18, 23, 26 "P"; כסה Exod 14:28 "P"²⁴).

Therefore, the Priestly document should be taken as the *terminus ante quem non* for Joshua 24 or at least for a considerable portion of it. This means that Joshua 24 is hardly older than the Second Temple of 515 B.C.E. and the conquest of Egypt by Cambyses in 525 B.C.E., neither of which is assumed by the Priestly document.²⁵

²⁰ Cf. Mölle, *Landtag*, 208.

²¹ Cf. Anbar, *Josué*, 87.

²² Cf. H. Valentin, *Aaron: Eine Studie zur vor-priesterschriftlichen Aaron-Überlieferung* (OBO 18; Fribourg: Universitätsverlag, 1978), 36–45; P. Mommer, *Samuel: Geschichte und Überlieferung* (WMANT 65; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1991), 126.

²³ Cf. also Blum, "Knoten," 197 and n. 68.

²⁴ Cf. V. Fritz, *Das Buch Josua* (HAT I/7; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994), 249; who naturally sees the relevant text portions in Josh 24:6–7 as "additions" because his basic text originates from "DtrH"; Anbar, *Josué*, 98–99. K. Bieberstein, *Josua – Jordan – Jericho: Archäologie, Geschichte und Theologie der Landnahmeerzählungen Jos 1–6* (OBO 143; Fribourg: Universitätsverlag, 1995), 399; he sees in Josh 24:7, 11, however without any detailed explanation, "nur eine allgemeine Abhängigkeit von der so genannten 'jahwistischen Fassung' von Ex 14" ("only a general dependence on the so-called 'Yahwistic version' of Exodus 14").

²⁵ Cf. A. de Pury, "P⁸ as the Absolute Beginning," in *Les dernières rédactions du Pentateuque, de l'Hexateuque et de l'Ennéateuque* (ed. K. Schmid and T. Römer; BEThL 203; Leuven: Peeters, 2007), 99–128; K. Schmid, "Taming Egypt: The Impact of Persian Imperial Ideology and Politics on the Biblical Exodus Account," in: *Jewish Cultural Encounters in the Ancient Mediterranean and Near Eastern World* (eds. M. Popović et al.; JSJ.S 178, Leiden: Brill, 2017), 13–29.

A relative literary *terminus ante quem* for the formation of Joshua 24 might be found in Neh 13:28–30, which presents a clear and critical response to the position of Joshua 24. Whereas Joshua 24 still promotes the inclusion of the Northern tribes (or as I would put it given the probable date of Joshua 24, the Samaritans) and calls for the dismissal of the “foreign” gods with an all-Israel perspective and a conspicuous Northern setting in Shechem, Nehemiah 13 views the Samaritans themselves as “foreign.” Nehemiah even prides himself on having expelled one of the sons of Jerusalem’s high priest because he had intermarried with the Samaritans:

And one of the sons of Jehoiada, son of the high priest Eliashib, was the son-in-law of Sanballat the Horonite; I chased him away from me.... Thus I cleansed (טהר) ²⁶ them from everything foreign (גֵּוֹרֵם).” (Neh 13:28–30).

A similar case appears in Gen 35:2b, 4, which, according to Yair Zakovitch, Nadav Na’aman, and Hans Rapp, involves a critical reception of Joshua 24.²⁷ Genesis 35 makes its reader believe that the sanctuary near Shechem (that is in the background of Joshua 24) is nothing other or less than a *favissa* in which Jacob disposed of his family’s idols. However, these portions of Genesis 35 (v. 2b and 4) are difficult to date.

Joshua 24 is therefore later than the Priestly document, which belongs in the early Persian period, but earlier than both Nehemiah 13 and Genesis 35. It likely emerged between the end of the 6th and the 4th centuries B.C.E.²⁸

Whether one can further narrow the date on the basis of ancient Shechem’s archaeology depends on how one interprets the content of Joshua 24. Ancient Shechem, *Tel Balāta*, appears to have been unsettled between 480–330 B.C.E.²⁹ Depending on the degree to which one sees Joshua 24 as

26 On the terminology of „purity“ see S. Olyan, “Purity Ideology in Ezra-Nehemiah as a Tool to Reconstitute the Community,” *JSJ* 35 (2004) 4–10; R. Albertz, “Purity Strategies and Political Interest in the Policy of Nehemiah,” in *Confronting the Past* (eds. S. Gitin *et al.*; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2006), 199–206.

27 Cf. Y. Zakovitch, “The Object of the Narrative of the Burial of Foreign Gods at Shechem,” *BetM* 25 (1980): 30–37; N. Na’aman, “The Law of the Altar in Deuteronomy and the Cultic Site Near Shechem,” in *Rethinking the Foundations: Historiography in the Ancient World and in the Bible: Essays in Honour of J. Van Seters* (ed. S. L. McKenzie and T. Römer; BZAW 294; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2000), 141–161, here 160–161 n. 54; H. A. Rapp, *Jakob in Bet-El: Gen 35,1–15 und die jüdische Literatur des 3. und 2. Jahrhunderts* (HBS 29; Freiburg i.Br.: Herder, 2001), 62–63. Critical are Römer, “Ende,” 542 n. 103; and U. Becker, “Jakob in Bet-El und Sichem,” in *Die Erzväter in der biblischen Tradition: Festschrift für Matthias Köckert* (ed. A. C. Hagedorn and H. Pfeiffer; BZAW 400; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2009), 159–185, here 181–182.

28 Cf. also Knauf, *Josua*, 193.

29 Cf. K. Jaroš, *Sichem: Eine archäologische und religionsgeschichtliche Studie mit besonderer Berücksichtigung von Jos 24* (OBO 11; Fribourg: Universitätsverlag, 1976), 47–48; cf.

pro-Samaritan by virtue of its setting at Shechem and its explicit address to all twelve tribes, Southern and Northern, then 480 B.C.E. could present a further *terminus ante quem*. If Joshua 24 were truly an offer to the North to join the South culturally and politically, then the setting in Shechem would fit better with a settlement that still existed. If Joshua 24 instead drafts a theological ideal of all Israel conceived in the South but not really envisioning cooperation with the North as equals, then a date after 480 B.C.E. would be more plausible. In this case, Joshua 24 would take place in Shechem as a theological gesture, but would not imply any actual competition with Jerusalem.

If one can assume the framework of these dates, then how did readers understand Joshua 24 at the time of its origin, i. e., in the Persian period? The opening in v. 1 is important for this question:

Then Joshua gathered all the tribes of Israel to Shechem, and summoned the elders, the heads, the judges, and the officers of Israel; and they presented themselves before God.

Israel presents themselves before God – and with the use of **יְהוָה צִבּוֹר**, Josh 24:1 employs the technical term for a council. Evidence for this appears in 1 Sam 10:19, as well as in the scenes in heaven in the prologue of Job. Here in Joshua, the setting in Shechem is very conspicuous. It is well anchored in the Hebrew text (cf. also v. 25). The LXX, however, has *καὶ συνήγαγεν Ἰησοῦς πάσας φυλάς Ἰσραὴλ εἰς Σηλω*, therefore reading “Shiloh” instead of “Shechem” (also in v. 25), which may have arisen from the anti-Samaritan tendency in its *Vorlage*.³⁰ Interestingly, Knauf identifies the location in Shechem (!) as the result of an anti-Samaritan reworking of the text and deems Shiloh to be the original reading.³¹ Why? Knauf thinks Shiloh is a better fit for the original text, since Shiloh is right between Samaria and Judah, and the redactional transfer to Shechem happened in order to accuse especially the Northern tribes of the apostasy that led eventually to

Römer, “Ende,” 545 n. 121. The city was fortified again only in the Hellenistic period, cf. E. F. Campbell, “Shechem,” *NEAEHL* 4 (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1993), 1345–1354; Ahlström, *History*, 901. See however E. Stern, *Archaeology of the Land of the Bible*, 2 (ABRL; New York: Doubleday, 2001) 427–28 who is arguing for an ongoing settlement into the 4th century. On the discussion of the tree sanctuary near Shechem, cf. L. Wächter, “Zur Lokalisierung des sichemitisches Baumheiligtums,” *ZDPV* 103 (1987): 1–12.

30 Cf. the discussion in Hjelm, *Jerusalem’s Rise*, 197 and n. 197; C. Nihan, “The Torah between Samaria and Judah: Shechem and Gerizim in Deuteronomy and Joshua,” in *The Pentateuch as Torah: New Models for Understanding its Promulgation and its Acceptance* (ed. B. M. Levinson and G. N. Knoppers; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2007), 187–223, here 197 n. 31.

31 Knauf, *Josua*, 195.

the catastrophe of 587 B.C.E. Knauf's suggestion is interesting, but it has not won the day, so Shechem is to be considered the original reading.

Why, then, is Shechem the location for Joshua 24? Joshua's speech is addressed to "all the tribes of Israel," meaning all Israel, North and South. Especially this invitation to the North precipitates the choice of an appropriate location. Shechem would easily come to mind as an option, given the broader context of Deuteronomy and Joshua.³² There likely are literary and theological reasons for the choice of Shechem. According to 1 Kgs 12:1, Shechem is where Rehoboam must go in order to be made king. Shechem was, therefore, the place where kings were enthroned. Because Joshua 24 reports the choice of *YHWH* as king – it is, so to speak, the founding legend of the theocracy – Shechem is a logical choice as the venue for Israel's decision. In addition, one should recall the bookends created by Joshua 24 and Genesis 12 at the beginning of the ancestral story: according to Gen 12:6, Shechem is the first place in the land where Abraham builds an altar.³³ Joshua 24 thus constructs a narrative arc back to Genesis 12. The promulgation of the law in Shechem takes place at the same location where the first cultic place for *YHWH* was set up in the land.

The narrative then continues in v. 2:

And Joshua said to all the people, "Thus says *YHWH*, the God of Israel: Long ago your ancestors – Terah and his sons Abraham and Nahor – lived beyond the Euphrates and served other gods. ..."

The beginning of Joshua's speech refers back to the idolatry of Israel's ancestors in Mesopotamia. This motif of Abraham's liberation from Mesopotamian idol worship became common in the history of reception, but it is noteworthy that it is not in the present biblical text of Genesis 11–12. Joshua 24:15 offers a standalone motif here; maybe its authors derived Abraham's original idolatry from the fact that *YHWH* has to reveal himself to him only after Abraham arrives in the land (Gen 12:7; 15:1; 17:1). Joshua 24:2 describes its addressees – unspecified in terms of North and South – as a still syncretistic religious community that worships Mesopotamian deities, even though not exclusively. If one considers the postexilic audience of Joshua 24, it appears as though the author of this chapter did not think entirely differently about the Israel of his own time.

This point is noteworthy, since, like 2 Kgs 17:24–31, this very evaluation – whether historical or not – is used to characterize the religious history of the North after 722 B.C.E.:

³² Cf. Blum, "Knoten."

³³ Römer, "Ende," 544 n. 118.

So these nations worshipped YHWH, but also served their carved images; to this day their children and their children's children continue to do as their ancestors did. (2 Kgs 17:41).

It is recognized today that 2 Kgs 17:24–41, especially the later insertion of vv. 34b–40, hardly provides an adequate view into the religious situation in the North. However, it is incontestable that, when 2 Kings 17 and Joshua 24 were composed, the religious state of affairs could be depicted in this manner (cf. 2 Kgs 17:34, 41, “until this day”).

A longer exposition that reprises the ancestral and exodus story then follows. Joshua's speech culminates in vv. 14–15 in the call that connects with the problem presented:

Now therefore revere YHWH, and serve him in sincerity and in faithfulness; put away the gods that your ancestors served beyond the River and in Egypt, and serve YHWH. Now if you are unwilling to serve YHWH, choose this day whom you will serve, whether the gods your ancestors served in the region beyond the River or the gods of the Amorites in whose land you are living; but as for me and my household, we will serve YHWH. (Josh 24:14–15)

The narrative world states clearly that Joshua presents the tribes of Israel with a clear choice: either YHWH or the other deities.

This concluding declaration of Joshua's first big speech is also an important piece of evidence for showing that Joshua 24 is not simply Deuteronomistic, as has long been argued by Lothar Peritt, Volkmar Fritz, and others. The fact that the people can choose their own deity does not belong to the conceptual repertoire of “Deuteronomism.”

In addition to the deities of Mesopotamia and Egypt,³⁴ the deities of the land's previous inhabitants are also named and classified as illegitimate. Joshua 24 apparently assumes the general *de facto* validity of the principle *cuius regio eius religio* (“whose realm, his religion”), but also indicates the theological illegitimacy of other deities.

How will the people answer? Initially, v. 16 states that

Then the people answered, “Far be it from us that we should forsake YHWH to serve other gods.”

This answer is significant because of what it communicates about the people's self-perception. Joshua 24 characterizes the addressees of Joshua's speech as though they already worshipped YHWH, and they repudiate serving other deities in place of him. But in the narrator's world, the problem appears to be that the tribes of Israel serve YHWH, but not YHWH alone.

34 Sometimes the mention of the gods of Egypt is eliminated by composition criticism, correctly against this are Blum, “Knoten,” 198 n. 74; and Römer, “Ende,” 538 n. 79.

The people confirm their choice again in v. 18:

and YHWH drove out before us all the peoples, the Amorites who lived in the land. Therefore we also will serve YHWH (נעבד את יהוה), for he is our God.

Joshua responds in vv. 19–21:

But Joshua said to the people, “You cannot serve YHWH, for he is a holy God. He is a jealous God; he will not forgive your transgressions or your sins. If you forsake YHWH and serve foreign gods, then he will turn and do you harm, and consume you, after having done you good.” And the people said to Joshua, “No, we will serve YHWH!” (נעבד את יהוה).

According to Erik Aurelius,³⁵ Thomas Römer,³⁶ Christophe Nihan, and others,³⁷ vv. 19–21 is a later insertion. They base this argument on two main points. First, it appears to render pointless the solemn engagement that was just taken by the people in v.18. The second is that v. 21 offers a resumption (*Wiederaufnahme*) of v. 18: “we will serve YHWH,” but in the reverse order (את יהוה נעבד/נעבד את יהוה), corresponding to “Seidel’s law.”³⁸ We can forego for now the discussion about whether Joshua 24 was originally formed as the conclusion to an independent Hexateuch or whether Joshua 24 functioned from the outset as a hinge between the salvation history of Genesis–Joshua and the history of calamity in Judges–Kings.

Importantly, the people commit themselves to YHWH, but the issue of how exclusive YHWH worship is to be remains curiously open. This ambiguity marks the concluding passage of vv. 22–23:

Then Joshua said to the people, “You are witnesses against yourselves that you have chosen YHWH, to serve him.” And they said, “We are witnesses.” He said, “Then put away the foreign gods that are among you, and incline your hearts to YHWH, the God of Israel.”

Joshua calls the people once again to lay aside their syncretistic worship, but the people answer once again (v. 24):

The people said to Joshua, “YHWH our God we will serve, and him we will obey.”

The commitment concerns what is actually undisputed (worship of God), while what is disputed (*the exclusive nature* of this worship) remains open

35 E. Aurelius, *Zukunft jenseits des Gerichts: Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Studie zum Enneateuch* (BZAW 319; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2003), 175.

36 Römer, “Ende,” 539; with reference to Noth, *Josua*, 136: “Nach der Aufforderung 14 ist 19.20 sehr sonderbar” (“after the summons in 14, 19–20 are very odd”).

37 Nihan, “Torah,” 193–194 n. 17 (bibliography), 197 n. 30; Römer, “Ende,” 546–547.

38 On “Seidel’s law,” cf. B. M. Levinson, *Deuteronomy and the Hermeneutics of Legal Innovation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), 18–20.

and to a certain degree forms the religious sword of Damocles, which will hang over the literary portrayal of the history of Israel until the catastrophes of 722 and 587 B.C.E. in the subsequent books.

Joshua 24 therefore appears to serve a double function in view of its implicit reader: One is that it promotes the exclusive worship of God, and the other is that in presenting the problem of actual non-exclusivity – which notably is held against *all* the tribes of Israel in both the North *and* South – Joshua 24 offers its own etiology for the demise first of the state of Israel and then of Judah.

We have already established that Josh 24 should be dated after “P” and before Nehemiah, so likely somewhere in the 5th century B.C.E. By this time, Samaria and Judah had been independent provinces for a while – this should be clearly underlined against earlier scholarship that is based primarily on the publications of Albrecht Alt.³⁹ Judah did not first become an independent province at the time of Nehemiah only. The epigraphic evidence – not yet known to Alt – reveals this in quite a few bullae, seals, and coins of its governors, which are substantially earlier than those attested for the province of Samaria.⁴⁰

For the ancient reader of Joshua 24, Samaria and Yehud were thus in all probability independent provinces. Joshua 24 opts for a theocratic constitution for all Israel within the framework of a religious orientation that, in biblical terms, renounces both the ancestors’ deities from beyond the River and the Amorites’ deities, focusing instead on YHWH alone. The choice of Shechem as the location for this scene allows little room to doubt that in both the narrative world and in the world of the narrator, the North is not the exclusive, but a very prominent addressee.

This conception of Joshua 24 is close to the basic convictions of the Chronistic History. The term “Israel” means all Israel. But unlike Chronicles, Joshua 24 is not centered on Jerusalem. The reason may be linked to the literary fiction of the scenery of Joshua 24: Jerusalem had not yet been taken. At the time when the narrative of Joshua 24 is set, Shechem remained a legitimate sanctuary.

It is interesting that the juxtaposition and interconnectedness of the North and South in Joshua 24 coincide with the almost contemporary texts from

³⁹ Esp. Alt, *Rolle*.

⁴⁰ Cf. R. G. Kratz, *Das Judentum im Zeitalter des Zweiten Tempels* (FAT 42; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), 99. Magen, *Samaritans*, 8, speaks curiously and incorrectly of “the satrapies of Judah and Samaria.” Correctly against this is idem *et al.*, *The Aramaic, Hebrew and Samaritan Inscriptions*, Vol. 1 of Mount Gerizim Excavations (Jerusalem: Israel Antiquities Authority, 2008), 111 (“two provinces”).

Elephantine.⁴¹ The Jews in that colony had their own temple, which was destroyed in the course of altercations with the Chnum priesthood. In the question of the restoration of the temple, they petitioned the governors of *both* Samaria and Judah with whom they apparently felt closely linked.⁴² The answer to this petition came through a messenger who referred to what Bagohi *and* Delayah said.⁴³ The governor of Yehud and the one from Samaria expressed themselves together. The correspondence between Elephantine on the one hand and Jerusalem and Samaria on the other does not give the impression that it was the first time such correspondence had occurred, but it apparently rested on a particular tradition.⁴⁴

What does this mean for the history of Samaria and Yehud in the 5th century B.C.E.?

For the relationship between Samaritans and Judeans, the claims in previous scholarship of there having first been competition and then separation appear inadequate. For the period prior to the competition surrounding the building of the wall under Nehemiah, one should likely reckon with a phase of concordance, as Benedikt Hensel has proposed in a recent study.⁴⁵ Joshua 24 – in conjunction with the documents from Elephantine – implies a relationship between Judeans and Samaritans in which living side by side in the two provinces appears to have been understood not in terms of competition but of concordance. Hence, Joshua 24 is in agreement with various early postexilic texts, in particular those from the Prophetic tradition that nourished hopes of the restitution of all Israel after the exile: Jer 30:3, 8–9; 31:27–28, 31–34; Ezek 34:23–31; 37:15–28; Obad 18–21; Isa 11:11–16; Jer 3:18; Zech 9:9–13; 10:6–8.⁴⁶ The competitive claims of Samaria and Judah in the later time of Nehemiah and finally in the combative actions of John Hyrcanus against the Samaritans turned this hope of a broad restitution into a thing of the past.

41 Cf. M. Weippert, *Historisches Textbuch zum Alten Testament* (GAT 10; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2010), 475–485.

42 Cf. *ibid.*, 285, 29.

43 Cf. *ibid.*, 286, 1.

44 Cf. Kratz, *Judentum*, 94.

45 B. Hensel, *Juda und Samaria: Zum Verhältnis zweier nach-exilischer Jahwismen* (FAT 110; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016).

46 E. Blum, *Die Komposition der Vätergeschichte* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1984), 59.

Cynthia Edenburg

Joshua 24: A Diaspora-oriented Overriding of the Joshua Scroll

Joshua 24 as a whole is a Persian-period composition that presumes the Hexateuchal narrative. At the same time, it diverges from the Hexateuchal narrative on significant points. These divergences do not derive from an early tradition or source, but represent a revision of the Hexateuchal tradition for a target audience located in the Eastern Diaspora. The new covenant at Shechem is conditioned only upon faithfulness to Yahweh, and is directed towards strengthening Judean and Yahwistic identity in the face of integration and assimilation in the host society.

Keywords: Joshua 24; Babylonian Diaspora; historical-critical method; intertextuality; scroll production

Interest in Joshua 24 has burgeoned in the last few decades and has produced an immense volume of scholarship. In the following, I will focus on discussing possible social contexts for the composition of the account of the Shechem covenant and will investigate a target audience that has not received due regard in previous research. But before I present my thesis, I will briefly outline some of the main trends that dominated the discussion of Josh 24 prior to the 1980's, and the factors that brought this text into the spotlight of recent inquiry.¹

1 See additional discussion and literature on the history of research in J. Van Seters, "Joshua 24 and the Problem of Tradition in the Old Testament," in *In the Shelter of Elyon: Essays on Ancient Palestinian Life and Literature in Honor of G. W. Ahlström*, (ed. W. B. Barrick and J. R. Spencer; JSOTSup 31; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1984), 139–158, here 141–146; M. Anbar, *Josué et l'alliance de Sichem (Josué 24:1–28)* (BET 25; Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1992), 7–22; K. Schmid, *Genesis and the Moses Story. Israel's Dual Origins in the Hebrew Bible* (trans. J. Nogalski; Siphrut 3; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2010), 197–198; idem, "Die Samaritaner und die Judäer; Die biblische Diskussion um ihr Verhältnis in Josua 24," in *Die Samaritaner und die Bibel – The Samaritans and the Bible; Historische und literarische Wechselwirkungen zwischen biblischen und samaritanischen Traditionen – Historical and Literary Interactions between Biblical and Samaritan Traditions* (ed. J. Frey et al.; Studia Judaica 70, Studia Samaritana 7; Berlin: De Gruyter, 2012), 31–49, here 38–40.

Why has Joshua 24 come to the fore in recent research?

Classical source critics, who held that pentateuchal sources continued into Joshua, assigned Joshua 24 to E, J or JE; and this view continued to persist among some scholars into the mid-twentieth century and even to the present.² Martin Noth, however, signaled a turning point in the study of Joshua 24 by refuting the notion that the book of Joshua is the conclusion of a Hexateuch. For Noth, the book of Joshua is a Deuteronomistic creation that only presumes Deuteronomy and no other pentateuchal source, and which finds its continuation in Judges through Kings.³ Yet Noth held that Joshua 24 was not part of the Deuteronomist's work, but instead was subsequently inserted into it.⁴ At the same time, Noth also held that Joshua 24 was based upon ancient tradition, and that it serves as the foundation narrative of the old twelve tribe amphictyony.⁵ In order to provide a *Sitz im Leben* for this foundation narrative, it was postulated that the tribal league conducted periodic cultic ceremonies of covenant renewal. Scholars quickly viewed Joshua 24 as proof that there were regular covenant renewal festivals. Once the existence of the amphictyony and its covenant renewal festival was established, further genres or literary forms could be associated with it.

-
- 2 E. g., J. Wellhausen, *Die Composition des Hexateuchs und der historischen Bücher des Alten Testaments* (4th ed.; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1963), 133–134; O. Eissfeldt, *The Old Testament: an Introduction; The History of the Formation of the Old Testament* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1965); M. Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972), 165; cf. Rofé's "Ephraimite History," which is inspired by Burney's view of E; and see C. F. Burney, *The Book of Judges with Introduction and Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Kings* (repr.; New York: Ktav, 1970 [orig. 1918]), xli–l; A. Rofé, "Ephraimite versus Deuteronomistic History," in *Reconsidering Israel and Judah: Recent Studies on the Deuteronomistic History, Sources for Biblical and Theological Study* (ed. G. N. Knoppers and J. G. McConville; SBTS 8; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2000), 462–474.
 - 3 M. Noth, *The Deuteronomistic History* (2nd ed.; JSOTSup 15; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991), 25–28, 118–120; idem, *The Chronicler's History* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1987), 107–109.
 - 4 Noth, *Deuteronomistic History*, 23 n. 1; but cf. M. Noth, *Das Buch Josua* (2nd ed.; HAT 7; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1953), 10, 139, where he held that the pre-Dtr version of Joshua 24 was edited by a Dtr scribe and inserted into the DtrH as an appendix to the Deuteronomistic account of the period of Joshua. For a survey how Noth's view changed over time, see C. Frevel, "Das Josua-Palimpsest. Der Übergang vom Josua zum Richterbuch und seine Konsequenzen für die These eines Deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerks," *ZAW* 125 (2013): 49–71, here 51–55.
 - 5 M. Noth, *Das System der zwölf Stämme Israels* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1966), 66–75; repr. of *Das System der zwölf Stämme Israels* (BWANT 41; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1930).

However, when the amphictyonic hypothesis was laid to rest in the mid-70's, interest in Joshua 24 temporarily receded.⁶

In the 1970s, when the Deuteronomistic History's thematic tensions, as well as multiple era introductions and endings, sparked theories concerning multiple Deuteronomistic redactions, scholars then began to explore how one might read Joshua 24 as a Deuteronomistic text within one of the history's redactional layers, and how it relates to Joshua 23.⁷ For the most part, this direction of research did not focus specifically upon Joshua 24, but was advanced within comprehensive commentaries on the book of Joshua or within studies of the redactional layers of Deuteronomy through Kings as a whole. This line of research still had to explain not only the similarities between Joshua 24 and the body of Deuteronomistic literature, but also its dissimilarity, and the means usually chosen was isolating an ancient source or tradition that was picked up by a Deuteronomistic scribe and utilized for his purposes, while imparting upon it a veneer of Deuteronomistic idiom. Thematic and ideological discrepancies between Joshua 24 and the corpus of the core Deuteronomistic texts were easily explained by the postulate that the Deuteronomist(s) respected their inherited sources and refrained from the type of harmonization and rewriting that is characteristic of the Chronist.

In the 1980s, John Van Seters led the discussion of Joshua 24 into a new direction by pointing out the non-characteristic use of Deuteronomisms in the text, as well as the way it combines Deuteronomisms with motifs and expressions from the Yahwist's narrative in the Pentateuch. Van Seters' Yahwist is a brilliant post-Deuteronomistic author, and he composed his composition as a supplement to the Deuteronomistic History. Hence, Joshua 24 does not preserve the memory of any ancient tradition or source, but rather builds upon a literary corpus that evolved after the demise of the kingdom

6 See e.g., O. Bächli, *Amphiktyonie im Alten Testament: Forschungsgeschichtliche Studie zur Hypothese von Martin Noth* (Basel: F. Reinhardt, 1977); N. P. Lemche, *Early Israel: Anthropological and Historical Studies on the Israelite Society before the Monarchy* (VTSup 37; Leiden: Brill, 1985), 292–293.

7 L. Peritt, *Bundestheologie im Alten Testament* (WMANT 36; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1969), 239–284; R. Smend, “The Law and the Nations: A Contribution to Deuteronomistic Tradition History,” in *Reconsidering Israel and Judah: Recent Studies on the Deuteronomistic History* (ed. G. N. Knoppers and J. G. McConville; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2000 [orig. 1971, German]), 95–110, here 102–105; R. D. Nelson, *The Double Redaction of the Deuteronomistic History* (JSOTSup 18; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1982), 94–98; A. D. H. Mayes, *The Story of Israel between Settlement and Exile: A Redactional Study of the Deuteronomistic History* (London: SCM Press, 1983), 51–53.

of Judah. Most of the studies since then, particularly those from continental Europe, build upon the ground broken by Van Seters.⁸

To a large extent, the recent interest in Joshua 24 is due to various trends current in the last fifteen years of biblical research. Thus, the Gerizim excavations and its Persian period cult site provide a new context for biblical texts dealing with Shechem and Samaritans.⁹ Another recent current is the interest in the formation, extent and shape of different meta-narratives running across the so-called “Primary History” in the Hebrew Bible. Within this frame of discussion, Joshua 24 plays a critical role, since it surveys history from Abraham to the fulfillment of the patriarchal promises, implying a hexateuchal framework, but also looks ahead to the consequences of infidelity to Yahweh and creates a bridge to Judges.¹⁰ So too, the theme of infidelity to Yahweh implies a possible enneateuchal framework that culminates in the destruction of Jerusalem.¹¹ At the same time, many of the same scholars are engaged in examining the seams between the biblical narrative books and the stages of growth within biblical scrolls. Here the question of the double

8 Van Seters, “Joshua 24”; compare, e.g., T. Römer, *Israels Väter: Untersuchungen zur Väterthematik im Deuteronomium und in der deuteronomistischen Tradition* (OBO 99; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990), 326–328; Anbar, *Josué*; Schmid, *Genesis*, 209–210. To be sure, Perlitt anticipated Van Seters by some fifteen years when he identified the addressees within the text as the target audience of the author’s time, although Perlitt, unlike Van Seters after him, held that Joshua 24 is a Deuteronomistic composition. See Perlitt, *Bundestheologie*, 273–279.

9 See, e.g., G. N. Knoppers, *Jews and Samaritans: the Origins and History of their Early Relations* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013), 120–131.

10 See, e.g., E. Blum, “Der kompositionelle Knoten am Übergang von Josua zu Richter: Ein Entflechtungsvorschlag,” in *Textgestalt und Komposition exegetische Beiträge zu Tora und Vordere Propheten* (ed. E. Blum and W. Oswald; FAT 69; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010); repr. of *Deuteronomy and Deuteronomistic Literature* (Leuven: University Press, 1997), 249–280, here 263–264; Schmid, *Genesis*, 201–203; R. G. Kratz, “Der vor- und der nachpriesterschriftliche Hexateuch,” in *Abschied vom Jahwisten; Die Komposition des Hexateuch in der jüngsten Diskussion* (ed. J. C. Gertz, et al.; BZAW 315; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2002), 295–323, here 302–303; U. Becker, “Endredaktionelle Kontextvernetzungen des Josua-Buches,” in *Die deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerk: Redaktions- und religionsgeschichtliche Perspektiven zur „Deuteronomismus“-Diskussion in Tora und Vorderen Propheten, Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* (ed. M. Witte et al.; BZAW 365; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2006), 139–161, here 144–146.

11 E.g., Kratz, “Hexateuch,” 303–306; E. Blum, “The Literary Connection between the Books of Genesis and Exodus and the End of the Book of Joshua,” in *A Farewell to the Yahwist? The Composition of the Pentateuch in Recent European Interpretation* (ed. T. B. Dozeman and K. Schmid; SBLSymS 34; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006), 89–106; Schmid, *Genesis*, 193–213; C. Frevel, “Die Wiederkehr der Hexateuchperspektive: Eine Herausforderung für die These vom deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerk,” in *Das deuteronomistische Geschichtswerk*, (ed. H.-J. Stipp; ÖBS 39; Frankfurt a. M.: Peter Lang, 2011), 13–53.

conclusion to the Joshua scroll and the overlap between the final verses of Joshua 24 and Judg 2:6–9 comes to the fore.¹² Another recent focus has been on cultural and collective memory that highlights the role of rehearsing a (re)constructed or imagined past, which creates a sense of “imagined” community. In this light, Joshua 24 is of interest given its use of historical recitation that combines southern and northern traditions as the basis for forging a foundation narrative about a community united in the worship of Yahweh at Shechem.¹³

Social Contexts of Biblical Compositions: Pitfalls and Methodological Considerations

The issue I wish to examine here is the social-historical context of Joshua 24 with its summary recitation of pentateuchal narrative and its narrative of the election (or referendum) to revere Yahweh as the sole God. Throughout the history of research, this text has been assigned to widely varying contexts that are rooted in periods ranging over at least eight hundred years. Therefore, some discussion of methodological considerations is in order.

The discussion of the social context of a composition represents an attempt to go beyond historical-critical considerations, and to consider the social location of those who composed the text, the issues arising from within their particular social circle and the historical situation that motivated their composition, as well as the social and historical context of their target audience. However, the texts before us are the product of a lengthy chain of transmission, and preserve no direct evidence for authorship. Since we have hardly any primary evidence regarding the social and historical location of the scribes who produced the texts, we have no recourse but to extract circumstantial evidence from the text itself. Such circumstantial evidence usually takes the form of vocabulary, datable details (which are rare,

12 E. g., Blum, “Knoten,” 262–274; T. Römer, “Das doppelte Ende des Josuabuches: Einige Anmerkungen zur aktuellen Diskussion um ‘deuteronomistisches Geschichtswerk’ und ‘Hexateuch,’” *ZAW* 118 (2006): 523–548; Becker, “Kontextvernetzungen,” 150–152; C. Frevel, “Josua-Palimpsest,” 49–71.

13 E. g., C. Nihan, “The Torah between Samaria and Judah: Shechem and Gerizim in Deuteronomy and Joshua,” in *The Pentateuch as Torah, New Models for Understanding Its Promulgation and Acceptance*, (ed. G. N. Knoppers and B. M. Levinson; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2007), 187–223, here 193–199; E. Ben Zvi, “The Memory of Abraham in Late Persian/Early Hellenistic Period Yehud,” in *The Reception and Remembrance of Abraham* (ed. D. V. Edelman and E. Ben Zvi; PHSC 13; Piscataway: Gorgias Press, 2011), 3–37, here 35–36.

and only provide a *terminus a quo*), theme and ideology. While wisdom and priestly vocabulary might provide some indication of the social context of the scribes, do they indicate anything about the target audience? Or if we uncover a mixture of idiom, does this necessarily point to separate stages of composition and amplification, or could it indicate that the composition was produced by a late scribe versed in the vocabulary of different bodies of literature already perceived as authoritative?¹⁴ Deuteronomisms in particular had wide-ranging and long-lived influence, as is evident in the independent use of Deuteronomisms in Chronicles and different non-biblical texts from Qumran.¹⁵ Similarly, if Aramaisms are present, are they evidence of a Northern or late origin? Or might they be employed by a skillful scribe who wishes to faithfully depict the speech of Northerners or others of “non-Israelite” extraction?¹⁶

In particular, thematic considerations can be problematic for identifying the social locus of a text within a specific historical context. Identifying themes and their targets is highly subjective, and can depend on how one defines the extent of the text and its context, since what is perceived as a theme by one reader might be viewed as an incremental motif by another. As for social/historical contexts, while we may employ comparative sociological and anthropological studies, as well as interpretation of material finds in order to reconstruct social contexts surrounding the daily life of different periods, what external evidence do we have for the social contexts of biblical texts? And finally, how can we argue with any certainty that a specific

14 See, e.g., Anbar, *Josué*, 47–48; Nihan, “Torah,” 195.

15 See, e.g., the essays by N. Lohfink and M. Brettler in *Those Elusive Deuteronomists: The Phenomenon of Pan-Deuteronomism* (ed. L. S. Schearing and S. L. McKenzie; JSOTSup 268; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999); G. N. Knoppers, “The Relationship of the Deuteronomistic History to Chronicles: Was the Chronicler a Deuteronomist?” in *Congress Volume Helsinki, 2010* (ed. M. Nissinen; VTSup 148; Leiden: Brill, 2012), 307–341; K. Schmid, “The Deuteronomistic Image of History as Interpretive Device in the Second Temple Period: Towards a Long-term Interpretation of ‘Deuteronomism,’” in *Congress Volume Helsinki, 2010* (ed. M. Nissinen; VTSup 148; Leiden: Brill, 2012), 369–388; B. M. Levinson, *A More Perfect Torah: At the Intersection of Philology and Hermeneutics in Deuteronomy and the Temple Scroll* (Critical Studies in the Hebrew Bible 1; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2013), 81–93.

16 See, e.g., E. L. Greenstein, “The Language of Job and its Poetic Function,” *JBL* 122 (2003): 651–666; F. H. Polak, “Sociolinguistics and the Judean Speech Community in the Achaemenid Empire,” in *Judah and the Judeans in the Persian Period* (ed. O. Lipschitz and M. Oeming; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2006), 589–628, here 591–601; N. Mizrahi, “A Matter of Choice: A Sociolinguistic Perspective on the Contact between Hebrew and Aramaic, with Special Attention to Jeremiah 10.1–16,” in *Discourse, Dialogue, and Debate in the Bible; Essays in Honour of Frank H. Polak* (ed. A. Brenner-Idan; Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2014), 107–124.

audience was a text's target audience, and not one of the many audiences for whom the text was relevant throughout its history of reception?

I must admit that I do not have a set of ready rules for maneuvering these methodological pitfalls. In fact, although there are many socio-historical "readings" of biblical texts, particularly within the prophetic corpora, I have found very few studies that purport to treat the methodological questions relating to locating a social context of the *target audience* of a work.¹⁷ It seems to me that the discussion of the social context of compositions from better documented periods (as with New Testament studies) might stand on firmer ground than the texts from the Hebrew Bible that stem from the Persian period and before.¹⁸ This does not mean that I think it futile to search for social contexts of compositions and their target audiences. What I do propose is that we bear in mind the provisional nature of the hypothetical settings we suggest for texts. As with all scholarly hypotheses, they are subject to falsification, and we would be wise to try to imagine how they might be falsified.

17 On the social location of biblical *scribes*, see, e.g., D. W. Jamieson-Drake, *Scribes and Schools in Monarchic Judah; A Socio-Archeological Approach* (JSOTSup 109; Sheffield: Almond Press, 1991); P. Dutcher-Walls, "The Social Location of the Deuteronomists: A Sociological Study of Factional Politics in Late Pre-Exilic Judah," *JOT* 52 (1991): 77–94; M. V. Fox, "The Social Location of the Book of Proverbs," in *Texts, Temples, and Traditions; A Tribute to Menahem Haran* (ed. M. V. Fox et al.; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1996), 227–239; E. Ben Zvi, "The Urban Center of Jerusalem and the Development of the Literature of the Hebrew Bible," in *Urbanism in Antiquity; From Mesopotamia to Crete* (ed. W. E. Aufrecht et al.; JSOTSup 244; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 194–209; W. M. Schniedewind, *How the Bible Became a Book; The Textualization of Ancient Israel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004); D. M. Carr, *Writing on the Tablet of the Heart: Origins of Scripture and Literature* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005).

18 Most purely theoretical discussions that I have found focus on the modern period, such as the discussion of target audiences in M. C. Howell and W. Prevenier, *From Reliable Sources: An Introduction to Historical Methods* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2001), 139–140; and see respectively A. Mayne, "Material Culture" and J.-M. Strange, "Reading Language as a Historical Source" in *Research Methods for History* (ed. S. Gunn and L. Faire; Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2012), 48–65, 167–183. For a small sampling of socio-historical studies on the New Testament see, e.g. V.K. Robbins, "Socio-rhetorical Criticism: Mary, Elizabeth and the Magnificat as a Test Case," in *The New Literary Criticism and the New Testament* (ed. E. S. Malbon and E. V. McKnight; JSNTSup 109; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 164–209; A. D. Clarke, *Secular and Christian Leadership in Corinth: A Socio-Historical and Exegetical Study of 1 Corinthians 1–6* (AGJU 18; Leiden: Brill, 1993); W. R. Domeris, "Sociological and Social Historical Investigations," in *Text and Interpretation; New Approaches in the Criticism of the New Testament* (ed. P. J. Hartin and J. H. Petzer; NTT'S 15; Leiden: Brill, 1991), 214–233; L. Schottroff, *The Parables of Jesus* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2006).

In Search of the Social Context of Joshua 24 and its Target Audience

A useful starting point for our inquiry into the social context of Joshua 24 is an observation about authors and target audiences. Firstly, narration and recitation of the past both reflects and furthers the concerns of those who composed the text; and secondly, the rehearsal of the past is directed towards a target audience contemporaneous with the composition.¹⁹ Such indeed is the nature of historical narration as a genre.²⁰ Hence, we need to identify the audience for whom the account of the Shechem covenant was relevant. But texts frequently undergo updating in the course of transmission, and can thus be redirected to new target audiences. At the same time, we need to avoid a monistic approach, since a text can appeal to more than one group, and indeed may have been intended to address a number of interests. Thus, the question of compositional unity comes to the fore since an initial composition might be subsequently reworked in order to address the concerns of later generations.

Although nearly all of the literary-critical analyses of Joshua 24 differ on various points, it is possible to distinguish two major groups: those that hold that Josh 24:1–28 is basically a unified composition even though some glossing and expansions may be found,²¹ and those that hold that the original narrative was quite short, having been extensively overwritten by subse-

¹⁹ See, e.g., Van Seters, "Joshua 24," 152.

²⁰ See H. R. Immerwahr, *Form and Thought in Herodotus* (Cleveland: American Philological Association, 1966), 4; and cf. the use by Van Seters of Huizinga's definition of history in J. Van Seters, *In Search of History: Historiography in the Ancient World and the Origins of Biblical History* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983), 1–5. Compare also Collingwood's view that history is aimed towards furthering human self-knowledge, and that knowledge of the past is acquired by means of conscious reenactment in the mind of the historian, accompanied by identifying with or empathizing with the actors in the historical process, R. G. Collingwood, *The Idea of History* (London: Oxford University Press, 1946), 10, 282–302. See also C. A. Newsom, "Rhyme and Reason: The Historical Résumé in Israelite and Early Jewish Thought," in *Congress Volume Leiden 2004* (ed. A. Lemaire; VTSup 109; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 215–233.

²¹ See, e.g., Perlitt, *Bundestheologie*, 243–244, 259, 266–270; Van Seters, "Joshua," 149–150; S. D. Sperling, "Joshua 24 Re-examined," in *Reconsidering Israel and Judah; Recent Studies on the Deuteronomistic History, Sources for Biblical and Theological Study* (ed. G. N. Knoppers and J. G. McConville; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2000; repr. of HUCA 82 [1987]), 240–258, here 241–242, 255–258; Anbar, *Josué*, 47–68; Römer, *Väter*, 325; R. D. Nelson, *Joshua: A Commentary* (OTL; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1997), 267–278; Blum, *Knoten*, 263; Römer, "Ende," 536–539; Schmid, *Genesis*, 198–199; Nihan, "Torah," 193; Knauf, *Josua* (ZBK; Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 2008), 191–193.

normal, particularly when a point is being emphasized for the purpose of persuasion and within the discourse of negotiation, in which the sides reiterate their positions in a series of statements and antiphonic replies.²⁷ Hence, repetition in itself does not provide adequate grounds for redactional analysis. Instead, the primary criterion should always be that of consistency in style, thought and ideology, or content. Only if the repetition is *also* inconsistent with the context, or if the material it frames is inconsistent with the context, then the repetition could provide grounds for redactional analysis.²⁸

Accordingly, I find it preferable to presume the compositional unity of a text as long as it displays narrative continuity and unity of content, purpose and style. Admittedly, it is conceivable that multi-stage redaction might produce the appearance of textual unity, particularly if the various editors stemmed from the same school or stream of tradition. But this alternative defeats the object of literary criticism from the outset, since critical tools could not validate or falsify either the unity of the text, or the proposition of multi-stage editing. For this reason, I prefer to be guided by the rule of parsimony and grant priority to the simplest explanation for the evolution of the text.

To be sure, in the case of Joshua 24, there are some awkward locutions and transmission variants. For example, in verse 2 the referent of the plural verbs יִשְׁבוּ and יַעֲבֹדוּ is “your fathers” אֲבוֹתֵיכֶם, but the continuity between the two clauses (“your fathers had always dwelt across the river . . . and worshipped other gods”) is suspended by the mention of “Terah, father of Abraham and father of Nahor.” Accordingly, many scholars view the mention of Terah as a gloss.²⁹ However, it can be read as a primary appositional

Studies (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, and Leiden: Brill, 1993), 112–133, here 118–122; I. L. Seeligmann, “Hebräische Erzählung und biblische Geschichtsschreibung,” in *Gesammelte Studien zur Hebräischen Bibel* (ed. Erhard Blum; FAT 41; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), 119–138, here 128–129, 135; B. O. Long, “Framing Repetitions in Biblical Historiography,” *JBL* 106 (1987): 385–399; M. Anbar, “La ‘reprise,’” *VT* 38 (1988): 385–398; R. Person, *From Conversation to Oral Tradition: A Simplest Systematics for Oral Traditions* (Routledge Studies in Rhetoric and Stylistics 10; New York: Routledge, 2016), 142–179.

27 See F. H. Polak, “Forms of Talk in Hebrew Biblical Narrative: Negotiations, Interaction, and Sociocultural Context,” in *Literary Construction of Identity in the Ancient World: Proceedings of a Conference, Literary Fiction and the Construction of Identity in Ancient Literatures* (ed. H. Liss and M. Oeming; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2010), 167–198.

28 See Blum’s eloquent comment that “amputation” by analysis to eliminate repetitions ignores the didactic function of rhetorical repetition, and that “redundant free,” short formulation is hardly a golden rule, “Knoten,” 263 n. 57. See also Anbar, *Josué*, 59–60.

29 See, e.g., Noth, *Josua*, 135; C. H. Giblin, “Structural Patterns in Jos 24:1–25,” *CBQ* 26 (1964): 50–69, here 54; Römer, “Väter,” 320–321; Nelson, *Joshua*, 274; Römer, “Ende,” 536; Knauf, *Josua*, 195.

elaboration: “your fathers – Terah, father of Abraham and father of Nahor – dwelt,” etc. So too, the sending of Moses and Aaron (ואשלח את משה ואהרן) is missing in the LXX of Josh 24:5, while the identical phrase is found in 1 Sam 12:8 where it establishes the paradigm in Samuel’s speech of sending saviors to deliver the people after they cry out to Yahweh.³⁰ This phrase is less appropriate to the historical retrospect in Joshua 24, since the divine speech relayed by Joshua focuses on Yahweh’s direct intervention on behalf of Israel, with no need for intermediaries.³¹

Nevertheless, I find no gaps in Joshua 24, nor any serious disjunctions or internal inconsistencies. It is thus unwarranted to excise the historical retrospect in vv. 2–13.³² On the contrary, it is justified to view the account of the Shechem covenant in Joshua 24 as a unified composition. The various oddities in this text are best explained as the product of its time and mode of composition, rather than as the result of cumulative redactional layers. In this case, the text was composed as an intertextual mosaic that pieces together multifold references picked from numerous literary sources, and as frequently occurs the recycled language and references are only partially adapted to their context, leaving traces of verbal, literary or conceptual “ungrammaticality.”³³ Thus, for example, the diction in v. 5aβ is elliptic (“I

30 See also Müller, *Königtum*, 185.

31 Anbar, *Josué*, 33; Römer, “Ende,” 536–537; cf. C. Nihan, “1 Samuel 8 and 12 and the Deuteronomistic Edition of Samuel,” in *Is Samuel among the Deuteronomists? Current Views on the Place of Samuel in a Deuteronomistic History* (ed. C. Edenburg and J. Pakkala; SBLAIL 16; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2013), 225–273, here 260 n. 100.

32 Those who eliminate vv. 2b–13 from the base text of Joshua 24 adhere to Smend’s view that Joshua 24 is earlier than Joshua 23 (Smend, “Law,” 102–105); and see, e.g., Kratz, *Composition*, 199–200; Müller, *Königtum*, 233–234; Becker, “Kontextvernetzungen,” 150–152; Knauf, *Josua*, 21–23, 188–189; Frevel, “Josua-Palimpsest,” 67–69. Mayes, *Story*, 50–51, demurs from Smend’s ruling that Joshua 24 was composed by the Deuteronomistic Historian, while Joshua 23 derives from DtrN. According to Mayes, both Joshua 23 and Joshua 24 revolve around the covenant ideas and terminology, and the theme of obedience to the law was added by a later editor of the Deuteronomistic History. Furthermore, the late Deuteronomistic editor would hardly undermine the end of the Deuteronomistic conquest narrative by adding the farewell speech in Joshua 23 right before the purported earlier address and covenant at Shechem in Joshua 24: “the abrupt clash of Josh. 23 and Josh. 24 finds no analogy in the work for which the later deuteronomistic editor can be held to be responsible” (Mayes, *Story*, 51). Mayes’ arguments are further strengthened by Blum, “Knoten,” 263–264; Nelson, *Joshua*, 268–269; Römer, “Ende,” 526–527, 539 n. 88; Schmid, *Genesis*, 200–202; Nihan, “1 Samuel 8,” 264, n. 110.

33 On this concept of “ungrammaticality,” see C. Edenburg, “How (Not) to Murder a King: Variations on a Theme in 1 Sam 24; 26,” *SJOT* 12 (1998): 64–85, here 68–69, with additional literature there.

struck Egypt *according to what I did in it* and afterwards I brought you out”; (ואגף את־מצרים כאשר עשיתי בקרבו ואחר הוצאתי אתכם “what I did in it” lacks a referent. This ellipsis stems from echoing and shortening the fuller text of Exod 3:20 (I shall strike Egypt with all the *wonders* that I shall do to it and afterwards *he shall send you forth*; והכיתי את־ (מצרים בכל נפלאתי אשר אעשה בקרבו ואחר־יכן ישלח אתכם).³⁴

A particularly complex combination of references occurs in the description of the deliverance by the sea in vv. 6b–7, which combines language and motifs from the P and non-P versions of the event in Exodus 14,³⁵ but then concludes by mixing the Deuteronomistic idiom, “your eyes saw” (תראינה) (ענייכם)³⁶ with the text of Exod 19:4 “you saw what I did to Egypt” (אתם אראתם אשר עשיתי למצרים). Similarly, vv. 9–10 also combine different pentateuchal sources. Thus, the mention of Balak *the son of Zippor* (v. 9) derives from Numbers 22, where he is also titled *king of Moab* (Num 22:2, 4, 10, 16; cf. Judg 11:25), while he is noticeably absent from Deuteronomy. In Deut 23:5 the Moabites themselves, rather than Balak, are those who hire Balaam. On the other hand, vv. 9b–10 display the influence of Deut 23:5–6. Both Josh 24:9 and Deut 23:5–6 employ the verb קלל, “to curse” in describing the purpose for which Balaam was hired, while Numbers 22–24 completely avoids this verb and prefers instead ארר and קבב/נקב.³⁷ Also, only Josh 24:10 and Deut 23:6 imply that Balaam indeed set out to curse, but since Yahweh did not want it (לא אבה), he turned the curse into a blessing. The story in Numbers presents a different picture of Balaam as one who knows that he can speak only the words that Yahweh places in his mouth (Num 22:13b, 18b, 20b, 38b, 23:12, 26, 24:13).

As others have noted, the choice of references cuts across the pentateuchal narrative strands and sources, including not only P, but also allusions to material in Joshua–Kings (both non- and post-Deuteronomistic material) and in the Prophets.³⁸ However, the scribe does not seem to have been concerned

34 See also Nelson, *Joshua*, 264. Anbar, *Josué*, 34–35 prefers the reading of LXX^A which is similar to that found in Num 14:11b; however this raises the question whether the LXX^A reading is not the result of assimilation.

35 See, e.g., Blum, “Knoten,” 265; Nihan, “Torah,” 195; idem, “1 Samuel 8 and 12,” 264–265; Schmid, “Genesis,” 210. Anbar, *Josué*, 90–91, further notes how the combination of intertexts impacted the ordering of the events by the sea in Josh 24:6–7.

36 See also Anbar, *Josué*, 72–73. The idiom *ענייכם הרואות* or *ענייכם ראו ענייכם* is frequent in Deuteronomy as a witness formula, and see Deut 3:21, 4:3, 9, 7:19, 10:21, 11:7, 29:2. Outside of Deuteronomy and Joshua 24 this usage recurs only in 1 Sam 24:11.

37 ארר – Num 22:6, 12, 23:7, 24:9; נקב/קבב – Num 22:11, 17, 23:8, 25, 27, 24:10. See also Noth, *Josua*, 135; Anbar, *Josué*, 91–92.

38 See e.g. Van Seters, “Joshua 24,” 146–149; Sperling, “Joshua 24,” 123–133; Anbar, *Josué*, 98–100; Nihan, “Torah,” 195–197; Römer, “Ende,” 540; Schmid, *Genesis*, 201. Parallels

with weaving the intertextual references together into a smooth fabric, but only partially adapted them to their present context, perhaps in order to signal their presence, as is characteristic of literary allusion.

In my view, the final form of Joshua 24:1–28 basically represents its original form, and its placement at the end of the Joshua scroll, as well as the choice of its intertexts explains why this is so. This passage was appended to the end of the Joshua scroll at the latest stage of the book's growth, and the scribe who composed it was familiar with the Pentateuch as well as with post-Deuteronomistic material in the Former Prophets. Subsequent changes to the text of the scroll belong to the process of transmission, rather than redaction. Thus, in the case of Joshua 24, it is unnecessary to isolate an original text from subsequent supplementation or editing before we examine it for indications of its social context and target audience.

The historical recitation opens in the Diaspora, where the fathers – Terah and his sons – worshipped other gods (v. 2), and then proceeds to Abraham's migration to Canaan and the birth of his offspring there (vv. 3–4a). From here the historical summary progresses to the descent of Jacob and his sons into Egypt, and the deliverance by means of plagues brought on Egypt, followed by the Exodus from Egypt, during which the pursuing Egyptians were overwhelmed by the sea and drowned (vv. 4bβ–7a). Despite the mention of specific details from the pentateuchal Exodus traditions, there are no explicit references in this part of the recitation to the bondage theme. After the summary of the Exodus, the narration resumes with the stay in the desert for “many days” (v. 7b), followed by the successful war against the Amorites in the Transjordan and the inheritance of their land (alluding to the kingdom of Sihon and Og of the Bashan; v. 8). As in Numbers 21–22, this continues with the encounter with Balak, king of Moab, and Balaam who blessed rather than cursed Israel. However, the recitation here also relays a divergent detail and states that Balak *warred* against Israel (vv. 9–10; contra Judg 11:25). From this point, the narration continues directly to the crossing of the Jordan (v. 11aα), thus ignoring the Baal Peor incident, the encampment on the plains of Moab and Moses's death. Just one battle in the land of Canaan serves to signify the conquest of all its seven peoples. But the one

found only outside the “Enneateuch” include the following: v. 17, since the only other instance of “bringing up from Egypt” formula with the participle of עלה is in Jer 2:6; the unique expression גרש מפניהם in v. 18, which is closely paralleled by Ps 78:55 יגרש מפניהם וגו'; v. 19 אל modified by the infinitive form קנא recurs only in Nah 1:2, otherwise the epithet is construed with the participle קנא (e.g., Exod 34:14; Deut 4:24, 6:15; cf. Noth, *Josua*, 136); v. 20 ועבד אלהי נבר (את ה') עוב is properly paralleled only in Jer 5:19; and finally, the idea expressed in v. 27 by the phrase באלהים כחש is paralleled only by Isa 59:13; Jer 5:12.

battle chosen to represent the military conquest is Jericho, though here too, as with Balak, the people of Jericho go out to battle the Israelites – a detail lacking in the report in Josh 6:11–20. The historical recitation is summed up with the statement that Yahweh gave Israel the land that was built and planted by others (vv. 12–13).

I have dwelt upon some of the details that are left out of this recitation, but of all the major pentateuchal themes, the most prominent omission in this historical summary is any reference to previous covenants, whether with Abraham or those at Sinai/Horeb or the Plains of Moab.³⁹ This historical narration presumes no prior covenants, and instead goes on to relate a covenant established at Shechem based upon the commitment to the exclusive worship of Yahweh. This covenant is not contingent on any rules other than the solemn obligation to revere Yahweh and him alone.⁴⁰ Finally, while this covenant is contracted at a cult site where there is said to be a sanctuary (v. 26, *מקדש*), there is no mention of an altar or a ceremonial meal accompanied by sacrifice. Instead, the covenant is solemnly concluded by erecting a standing stone as a witness to the people's choice (v. 26).⁴¹

The way the recitation leaves out any mention of the pentateuchal covenants suggests that the present text is intended to override them. Although the pentateuchal covenants were tied to conditions surrounding the grant or possession of the land (and its subsequent loss, cf. Josh 23:12–13, 15b–16), the Shechem covenant revolves solely around renewing the choice of Yahweh as God.⁴² Such an intent, of course, would be quite radical. The events' location outside the region of Yehud at a cult-less sanctuary lacking an altar but with a standing stone as witness (Josh 24:26) is suggestive of any area where people may revere Yahweh – especially people without recourse to a formal cult or cultic regulations that are contingent on hallowed space.

This understanding evokes interesting associations between the account of the covenant at Shechem and the story of the Transjordan altar in Joshua 22. Rather than active cult sites, the two narratives represent standing stones as witnesses to a ritual of memory and intention to serve Yahweh.⁴³

Josh 22:26–27 נעשה־נא לנו לבנות את־המזבח לא לעולה ולא לזבח, **כי עד הוא** בינינו וביניכם
ובין דרוח־ינו אחרינו לעבד את־עבדת ה' [...] **ולא־יאמרו בניכם מחר לבנינו**
אי־לכם חלק בה'

³⁹ See also Anbar, *Josué*, 134–135; Kratz, “Hexateuch”, 302; Schmid, *Genesis*, 211.

⁴⁰ See also Schmid, *Genesis*, 212.

⁴¹ Cf. Josh 22:28, and see also Schmid, *Genesis*, 211.

⁴² See Blum, “Knoten” 266.

⁴³ See also Nelson, *Joshua*, 250.

Let us build an altar – not for sacrificial offerings – but as a witness between us and you and between the generations to come to serve Yahweh ... so that your future sons will not say to our sons: You have no part in Yahweh

Josh 24:27 האבן הזאת תהיה לנו לעדה כי־היא שמעה את כל־אמרי ה' אשר דבר עמנו
והיתה בכם לעדה פ־תכחשון באלהיכם

This stone is witness to all the words that Yahweh spoke to us, and it will bear witness against you, lest you forget your God

However, the two texts differ widely in style, language, and narrative arc, and hardly derive from the same scribal circles. It is even possible that Joshua 24 picked up the motif of the stone witness from Joshua 22 and transformed the stone altar wrongly erected by the Transjordanian tribes into a monolith erected by Joshua – a monolith that lacks any intrinsic function other than a site of memory and witness.⁴⁴ For the late “Priestly” author of Joshua 22, the historical referent of the Transjordan tribes must have lain in the distant past; hence, the Transjordan inheritance could represent any extra-territorial community of Yahwists. Thus, Joshua 22 arguably addresses the relations between Diaspora communities and those of Yehud-Samaria, and it rejects the notion of any extra-territorial cult, such as that observed in Yahweh sanctuaries in Elephantine and Leonopolis. According to this point of view, Diaspora cult symbols could only serve as a memorial by which to remember their cultural-religious ties with Yehud-Samaria. From a more narrow Judean perspective, the same could also hold true of the choice of Shechem in Joshua 24, which could equally be perceived as extra-territorial, lying beyond the confines of Yehud.

As Carol Newsome notes, the scope chosen for a historical résumé does not stem solely from the authority of a master narrative, but reflects deliberate configuration or emplotment of the past “so that the end and the beginning are seen as compellingly meaningful or true.”⁴⁵ The choice to open the recitation with the Diaspora forefathers suggests that its target audience is not necessarily those “sons of Abraham” residing within Yehud or the “sons of Jacob” in Samaria, or even returnees to Yehud from the Diaspora(s). Despite acrimonious biblical polemic, the choice between Yahweh and the nameless gods of other nations was mainly a problem faced by those *living* in the Diaspora (cf. Deut 4:28, 28:36, 64).⁴⁶ Furthermore, the depiction of the covenant based solely on revering Yahweh without necessitating any

⁴⁴ Römer raises the possibility that both Josh 22:9-34 and Joshua 24 were added at the same stage, thus flanking the farewell speech in Joshua 23; cf. Römer, “Ende,” 546.

⁴⁵ Newsom, *Rhyme*, 219.

⁴⁶ See Anbar, *Josué*, 121–122, 127–130.

formal cult, would particularly be appropriate for the Eastern Diaspora, which, as far as we know, had no local cult installations devoted to the cult of Yahweh.⁴⁷

Recent publications and evaluations of the Babylonian documents from the sixth and fifth centuries provide valuable evidence for the daily life of former Judeans in the Eastern Diaspora. There they were incorporated into the economic infrastructure with the possibility of upward mobility. Those settled in the countryside might work crown land as tenant farmers or independently lease land and attached irrigation canals.⁴⁸ Some engaged in commerce as merchants and even achieved the rank of royal merchants (*tamkār šarri*), and those who prospered are cited as creditors in transactions.⁴⁹ Some even advanced to administrative positions in royal service, as attested by official titles such as *šaknu* (chief officer) and *dēkū* (foreman of corvée), as well as by personal names of types borne only by courtiers (theophoric element + *šarru* + verb).⁵⁰ Cross cultural comparison with other groups in history that have been relocated or displaced indicates that most displaced Judeans probably remained by choice in “Judah by the Euphrates,” either due to lack of means to return to Judah or due to social and economic advancement in the Diaspora.⁵¹

47 Cf. L. E. Pearce, “Cuneiform Sources for Judeans in Babylonia in the Neo-Babylonian and Achaemenid Periods: An Overview,” *Religion Compass* 10/9 (2016): 230–243, here 231: “To date, there is no known cuneiform evidence that addresses explicitly any aspect of the religious or cultic practices of Judeans in Mesopotamia.”

48 See M. D. Coogan, “Life in the Diaspora: Jews at Nippur in the Fifth Century BC,” *BA* 37 (1974): 6–12, here 8–9; C. Wunsch, “Glimpses on the Lives of Deportees in Rural Babylonia,” in *Arameans, Chaldeans, and Arabs in Babylonia and Palestine in the First Millennium B. C.* (ed. A. Berlejung and M. P. Streck; LAS 3; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2013), 247–260, here 252–257; Pearce, “Cuneiform Sources,” 235–238.

49 See Coogan, “Life,” 10; Y. Bloch, “Judeans in Sippar and Susa during the First Century of the Babylonian Exile: Assimilation and Perseverance under Neo-Babylonian and Achaemenid Rule,” *JANEH* 1 (2014): 119–172, here 126–135; C. Waerzeggers, “Locating Contact in the Babylonian Exile: Some Reflections on Tracing Judean-Babylonian Encounters in Cuneiform Texts,” in *Encounters by the Rivers of Babylon: Scholarly Conversations between Jews, Iranians and Babylonians in Antiquity* (ed. U. Gabbay and S. Secunda; TSAJ 160; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014), 131–146, here 132.

50 See Coogan, “Life,” 10; Wunsch, “Glimpses,” 254; Bloch, “Judeans,” 126, 135–139; L. E. Pearce, “Identifying Judeans and Judean Identity in the Babylonian Evidence,” in *Exile and Return, The Babylonian Context* (BZAW 478; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2015), 7–32, here 24–25.

51 See the cross-cultural discussion of relocation and displacement in L. L. Grabbe “‘They Never Returned’: Were the Babylonians Jewish Settlers Exiles or Pioneers?” in *By the Irrigation Canals of Babylon, Approaches to the Study of the Exile* (ed. J. J. Ahn and J. Middlemas; LHBOTS 526; London: T&T Clark, 2012), 158–172.

In particular, the prosodographic record documents the social and cultural integration of Judeans in the eastern Diaspora. Individuals bearing names compounded with the phonetic variation of the Yahwistic theophoric element (*Yahu-X*; *X-Yahu / Yaw*; *X-Yama*) are evidently of Judean extraction; accordingly, their parents, siblings and offspring can be considered Diaspora Judeans. Thus, patronymics and reconstructed family trees help to identify Judeans who bear hypocoristic or non-Yahwistic theophoric names.⁵² The Bible does mention a few Judeans who adopted in the Diaspora Akkadian names with non-Yahwistic theophoric elements, some of whom remained in the Diaspora, such as Bethelsarezer (*Zech 7:2; Bit-ili-šar-ušur*, “Bethel [will] protect the king”) and Shenazzar son of Jehoiachin (1 Chr 3:18; *Sin-[ab/šar]-ušur*), and others who are counted among the returnees, such as Sheshbazzar (*Ezra 1:8, 11, 5:14, 16; Šamaš-bani/aḫla-ušur*, “Shamash protect the progenitor/son”), Zerubabel⁵³ (*zēr-bābili*; “offspring of Babilu”), Bilshan (*Ezra 2:2; Neh 7:7; X-Bēl-šunu*, “X is their god”), and others. However, valuable information regarding the process of acculturation in Diaspora is culled from Babylonian and early Persian period cuneiform documents, which derive from various locations in Babylonia and Persia. Personal names are important components of self-identity and they convey how individuals choose to represent themselves and those affiliated with them in different social settings. For example, it has been suggested that some might have changed their Yahwistic names for Babylonian styled names, and this practice is particularly evident in the case of individuals who assumed administrative offices.⁵⁴

A tendency to adopt local name-giving practices in order to facilitate the integration of the second and third generation in the Diaspora might be

52 Names compounded with non-theophoric elements in place of a DN, such as *ʾab* and *aḫ* are ambiguous for purposes of identity, since they are shared with other West Semites. Although the hypocoristic name *Ḥaggai* is identical to that of the biblical prophet, it is also shared with other West Semites, while the hypocoristic name *Šabbātaya* (= שַׁבְּתָיָא) might possibly indicate non-Judeans who adopt Sabbath observance, and cf. Isa 56:3–4; M. D. Coogan, *West Semitic Personal Names in the Murašû Documents* (HSM 7; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1976): 73, 84, 119; Pearce, “Identifying,” 18–21. Notwithstanding, the four individuals named *Ḥaggai* or *Šabbātaya* in the *Āl-Yāhūdū* corpus all have fathers or siblings with Yahwistic names, and see Pearce, “Identifying,” 21–22.

53 See, e. g., Hag 1:1, 12, 14; Zech 4:6–10; Ezra 3:2, 8; Neh 7:7.

54 E. g., Mattan-Yāma (= מַתַּנְיָא) becomes Akkadianized as Mannu-danni-Yāma. An official named Bēl-šarra-ušur turns out to be a Judean who later is called Yāhu-šarra-ušur. Since both forms belong to the type born by royal officials, the individual undoubtedly had a different and perhaps Yahwistic birth-name. On these cases and others see Pearce, “Identifying,” 24–28.

reflected by cases of sons with Akkadian names and Yahwistic or possibly Judean patronymics, such as Šamaš-ladin son of Yadi^c-yah (ידעיה); Arad-Gula son of Šamri-Yāma (שמריהו); Niqūdu son of Mušallammu (משולם); Šamaš-apla-ušur son of Rapê (רפא); and the sons of Amuše (= הושע), who are named Bēl-uballit, Šamaš-iddin, Nabū-ittannu and Bēl-iddin.⁵⁵ The progression in assimilation can be seen in some cases in which family trees can be reconstructed, as with the family of the merchant Ariḫ (אריח, cf. Ez 2:5; Neh 6:18) in Sippar in the second half of the sixth century B.C.E. One of Ariḫ's sons has a Yahwistic name (Aḫi-Yāma = אחיה); another has a Hebrew hypocoristic (Amuše = הושע); another reflects the chief god of the Babylonian pantheon (Mardukā); and the name of a fourth son is similar to that of a prominent Babylonian family (Basiya). The generation of grandchildren born in the Diaspora stands in contrast to the mixture of name types in the generation of sons. All of the known grandchildren in this family bear names with Babylonian theophoric elements.⁵⁶

At the same time, the opposite trend can be found when individuals bearing Babylonian names bestowed on their sons Yahwistic names, as in the case of Yadaḥ-yāma (ידעיה) son of Šamaš-ladin, Yigdal-yāma (יגדליה) son of Nanī-iddin, both known from the Murašū archives; Yāhū-šarra-ušur son of Šamaš-iddin and Šabbātaya son of Nabū-šarra-bullit at Susa;⁵⁷ as well as Yehoyishma^c (יהוישמע) daughter of Šamaš-šarra-ušur on an unprovenanced Hebrew seal published by Avigad.⁵⁸ This tendency is particularly marked in the Murašū archive corpus, but its significance remains open to interpretation.⁵⁹ The trend towards names honoring Babylonian deities and then back again to Yahwistic names is not an indication of personal belief, but rather indicates how a minority group both perceives itself and wishes to present itself as it adapts to life in a foreign cultural context. The extent of assimilation on the one hand, and adherence to Judean self-identification on the other hand, are linked to varying social and geographic contexts. Merchants whose commercial dealings involve Babylonian temples and priests might be motivated to adopt Babylonian names in order to facilitate negotiation and the welding of connections. Exogamy also serves the same purpose among those seeking social mobility, as borne out by different instances of

55 Coogan, "Life," 11; Bloch, "Judeans," 127–130, 132–133.

56 See Bloch, "Judeans," 127–130. The generation of the grandchildren is represented by the sons of Amuše listed above.

57 Bloch, "Judeans," 138–139. See also the lists compiled by Bickerman, in E. J. Bickerman, "The Generation of Ezra and Nehemiah," in *Studies in Jewish and Christian History* (AJEC 68; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 2:975–999, here 996–998.

58 See Bloch, "Judeans," 139; Pearce, "Identifying," 27–28.

59 See Bloch, "Judeans," 124–125, 141–142.

alliances between Judean Diaspora daughters being given in marriage to native Babylonians of higher social standing.⁶⁰ Conversely, the rural setting of *Āl Yahūdu* provided a more insular environment for fostering social cohesion and cultural continuity, as Waerzeggers suggests.⁶¹ According to Yigal Bloch, the Yahwistic names among royal courtiers and officials indicate that the royal court and administration also comprised a social setting that provided the security to outwardly retain Judean identity.⁶² This may be due to the cosmopolitan character of the royal courts and administrations in the context of empire.

The type of acculturation expressed by adopting names typical of the culture in which migrants or displaced persons have been relocated does not imply a change in their religious affiliation, even in the case of adopting foreign theophoric names. Personal names are not only a means for self-identity, but also play a role in mediating between the migrant group and their new social context. Nonetheless, this type of acculturation might have been viewed as suspect by those in the distant “homeland,” particularly by Judean Yahwists who served a “jealous God.” Those representing this brand of exclusive Yahwism would not be sympathetic to the role played by relocated and acculturated Judean merchants in the economic infrastructure of Babylonian temples. In this light, I suggest that the account of the covenant at Shechem might reflect the recognition that Diaspora Yahweh communities would persist, encouraging them to choose Yahweh and maintain their separate identity among a multicultural populace in the Eastern Diaspora.⁶³ Joshua 24 could represent a dispensation to this end within the scriptural tradition, since it implies a single covenant obligation, namely to revere Yahweh alone.

Of course, many elements I have discussed can be thought to be directed towards including the Samaritan Yahweh worshippers in the scriptural tradition. While their cult site is recognized, it is demoted to the rank of a site of memory that serves as a witness to the ancient commitment to worship Yahweh. Different scholars talk of a type of compromise, by which Judean scribes granted recognition to Samaritans as members of a common Yahweh community.⁶⁴ Such a “compromise” is furthered by the amalgamation of

60 See K. Abraham, “West Semitic and Judean Brides in Cuneiform Sources from the Sixth Century BCE,” *AfO* 51 (2005/2006): 198–219; Waerzeggers, “Locating,” 140; Bloch, “Judeans,” 130, 132.

61 Waerzeggers, “Locating,” 132.

62 See Bloch, “Judeans,” 140–141.

63 Cf. Van Seters, “Joshua 24,” 153; Blum, “Knoten,” 266.

64 See, e.g., Blum, “Knoten,” 266–273; Nihan, “Torah,” 191–193, 197; Schmid, “Samaritaner,” 44–49; G.N. Knoppers, “The Northern Context of the Law-Code in Deuter-

Southern and Northern origin traditions into one common myth of origins, which serves to locate the “making of Israel” at this specific point of time, when “sons of Abraham” and “sons of Jacob” both accepted the exclusive worship of Yahweh.⁶⁵ However, even presuming a late Persian period (or early Hellenistic) context for the text, its premises regarding the ideal unity of Israel remain as fictive as those in Chronicles.

Is it possible to decide between these two contexts and target audiences, namely the Samaritan Yahweh community and the Eastern Diaspora? At present I do not think that we have the methodological tools or the evidence that enable us to falsify one and prioritize the other. Instead, it could be that both social contexts were envisioned by the scribe who drafted Joshua 24 as a concluding piece to the Joshua scroll, thereby overriding the purpose of the final form of Joshua’s farewell speech in Joshua 23.

Cynthia Edenburg
 The Open University of Israel
 1 University Road
 Ra’anana 43537
 Israel
 Cynthia@openu.ac.il

onomy,” *HeBAI* 4 (2015): 162–183. The broad combination of traditions could be seen to accommodate different groups: the eastern Diaspora “across the river” (v. 3), the Egyptian Diaspora (vv. 4b–8), along with the returnees (vv. 14–15), those who remained in the land (v. 18) and Samaritans; cf. Knauf, *Josua*, 193–194.

⁶⁵ Compare also Nihan, “Torah,” 198–199.

Joachim J. Krause

Hexateuchal Redaction in Joshua

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

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

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

I

The present paper¹ looks for a Hexateuchal redaction in Joshua, not for an original Hexateuch. To reckon with a literary work that from the outset covered the exodus *and* conquest, as do both the Documentary Hypothesis²

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

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

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

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

4 In the work of the so-called Neo-Documentarians (for this label, see J. Stackert, “Distinguishing Innerbiblical Exegesis from Pentateuchal Redaction: Leviticus 26 as a Test Case,” in *The Pentateuch: International Perspectives on Current Research* [ed. T. B. Dozeman et al.; FAT 78; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011], 369–386, here 370), the problem is conspicuous by its absence; see J. S. Baden, *J, E, and the Redaction of the Pentateuch* (FAT 68; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009); J. S. Baden, *The Composition of the Pentateuch: Renewing the Documentary Hypothesis* (AYBRL; New Haven: Yale University Press, 2012); J. Stackert, *A Prophet Like Moses: Prophecy, Law, and Israelite Religion* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2014).

on to Kings is due in the first place to a comprehensive Deuteronomistic redaction of the “historical” traditions in Joshua through Kings⁵ and the subsequent expansion of the resultant history by prefixing the origin myth of the exodus story,⁶ the search for the old “sources” or pre-Deuteronomistic strata of Hexateuchal scope becomes obsolete.⁷ In fact, it naturally gives way to the question of whether texts in Joshua that seem to presuppose some sort of a Hexateuch are to be explained as secondary attempts at delimiting the sextet of Pentateuch and Joshua as a literary unit.⁸

II

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Once held to form the bedrock of an original literary tradition comprising both exodus and conquest, the rather late provenance of Joshua 24 has been firmly established in the wake of two groundbreaking studies by John Van Seters¹⁰ and Erhard Blum^{11, 12}. In the latter, the assessment that Joshua 24 was composed in the post-exilic period comes with the aforementioned interpretation of the chapter as final piece of a comprehensive Hexateuchal redaction. This redaction sought to promote “the book of the Torah of

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

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

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

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

III

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

¹³ See Blum, “Knoten,” 269–272.

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

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

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

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

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

IV

While the Deuteronomistic conquest account presents itself as part of a larger literary work (in my view, the Deuteronomistic History¹⁸), situated

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

¹⁷ Krause, *Exodus und Eisodus*.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

ban.²⁶ The Deuteronomistic commandment is not simply abrogated, we now learn, but rather reappraised in a critical fashion.²⁷ In like manner, then, our revision is also responsible for a thorough reworking of the Jordan crossing in Joshua 3–4.²⁸ The clearest evidence of this is the new conclusion in Josh 4:21–24 that presents a catechetical teaching of Joshua. Here, the question is posed as to the significance of the Gilgal memorial and its reminiscence of the miraculous crossing. The following answer explains the purpose of the miracle to be the magnification and adoration of Yhwh – not only by Israel, but by all peoples: “so that all the peoples of the earth may know that the hand of Yhwh is mighty, and so that they may fear Yhwh your God forever” (Josh 4:24).

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

the notion of crossing the sea,³⁶ which in turn provided the crucial point of reference for the post-Priestly revision in Joshua 3–4.³⁷ This view is corroborated by the apparent lack of further evidence for the alleged redaction which has left virtually no trace in other places or motifs.³⁸ Most notably, in contrast to the clear back references from the Jordan to the sea, there are no corresponding forward references.³⁹ Thus, I agree with Dozeman and Wagenaar that the two originally independent accounts have been reworked in order to correspond to each other, but I fail to see that this has been done by one and the same hand, let alone the hand of some Hexateuchal redactor.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

V

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

⁴² See the relevant sections in Haarmann, *JHWH-Verehrer der Völker*.

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

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

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

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

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

⁴⁵ See below, p. 200.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Over against this literary critical separation, recent research has shown that the text of the pericope as it stands is a homogeneous, thoughtfully crafted literary piece⁵³ (in my view also including v. 9 which is still set off as secondary by most scholars⁵⁴). The customary separation is based on an outdated understanding of the phrase “disgrace of Egypt,” and it fails to recognize the intention of connecting the themes of circumcision and wilderness wandering. If we seek to solve the riddle of this seemingly enigmatic text, we have to follow the clues to other texts to which this pericope alludes, too. First and foremost, this holds for the spy mission of Kadesh Barnea (Numbers 13–14 par. Deut 1:19–46; see also Deut 2:14–15). As the crisis par excellence and the turning point of the exodus, the spy mission serves as the pivot of the theological interpretation of the wilderness wandering developed in the retrospective middle part.⁵⁵ The reference to this intertext is marked both by significant parallels in wording and by

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

That this line is not due to coincidence, but rather to deliberate authorial design, is proven by the episode of Josh 5:13–15 that stems from the same hand as 5:2–9.⁶⁰ All by himself in the field near Jericho, Joshua encounters

⁵⁶ Blum, "Beschneidung und Passa," 230–236.

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

⁵⁸ See Gertz, *Tradition und Redaktion*, 57–58, with literature.

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

⁶⁰ For the reasons, see Krause, *Exodus und Eisodus*, 390–392.

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

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

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

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

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

According to my analysis, this structure⁶² is due to a successive process of scribal *Fortschreibung* and inner-biblical interpretation,⁶³ catalyzed by the first line drawn between exodus and eisodus: the depiction of the Jordan crossing as counterpart to the crossing of the sea of reeds introduced by the post-Priestly revision. The parallel of these two passages, *pars pro toto* representing exodus and eisodus, functioned as both catalyst and docking point for local insertions that gradually embellished the story of Israel's entrance into the land – according to the model of the exodus from Egypt.

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

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

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

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

has approached that thesis in a new way. Contrary to his predecessors, he does not reckon with JG in Joshua 5, but interprets the reminiscences of the exodus as intertextual back references.⁶⁵ In so doing, however, he brings into play the idea these could be part of the same Hexateuchal redaction responsible for the colophon in Josh 24:26.⁶⁶ So what about Joshua 5 and 24?

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

So we are left with Josh 5:2–9 and 13–15, the accounts of circumcision and epiphany. None of them is mentioned in the historical retrospect of Joshua 24.⁷¹ In fact, the whole concept of the wilderness wandering as a time of disobedience and the corresponding dichotomy of the two generations, part and parcel of the theological perspective offered in Joshua 5, is apparently unknown in Joshua 24. Both Joshua 5 and Joshua 24 offer a theological perspective on Israel's past, but the two perspectives are independent of

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

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

66 Bieberstein, "Horizonte," 170.

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

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

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

70 See also Albertz, "Canonical Alignment."

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

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

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

VI

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thomas Römer

The Date, Composition and Function of Joshua 24 in Recent Research

A Response to Joachim J. Krause, Cynthia Edenburg, and Konrad Schmid

This article reviews the contributions of Cynthia Edenburg, Joachim Krause and Konrad Schmid and offers further arguments for the setting of Joshua 24, a post-priestly text, in the second half of the Persian period. It also underlines the Samaritan perspective of the chapter. Indeed, the aim of Joshua 24 was to create a Hexateuch, which would have been acceptable by Judeans, Samaritans and, under certain circumstances, also for the Diaspora.

Keywords: Joshua 24, Nehemiah 9, Persian period, Samaritans, Hexateuch

The articles by Joachim J. Krause, Cynthia Edenburg and Konrad Schmid suggest a growing consensus concerning the date, composition and function of Joshua 24. The three authors agree that Joshua 24 is a “late” text from the Persian period, which, according to Schmid, clearly presupposes the Priestly texts of the Pentateuch and, according to Edenburg, the whole Pentateuch. All three agree that Joshua 24 should be understood as a compositional and literary unity notwithstanding minor additions or revisions reflected in the MT and the Greek versions. They also agree that Joshua 24 aims to create or at least suggest a Hexateuch in its attempt to relate the book of Joshua in some way to the five books of the Torah. Such agreement on Joshua 24 is all the more striking when compared to the current state of research on Joshua 23. At a panel on Joshua 23 during the 2014 Annual Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature, researchers presented a variety of conclusions concerning the date (from the seventh century to the [post-]exilic period), literary unity (one or multiple authors) and function of this text within the so-called Deuteronomistic History.

How do we explain the emergence of such a consensus? We should note that the groundwork for this consensus was paved nearly thirty years ago

with the publications on Joshua 24 by John Van Seters,¹ Erhard Blum,² and Moshe Anbar.³ We must also recognize that the three authors represent European research, to which we can associate biblical scholarship in Tel Aviv. But the framework for consensus may indeed be broader and include North American scholars. For example, in his commentary on Joshua, Richard Nelson writes the following on Joshua 24:

“Chapter 23 works well as a summary to the book of Joshua, limiting its review to the occupation of the land. Chapter 24, in contrast, seems designed as a conclusion for the Hexateuch as a whole”.⁴

This statement, as well as Nelson’s treatment of the chapter as a whole, corresponds in many ways to the results of Schmid, Edenburg and Krause. To be sure, the emerging consensus on the interpretation of Joshua 24 is not universal. The advocates of the Neo-Documentarian Hypothesis may disagree with the dating of Joshua 24, but at this point their research is unclear about whether the documents of the Pentateuch extend to the book of Joshua.⁵ Other interpreters provide clear counter arguments. Jochen Nentel, for example, eliminates all Priestly and other late passages to reconstruct an original “dtr” version of Joshua 24 that functioned as the original dtr conclusion of Joshua.⁶ Christian Frevél admits that in its final form Joshua 24 is a

1 J. Van Seters, “Joshua 24 and the Problem of Tradition in the Old Testament,” in *In the Shelter of Elyon. Essays on Ancient Palestinian Life and Literature in Honor of G. W. Ahlström* (ed. W.B. Barrick and J.R. Spencer; JSOTS 31; Trowbridge: JSOT Press, 1984), 139–158.

2 E. Blum, *Die Komposition der Vätergeschichte* (WMANT 57; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1984), 45–61.

3 M. Anbar, *Josué et l’alliance de Sichem (Josué 24:1–28)* (BET 25; Frankfurt a.M.: Peter Lang, 1992).

4 R.D. Nelson, *Joshua. A Commentary* (OTL; Louisville: 1997), 268.

5 Since J. Wellhausen, *Die Composition des Hexateuchs und der historischen Bücher des Alten Testaments* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1963 [orig. 1899]), the existence of an “old” Hexateuchal narrative was the common assumption until M. Noth invented the “Deuteronomistic History.” Interestingly, as mentioned by Krause in a footnote, the function of Joshua 24 and the question of an “old” Hexateuch is not clearly addressed by the protagonists of the “Neo-Documentarian Hypothesis.” I realized this myself at a conference in Jerusalem in May 2014, where I saw them as very hesitant in regard to this question. See on this, B. J. Schwartz, “The Pentateuchal Sources and the Former Prophets. A Neo-Documentarian Perspective,” in *The Formation of the Pentateuch. Bridging the Academic Cultures of Europe, Israel, and North America* (ed. J. C. Gertz, B. M. Levinson, D. Rom-Shiloni, and K. Schmid; FAT 111; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016), 783–793. It is noteworthy that in this article, Schwartz admits not to have reached a conclusion on this question (793).

6 J. Nentel, *Trägerschaft und Intentionen des deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerks: Untersuchungen zu den Reflexionsreden Jos 1; 23; 24; 1Sam 12 und 1Kön 8* (BZAW 297; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2000), 69–127.

late “midrash,” but he too suggests that one could reconstruct Joshua 24 as an old pre-dtr conclusion of the Hexateuch, though Frevel does not do so.⁷ Additional divergent interpretations of Joshua 24 include David M. Carr’s theory that Joshua 24 was a pre-P text that underwent “priestly wash”; but this hypothesis is a *petitio principia* that cannot be demonstrated with diachronic criteria.⁸ In spite of these counter arguments, I think that the three papers of Edenburg, Krause and Schmid do indeed reflect a trend in critical biblical scholarship that is becoming the majority view on this chapter, and personally I think that this new view of Joshua 24 constitutes progress in biblical scholarship.

Having underscored an emerging consensus in the articles of Edenburg, Krause and Schmid, one should nonetheless note the differences in their research, as well as open questions that remain. My review of their contributions will deal with the following topics: How precisely we can date Joshua 24; Joshua 24 and the question of a Hexateuch redaction; whether the focus of Joshua 24 is the Diaspora or the land; the exclusive worship of Yhwh in the land and the Diaspora alike; and finally, Joshua 24 and the materiality of the Hexateuch.

How precisely can we date Joshua 24?

The three contributions represent the difficulty in dating biblical texts. Krause and Edenburg are quite cautious in their dating of Joshua 24. Krause speaks of a text from “post-exilic times” which presupposes a “fairly fully developed proto-Pentateuch and an equally elaborate book of Joshua.” Edenburg identifies a scribe who “was familiar with the Pentateuch as well as with post-Deuteronomistic material in the Former Prophets”; she envisages a date in the late Persian or even early Hellenistic period. Pursuing a Zurich tradition, Schmid is confident about the possibility of a more precise date. He asserts that Joshua 24 must be later than P, which he dates to the

7 C. Frevel, “Deuteronomistisches Geschichtswerk oder Geschichtswerke? Die These Martin Noths zwischen Tetrateuch, Hexateuch und Enneateuch,” in *Martin Noth – aus der Sicht der heutigen Forschung* (ed. U. Rütterswörden; BThSt 58; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2004), 60–95. See also C. Frevel, “Die Wiederkehr der Hexateuchperspektive. Eine Herausforderung für die These vom deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerk,” in *Das deuteronomistische Geschichtswerk* (ed. H.-J. Stipp; ÖBS 39; Frankfurt a.M.: Peter Lang, 2011), 13–53.

8 D.M. Carr, “Strong and Weak Cases and Criteria for Establishing the Post-Priestly Character of Hexateuchal Material,” in F. Giuntoli and K. Schmid (ed.), *The Post Priestly Pentateuch* (FAT; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck), 19–34, 28–29.

early Persian period (around 515 B.C.E.), but earlier than Genesis 35, which he argues presents a negative image of Shechem, and earlier than Nehemiah 13, which views the “Samaritans” as foreigners. However, these texts are not so easy to date, forcing him to conclude that Joshua 24 “likely emerged between the end of the 6th and the 4th centuries B.C.E.” Yet one could ask whether Nehemiah 13 is necessarily a *terminus ante quem*. It could be that Nehemiah 13 and Joshua 24 present conflicting views on the integration or exclusion of the Samaritans, with the possibility that Joshua 24 critically evaluates the view in Nehemiah.

In spite of the difficulty in dating Joshua 24, I do not find the general term “post-exilic” very helpful. Referring generally to the “post-exile” as the time of composition may even be problematic, because it suggests that there was an “exile” that ended in 539 B.C.E., even though an “exilic” or Diaspora situation continued over the centuries. I would add that there may be one indication for a *terminus a quo* in Joshua 24: If *kesita* in Josh 24:32 means “money,” as advocated in most commentaries and translations, then the text of Joshua 24 could hardly be older than the 5th century, since it was only at this time that people started to use coins in Palestine.⁹

Joshua 24 and the question of a Hexateuchal-redaction

Krause, Edenburg and Schmid agree that Joshua 24 was composed in order to make the book of Joshua part of a Hexateuch. On the literary level, one must ask whether one can identify other texts belonging to such a Hexateuchal redaction. The theme of Joseph’s bones to be buried in Ephraim in Gen 50:25 and Exod 13:19 probably belongs to the same literary level as Joshua 24. These verses do not make sense in the context of the Pentateuch, but they do function well to prepare Joshua 24. Thus, Josh 24:32 marks the end of a narrative trajectory that starts in Gen 50:25¹⁰ (or even in 33:19¹¹). But the question remains whether and how one can identify other passages that would belong to the same redactional level. Eckart Otto and Reinhard Achenbach have indeed attributed many texts to a “Hexateuchal redaction,”

⁹ E. A. Knauf, *Josua* (ZBK.AT 6; Zürich: TVZ, 2008), 200.

¹⁰ In fact, the suggestion that Joseph was specifically buried in Shechem creates a link with the beginning of the Joseph story, as noted by the medieval Jewish commentator Rashi (Rabbi Solomon son of Isaac, 1040–1105): “They [Joseph’s brothers] stole him from Shechem (see Gen 37:13), and they [Joshua’s generation] returned him to Shechem.” *Rashi ad Josh. 24* (translation by M. Brettler in T. Römer and M. Z. Brettler, “Deuteronomy 34 and the Case for a Persian Hexateuch,” *JBL* 119 [2000]: 401–419, 410).

¹¹ Blum, *Die Komposition der Vätergeschichte* (see n. 2), 44–45.

especially in the books of Deuteronomy and Numbers.¹² But what about the book of Joshua? Krause focuses in particular on this question. According to him, the answer is negative. He detects several post-dtr passages and also Priestly reworking, especially in Joshua 2; Joshua 3–4; and Joshua 5 and 7. These texts would reflect local additions and reworking, but they “offer no evidence for the hand of Joshua 24 nor for any other comprehensive Hexateuchal redaction.” Therefore he concludes one should not understand Joshua 24 as an “attempt to ... delimit the Hexateuch as a discrete literary work.” This raises the question about the function of Joshua 24. In a sense, Krause’s position comes close to Schmid’s idea that Joshua 24 was constructed as a hinge inside the Enneateuch in order to delimit a salvation history in the books of Genesis–Joshua and a history of doom in Judges–Kings.¹³ But Schmid emphasizes a concrete, theological-political claim of that chapter to which I will return below.

Before responding to Schmid’s interpretation, I will comment briefly on Krause’s statement that there are no texts in the book of Joshua that would belong to the same literary level as Joshua 24. It has often been observed that Joshua 24 presents the character of Joshua as a second Moses. Like Moses in Deuteronomy, he holds a farewell speech in which he recapitulates major events from the foregoing history until the time of the conquest. In verse 26 he writes “these words” (הַדְּבָרִים הָאֵלֶּה) in a book, an expression that may recall the opening of Deuteronomy (הָאֵלֶּה הַדְּבָרִים). Like Moses, Joshua concludes a covenant; enacts laws and decrees (v. 25); raises a stone; and writes a scroll (v. 26: “and Joshua wrote all the words in the scroll of the law of God”). One should therefore ask whether Joshua’s vision in Josh 5:13–15, which creates another parallel between Joshua and Moses (in alluding to Moses’ call in Exod 3:5), could not belong to the same literary level as Joshua 24:

Take off your sandal from your foot.
Indeed, the place where you are standing
is holy (Josh 5:15)

Take off your sandals from your feet.
Indeed, the place where you are standing
is holy ground (Exod 3:5)

12 E. Otto, *Das Deuteronomium im Pentateuch und Hexateuch. Studien zur Literaturgeschichte von Pentateuch und Hexateuch im Lichte des Deuteronomiumsrahmens* (FAT 30; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000); R. Achenbach, *Die Vollendung der Tora: Studien zur Redaktionsgeschichte des Numeribuches im Kontext von Hexateuch und Pentateuch* (Beihfte der Zeitschrift für altorientalische und biblische Rechtsgeschichte 3; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2003). It should be noted however that in his recent commentary on Deuteronomy, Otto is much more cautious in regards to the distinction between Hexateuchal and Pentateuchal redactors.

13 See already K. Schmid, *Erzväter und Exodus. Untersuchungen zur doppelten Begründung der Ursprünge Israels innerhalb der Geschichtsbücher des Alten Testaments* (WMANT 81; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1999), 209–230.

Krause rightly observes in this passage that “Joshua appears as a ‘new Moses,’” but this is exactly what happens also in Joshua 24. In a Hexateuchal context the appearance of the divine warrior in Josh 5:13 can also be understood as fulfilling the promise made in Exod 23:20: “I am going to send an angel in front of you, to guard you on the way and to bring you to the place that I have prepared.” One aim of Josh 5:13–15 is to connect the book of Joshua as narrowly as possible with the preceding Pentateuch.

In regard to the scene about the circumcision of the second generation in Josh 5:2–9, I cannot be as assertive as Krause, who states that the theological perspective of this passage is different from that in Joshua 24. It is true that Joshua 24 does not allude to the refusal of the conquest, which is narrated in Numbers 13–14 and Deuteronomy 1, but this may also be explained with the different function of the historical summary in this chapter, where the aim of Joshua’s discourse is to present all the good things that Yhwh did for Israel contrary to the “other gods” that the audience should reject. Interestingly, the link between Joshua 5 and Joshua 24 appears very clearly in the Greek version of Joshua’s funeral in 24:30–32.¹⁴ This version, which apparently was also known at Qumran,¹⁵ might reflect (even if the text were later reworked) the original ending of the Hexateuch, since it emphasizes the role of Joshua: “They placed there with him ... the stone swords by which he circumcised the sons of Israel in Galgal, when he led them out from Egypt as Lord ordained for them.”¹⁶ The fact that Joshua appears as the leader of the exodus can again be explained by the attempt to characterize Joshua as a second Moses.

Edenburg has drawn our attention to the fact that Joshua 24 does not contain “any mention of an altar or a ceremonial meal accompanied by sacrifice. Instead, the covenant is solemnly conducted by erecting a standing stone as witness to the people’s choice.” In a footnote, she refers to Joshua 22. There are indeed quite a few important parallels between Josh 22:7–34 and Joshua 24. In both texts, the present generation is mentioned together with the fathers (22:8//24:5–7,17); an altar appears as a witness (22:28//24:27); and the priest Phinehas and his father Eleazar play a central role (22:32//24:32). Both texts also employ Priestly vocabulary and ideas.¹⁷ Therefore, one could follow the suggestion of Stephen Chapman, who attributed Josh 22:7–34 to

14 For this text see also the contribution of Ville Mäkipelto in this volume.

15 B. Lucassen, “Josua, Richter und CD,” *RQ* 18 (1998), 373–396.

16 A. G. Auld, *Joshua. Jesus Son Of Naué in Codex Vaticanus* (Septuagint Commentary Series; Leiden: Brill, 2005), 83.

17 C. G. den Hertog, “Der geschichtliche Hintergrund der Erzählung Jos 22,” in *Saxa loquentur. Studien zur Archäologie Palästinas/Israels. Festschrift für Volkmar Fritz zum 65. Geburtstag* (ed. C. G. den Hertog, U. Hübner and S. Mürger; AOAT 302; Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2003), 61–83.

the same literary level as Joshua 24.¹⁸ If we could attribute at least parts of Joshua 5 and 22 to a “Hexateuchal level,” Joshua 24 would not be an “erratic bloc” in the book of Joshua.

The aim of Josh 24: Diaspora or the land?

Another important question running through these studies of Joshua 24 has to do with its function. Was Joshua 24 added to conclude the first part of the Enneateuch or perhaps to clarify the boundaries of “salvation history” in a larger Deuteronomistic History that began with the book of Exodus? Or can we detect a more precise aim, as suggested by Edenburg and Schmid?

According to Schmid, Joshua 24 was written to promote a theocratic constitution for all Israel in a time when Samaria and Judah had already been independent provinces for some time. In this case, the aim of Joshua 24 is to integrate Samaria or the North into Israel, an objective also found in the books of Chronicles where the focus, however, is clearly on Jerusalem. Evidence for separate centers of authority requiring integration may be supported by the letters of the Judean community in Elephantine, which were addressed to the governors of Judah and Samaria and which show that the relationship between the authorities at Jerusalem and mount Gerizim was understood not in terms of competition but in collaboration.¹⁹ But the question remains about the point of view of Joshua 24. Is the perspective of Joshua 24 still a Judean one? According to Schmid, the exhortation to an exclusive worship of Yhwh is broader than a Judean perspective, since the text is addressed to all Israel, the North and the South alike.

Edenburg understands Joshua 24 to be written from a Judean Jerusalemite perspective, and she offers two possible explanations. One option is that Joshua 24 could be an attempt to accept that there are Yahwistic Diaspora communities and to “[encourage] them to choose Yahweh and maintain their separate identity among a multicultural populace in the Eastern Diaspora.” The other option is that Joshua’s discourse in chapter 24 may aim at including Samaritan Yhwh worshippers in the scriptural tradition by the construction of a common history which, at the same time, is an attempt to interpret the Samaritan cult site as a place of commemoration and not of

18 S. B. Chapman, *The Law and the Prophets: A Study in Old Testament Canon Formation* (FAT 27; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000), 176.

19 G. Granerød, *Dimensions of Yahwism in the Persian Period: Studies in the Religion and Society of the Judaean community at Elephantine* (BZAW 488; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2016), 41–44.

sacrifices, in the same way as the cultic site in the Transjordan (cf. Joshua 22). Edenburg concedes that it is also possible that the scribe who authored this conclusion of the Joshua scroll had both ideas in mind.

Edenburg's interpretation raises the question of whether Joshua 24 also betrays a Diaspora perspective. In relation to this topic, one should recall a short but important article by Ehud Ben Zvi,²⁰ in which he draws attention to the concluding works of the five books of the Torah, which shows that, in the Pentateuch, the book of Genesis has a specific status. The endings of Exodus and Deuteronomy are constructed in a parallel way, as well as those of Leviticus and Numbers. By adding the ending of Joshua, then, one could postulate a certain parallel with the book of Genesis: Genesis ends with Joseph's death and funeral in Egypt, Joshua with the death of Joshua and of Eleazar, both of whom are buried in the mountains of Ephraim.

Gen 50:26: And Joseph died, *being one hundred ten years old*; he was embalmed and placed in a coffin **in Egypt**.

Exod 40:38: For the cloud of Yhwh was on the tabernacle ... **before the eyes of all the house of Israel** at each stage of their journey.

Lev 27:34: **These are the commandments that Yhwh gave to Moses for the people of Israel** on Mount Sinai.

Num 36:13: **These are the commandments and the ordinances that Yhwh commanded through Moses to the Israelites** in the plains of Moab by the Jordan at Jericho.

Deut 34:12: and for all the mighty deeds and all the terrifying displays of power that Moses performed **before the eyes of all Israel**.

²⁰ E. Ben Zvi, "The Closing Words of the Pentateuchal Books: A Clue for the Historical Status of the Book of Genesis within the Pentateuch," *BN* 62 (1992), 7–10.

Josh 24:29 After these things Joshua son of Nun, the servant of Yhwh, died, *being one hundred ten years old.*

24:30 They buried him in ... **in the hill country of Ephraim,**

24:32 ¶ The bones of Joseph, which the Israelites had brought up from Egypt, were buried at **Shechem,**

24,33: Eleazar son of Aaron died; and they buried him ... **in the hill country of Ephraim.**

The literary pattern indicates a clear intention at the end of Joshua 24 to link Joshua's death with the figure and fate of Joseph at the end of the book of Genesis. Both die at the age of 110, and both are buried in the mountains of Ephraim. Whereas Genesis 50 ends "in Egypt," Joshua 24 ends in the mountains of Ephraim. Both book-endings emphasize a literary unity running from Genesis to Joshua. The parallels between Genesis 50 and Joshua 24 also indicate that the first and the last books of the Hexateuch would include the Egyptian Diaspora (represented by Joseph), and the last book would include people living in Ephraim.

But can we say that Joshua 24 promotes a Diaspora perspective? The plot of a Hexateuch delimited by Joshua 24 is undoubtedly the possession of the land. This is clear also in Joshua's final discourse, which ends with Yhwh's gift of the land to the addressees. The hexateuchal narration starts with the divine promise in the land in Genesis and ends with the fulfillment of this promise in Joshua. In this respect, the end of the Pentateuch in Deuteronomy 34 seems to be a more Diaspora-oriented text. The Torah ends with a non-fulfillment. Moses is allowed to see the Promised Land but he cannot enter it. He dies outside the land in the plains of Moab, where Yhwh himself buries him. One can understand this text as constructing Moses as a figure of identification for people living in the Diaspora. The important thing according to Deuteronomy 34 is not to live in the land, but to live and to die according to Yhwh's will and his Torah. Joshua 24, however, insists on the given land and the necessity to practice in this land the exclusive worship of Yhwh.

The exclusive worship of Yhwh: in the land and in the Diaspora

Schmid underlines how, not only on the narrative level, but also on the intended audience's level, the author of Joshua's farewell speech insists on the worship of Yhwh alone and the rejection of other "foreign" deities. As I have shown elsewhere, the closest parallel to Joshua's historical recapitulation can be found in Nehemiah's prayer in Nehemiah 9.²¹ The major difference between both texts is the fact that Joshua's speech is framed by the reference to the "fathers" serving other gods "beyond" the river (in Mesopotamia) and in Egypt.

The "fathers" beyond the River served other gods (2)

Abraham, Isaac, Esau, Jacob, Descent to Egypt (3–4)	Gen 12–50
(Moses/Aaron) Plagues and Exodus (5–7a)	Exod 7–14
Wilderness (7b)	Exod 16–18*, Num?
Conquest of Transjordan territories (8)	Num 21
Balak und Balaam (9–10)	Num 22–24
Crossing of the Jordan (11a)	Josh 3–4
Victory against the people living in the land (11b–12)	Josh 6–12
Divine gift of the land (13)	Josh 13–19? (//Deut 6; Neh 9)

Exhortation to put away the god the "fathers" served beyond the River, in Egypt; gods of the Amorites (14–15)

The identification of the "fathers" in Josh 24:2 as "Terah, the father of Abraham and the father of Nahor" is grammatically awkward and thus often considered to be a gloss to emphasize that Abraham was not included among the polytheistic fathers. But even without this addition, v. 2 seems to presuppose a tradition that is fully developed in the book of Jubilees (chap. 12), where Terah is forced by the habitants of Ur to worship idols.

In Josh 24:14–15, the worship of other gods is extended from Mesopotamia to Egypt. Here we can indeed make a link with the documents from Elephantine, which mention the veneration of Yahô, Anat and Ashim-

21 T. Römer, "The Problem of the Hexateuch," in *The Formation of the Pentateuch: Bridging the Academic Cultures of Europe, Israel and North America* (ed. J.C. Gertz, B.M. Levinson, D. Rom-Shiloni, and K. Schmid; FAT 111; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016), 813–827, 824–825. See already T. Römer, *Israels Väter: Untersuchungen zur Väterthematik im Deuteronomium und in der deuteronomistischen Tradition* (OBO 99; Freiburg: Universitätsverlag, 1990), 326–327.

Bethel, so that the mention of the “other gods” in Egypt could refer to the syncretistic cult of the Elephantine community.²² Interestingly, Jeremiah 44 criticizes the Egyptian Diaspora in the Delta for worshipping a goddess named “Queen of Heaven.” The second part of 2 Kings 17, which probably originated in the time of Ezra and Nehemiah,²³ also provides a negative description of the cultic practices of the population living in the territory of the former kingdom of Israel:

“So they worshiped Yhwh but also served their own gods, after the manner of the nations from among whom they had been carried away

These nations worshiped Yhwh, but also served their carved images; to this day their children and their children’s children continue to do as their fathers did” (2 Kgs 17:33, 41).

This text is polemical and written from a Southern Judean perspective. Its concern appears to be similar to Joshua 24, which also exhorts the audience to put away the gods their father served. 2 Kings 17:41 even ends with the accusation that the inhabitants of Samaria still behave religiously as their fathers did.

The expression “gods of the Amorites” in Josh 24:15 provides further insight into the author’s religiously exclusive perspective, as well as into the literary function of Joshua 24 in the Hexateuch. In the Hebrew Bible the term “Amorites” is used in various ways. It sometimes designate the populations living in the land to be conquered by the Israelites, but, in other texts, it designates the population living in Transjordan. Yet in other passages within the book of Joshua, it signifies the population in the Promised land. But none of these texts mentions their gods. In Gen 15:16, Yhwh informs Abraham about the return of the fourth generation in the land, and concludes that the “iniquity of the Amorite is not yet complete (*shalem*).” We may have here an allusion to Jerusalem (*shalem*), especially when we link this text to Ezek 16:45, where the father of Jerusalem is called an “Amorite.” When Joshua 24 is read in relation to these texts, the gods of the Amorites may designate deities worshipped in Jerusalem or more broadly in Judea and Samaria, deities that the author of Joshua 24 wishes to ban. In this case, Joshua 24 could be understood as an attempt to enforce an exclusive Yhwh worship in Judaea, Samaria and the Diaspora. Such an exhortation would fit

22 For the relevant Elephantine texts see P. Grelot, *Documents araméens d’Égypte* (LAPÖ; Paris: Cerf, 1972), 463–499. On the syncretism in Elephantine, see A. Joisten-Pruschke, *Das religiöse Leben der Juden von Elephantine in der Achämenidenzeit* (Göttinger Orientforschungen Reihe 3, Iranica. NF 2; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2008), 88–95.

23 M. Kartveit, “The Date of II Reg 17,24–41,” *ZAW* (2014): 31–44.

the conclusion of a Hexateuch, which narrates the origins of Israel in relation to Yhwh's promises to the fathers and their fulfillment in the land. This conclusion brings us back for the last time to the question of the nature of the Hexateuch that Joshua 24 tries to construct.

Joshua 24 and the materiality of the Hexateuch

The general consensus is that Joshua 24 is a scribal attempt either at subdividing the Enneateuch into a "Hexateuch" and the history of the two monarchies or at adding a text to the Torah that recognizes Yhwh-worship by the Samaritans and the Diaspora. However, I wonder whether we should not imagine behind Joshua 24 a concrete attempt to add the book of Joshua to the scrolls of the Torah. With Marc Brettler, I have argued that there was indeed a conflict in the middle or second half of the Persian period between a Pentateuch- and a Hexateuch-party, in which the Hexateuch-party revised the scrolls of the Torah to make the scroll of Joshua the ending of Israel's foundation story.²⁴

Several arguments support this idea. First, the book of Joshua as it now stands has a double ending. Whereas Joshua 23 concludes the (last) deuteronomistic edition of the book, Joshua 24 recalls events starting with the time of the Patriarchs. There are other cases of double book endings in the Hebrew Bible that also reflect efforts to delimit different literary units. A prime example is the case of the two endings in Malachi 3 (Eng. Mal 3:1–18 and 4:1–6).²⁵ The original ending of the scroll of Malachi is to be found in 3:19–21, a passage that announces Yhwh's judgment and the defeat of the wicked. To this ending is added a new conclusion in 3:22–24, which is structured in a parallel way because it also ends with the possibility that Yhwh will strike the land. This new conclusion was created in order to relate the Prophets to the Torah. The opening of Mal 3:22 MT (4:6 LXX, "Remember the Torah of Moses, my servant, that I commanded him for all Israel") alludes to the insert in Josh 1:7–9 so that the two passages frame the *Nebi'im*. This new conclusion underlines that, at least until the eschatological return of Elijah, the Mosaic Torah is absolutely normative.

In contrast to the ending of Malachi 3, Joshua 24 is intended to construct a Torah that includes the scroll of Joshua. As Schmid reminds us, the setting

²⁴ Römer and Brettler, "Deuteronomy 34."

²⁵ See also the double ending of the book of Leviticus in Leviticus 26 and Leviticus 27.

of Joshua 24 in Shechem has often been explained in reference to 1 Kings 12, the place of the division of “Israel” into two kingdoms.²⁶ The pan-Israelite perspective of Joshua 24 (v. 1 mentions “all tribes”) could then be understood as a counter-program to the failure of kingship: Israel’s unity does not depend on political institutions such as the monarchy, but rather on a Torah. Of course, as Edenburg and Schmid have pointed out, Shechem also alludes to the sanctuary in Gerizim that had existed since the Persian period. But the place Shechem also frames the Hexateuch: Joshua 24 refers back to Gen 12:6–7, where, upon arriving in the land, Abram settles and builds an altar for Yhwh next to the holy oak²⁷ of Shechem. Similarly, Joshua takes a large stone “and sets it up there under the oak in the sanctuary of Yhwh” (24:26). As Schmid puts it, “Joshua 24 thus constructs a narrative arc back to Genesis 12. The promulgation of the law in Shechem takes place at the same location where the first cultic place for Yhwh was set up in the land.”

This literary strategy is comparable to that of the Pentateuchal redactor, who in Deuteronomy 34 mentions the land promised to the Patriarchs (v. 4), in order to refer back to the Patriarchal narratives in the book of Genesis.

Finally, as Krause has reminded us, the rare expression *spr trt 'lhym* (see also Neh 8:18) was possibly coined as an alternative to the term *trt mšh*, which in the Persian period became a name for the nascent Pentateuch. One could indeed argue that “the book of the Torah of Elohim” was coined as a designation for the Hexateuch. I would therefore agree with scholars such as Rainer Albertz, Otto and others that the book of the Torah of Elohim represents a “real attempt” to promulgate the Torah as a Hexateuch.²⁸ As is well known, this attempt failed and the book of Joshua became the first “deuterocanonical” book in relationship to the Pentateuchal Torah. However the texts that the Hexateuch redactor inserted throughout the first six books of the Bible succeeded in creating a close relationship between Joshua and the Pentateuch. In the Samaritan tradition one can mention the “Samaritan book of Joshua,”²⁹ and in a Christian context the “Old English Hexateuch,”

26 C. Levin, *Die Verheissung des neuen Bundes in ihrem theologieggeschichtlichen Zusammenhang ausgelegt* (FRLANT 137; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1985), 116–118; and Anbar, *Josué*, 117.

27 According to LXX. The plural in the MT is a later, dogmatic correction.

28 See for instance R. Albertz, *Exodus 1–18* (ZB.AT 2.1; Zürich: TVZ, 2012), 24–25; Otto, *Deuteronomium*, 230–232, 244–247; see also R. Achenbach, “Pentateuch, Hexateuch und Enneateuch. Eine Verhältnisbestimmung,” *ZAR* 11 (2005): 122–154.

29 J. A. D. Crown, “Book of Joshua,” in *A Companion to Samaritan Studies* (ed. A. D. Crown, R. Pummer and A. Tal; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1993), 42–43.

a work from the 11th century.³⁰ These examples indicate the continuing impact of Joshua 24 on the interpretation of the larger literary context of the book of Joshua as the continuation of the Pentateuch, an interpretation that has persisted in critical biblical scholarship from the 19th century to today.

Thomas Römer
Collège de France (UMR 7192) – PSL – University of Lausanne
11 place Marcelin Berthelot
F 75005 Paris
France

³⁰ B. C. Withers, *The Illustrated Old English Hexateuch, Cotton Ms. Claudius B. iv: the Frontier of Seeing and Reading in Anglo-Saxon England* (Studies in Book and Print Culture; London: British Library, 2007).

Ville Mäkipelto

The Four Deaths of Joshua: Why the Septuagint is Pivotal for the Study of Joshua 24

The article reconstructs the textual growth of the death and burial accounts of Joshua (Josh 24:28–31, Judg 2:6–9) in the light of documented evidence preserved in the LXX and the MT. It is argued that LXX Josh 24:28–31 generally preserves the earliest extant version from which the others have been edited to various new contexts. The article then discusses some implications of this reconstruction for literary and redaction criticism of Josh 24. Since redaction critics often neglect the LXX as a witness to an earlier Hebrew text, untenable conclusions have been advanced about the compositional history of Josh 24.

Keywords: Book of Joshua, Book of Judges, Septuagint, Textual history, Editorial history

1. Introduction

There are four differing accounts of the death and burial of Joshua in the textual witnesses to the Hebrew Bible. These are found in the Septuagint (LXX) and Masoretic (MT) versions of Josh 24:28–31 and Judg 2:6–9. The accounts are textually dependent on each other since they share the majority of their material word for word.¹ A comparison of these four accounts, however, reveals several important differences, which illuminate the textual growth of the pericope. In this study, I seek to reconstruct this textual de-

¹ These texts have been compared by several scholars as part of their larger studies, with no emerging consensus. See, for example, A. G. Auld, “Judges I and History: A Reconsideration,” *VT* 25 (1975): 261–285; H. N. Rösel, “Die Überleitungen vom Josua ins Richterbuch,” *VT* 30 (1980): 342–350; A. Rofé, “The End of the Book of Joshua,” *Henoch* 4 (1982): 21; W. T. Koopmans, *Joshua 24 as Poetic Narrative* (JSOTSup 93; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990), 363–369; D. Jericke, “Josuas Tod und Josuas Grab. Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Studie,” *ZAW* 108 (1996): 347–361. At this point, it is important to compare the four versions in their own right without letting their larger contexts in Joshua–Judges play too much of a role in the textual analysis. Moreover, it has not yet been sufficiently discussed how the data available from the text-critical parallel versions could affect the methods of literary and redaction criticism.

velopment. In addition, I will consider the implications of this text-critical reconstruction for literary (*Literarkritik*) and redaction criticism, since their practitioners have often overlooked the text-critical finding that the LXX in many cases reflects earlier Hebrew versions.² Even though this study is based on a limited number of verses, it can be argued that a reliable model of the compositional history of Joshua 24 cannot be reconstructed without taking the LXX into account.³

The structure of this study is threefold. First, some initial remarks will be given on the LXX versions of the pericopes in order to draw conclusions about their Hebrew *Vorlagen*. Second, a text-critical evaluation of the four traditions will be performed. This will result in a hypothesis on their relationship and development. Finally, some implications for using the text-critical analysis of this pericope in literary and redaction criticism will be considered. It will be argued that textual criticism of Joshua 24 overlaps in many instances with literary and redaction criticism and that they should not be treated separately.

2. The LXX as a witness to a variant Hebrew text

In studying the early history of the Hebrew text, the usage of the LXX versions of Joshua and Judges is challenged by the absence of a critical *Göttingen* edition of either one. In Joshua, the Old Greek (OG) text is quite often found in Codex Vaticanus (B) and other manuscripts (most notably 120 129) be-

2 A neglect of the LXX is seen, for example, in the early commentary by M. Noth, *Das Buch Josua* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1938), 105–110. A recent example is an article by E. Aurelius, “Zur Entstehung von Josua 23–24,” in *Houses Full of All Good Things: Essays in Memory of Timo Veijola* (ed. J. Pakkala and M. Nissinen; Helsinki: Finnish Exegetical Society, 2008), 95–114. In Aurelius’ study, only one LXX variant is accepted as preserving an earlier Hebrew text. Also the monograph by M. N. van der Meer, *Formation & Reformulation: The Redaction of the Book of Joshua in the Light of the Oldest Textual Witnesses* (VTSup 102; Leiden: Brill, 2004) should be noted. There a redaction-critical model based on the MT is kept strictly apart from the analysis of the textual witnesses. Such a separation is not, in my opinion, methodologically justifiable as I will attempt to show in this study. The study by van der Meer does not, however, deal with chapter 24. More on the neglect of the LXX in redaction criticism, see K. De Troyer, “Which Text Are We Using For Our Studies of Deuteronomistic Literature?” in *Congress Volume Helsinki 2010* (VTSup 148; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 461–472.

3 This article stems from my research project in which the evidence from the various textual witnesses of Joshua 24 and related texts will be integrated into a literary and redaction critical discussion. The results of my research will be available in my monograph: V. Mäkipelto, “Uncovering Ancient Editing: Documented Evidence of Changes in Josh 24 and Related Text” (University of Helsinki dissertation, 2018).

longing to the same group.⁴ Joshua 24:28–31 as given in the edition of Rahlfs is, in my judgment, a good estimation of the OG text.⁵ In Judges, the B-text and other manuscripts in the same group are in many instances influenced by the so-called *kaige* revision.⁶ The so-called Antiochian manuscripts are usually held to be the best witnesses for the OG.⁷ Judges 2:6–9 presents no such differences in the manuscripts of the LXX that would affect the reconstruction of its Hebrew *Vorlage* in instances where the four versions differ. Thus, the text of Rahlfs is a suitable starting point for this study.⁸

The translation techniques of Joshua and Judges vary. Seppo Sipilä has concluded that the translation technique of Joshua is situated between literalness and freedom while the LXX translation of Judges is quite literal.⁹ The freedom of the LXX Joshua translator is seen mainly in the flexibility in using varying translation equivalents for recurring Hebrew expressions and some grammatical structures.¹⁰ In our pericope, both translations quite faithfully present the components in their Hebrew *Vorlagen*.

Based on what we know so far of the translation technique of Joshua and Judges, it is important to highlight that the translators would not have intro-

-
- 4 On this consensus see, for example, L. Greenspoon, *Textual Studies in the Book of Joshua* (HSM 28; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1983) and C. G. den Hertog, *Studien zur griechischen Übersetzung des Buches Josua* (Gießen: Justus-Liebig-Universität Dissertation, 1996). These MSS are, however, not free from errors and revisions and ideally every reading should be evaluated on a case by case basis.
- 5 This is corroborated by the early critical edition by M. L. Margolis, *The Book of Joshua in Greek: According to the Critically Restored Text with an Apparatus Containing the Variants of the Principal Recensions and of the Individual Witnesses, Part V: Joshua 19:39–24:33* (Philadelphia: Annenberg Research Institute, 1992), 469–471 which is in these verses almost identical to the text of Rahlfs. It suggests only two corrections in the correct case of two proper names. These have, however, no implications for our study and will not be discussed here.
- 6 *Kaige* refers to early Jewish revisional activity, from the first century B. C. E. onwards, which aimed at bringing the Greek text closer to its Hebrew reference text. For *kaige* and other recensional developments in Judges, see W. R. Bodine, *Greek Text of Judges: Recensional Developments* (HSM 23; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1980).
- 7 See, for example, J. M. Dines, *The Septuagint* (London: T&T Clark, 2004), 17 and J. Trebelle Barrera, “Textual Variants in Joshua – Kings Involving the Terms ‘People’ and ‘Israel,’” in *In the Footsteps of Sherlock Holmes: Studies in the Biblical Text in Honour of Anneli Aejmelaeus* (ed. K. De Troyer, T. M. Law and M. Liljeström; Leuven: Peeters, 2014), 232.
- 8 However, A- and B-texts preserve a different version of verse 6. There, the OG-text is probably found in A but the matter is not yet settled.
- 9 Sipilä, *Between*, 193–212. Similarly also R. Sollamo, “Joosuan kirjan Septuagina-käännöksen luonteesta,” *TA* 92 (1987): 191–198.
- 10 C. G. den Hertog, “Jesus. Josue / Das Buch Josua,” in *Septuaginta Deutsch. Erläuterungen und Kommentare. Band 1: Genesis bis 4. Makkabäer* (ed. M. Karrer and W. Kraus; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft), 608–610.

duced significant changes in relation to their *Vorlagen*. Hence, the most radical differences between the LXX and the MT (e. g. relocations, rewritings, omissions, large additions) cannot be attributed to the translator without exceptionally good reasons.¹¹ It seems that the Hebrew texts in front of the translators of LXX Josh 24:28–31 and Judg 2:6–10 can be deduced with a good degree of certainty. These four verses use such common expressions and represent such literal translations that it seems highly probable that the major differences in relation to the MT were already present in their Hebrew *Vorlagen* and not introduced by the Greek translator.

3. The textual growth of the passage

There are several minor and major differences between the four versions of Joshua's death and burial. Firstly, the order in MT Josh 24:28–31 differs from the three other witnesses as the verse reporting the fidelity of the Israelites is situated after Joshua's death. Secondly, there is unique material in LXX Josh 24:31a reporting the burial of the flint knives and highlighting Joshua's active role as a leader in the exodus. Thirdly, the first verse differs in several details among all four versions. All of the variants are demonstrated in the table below.¹²

<i>Josh 24:28–31 (MT)</i> ¹²	<i>Josh 24:28–31 (LXX)</i>	<i>Judg 2:6–9 (MT)</i>	<i>Judg 2:6–9 (LXX A)</i>
28 28	28	6	6
וַיִּשְׁלַח יְהוֹשֻׁעַ	καὶ ἀπέστειλεν Ἰησοῦς	וַיִּשְׁלַח יְהוֹשֻׁעַ	Καὶ ἐξάπεστειλεν Ἰησοῦς
אֶת־הָעָם	τὸν λαόν,	אֶת־הָעָם	τὸν λαόν,
	<u>καὶ ἐπορεύθησαν</u>	וַיִּלְכוּ	<u>καὶ ἀπῆλθαν</u>
		<u>בְּנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל</u>	<u>οἱ υἱοὶ Ἰσραηλ</u> ¹³

11 This point is aptly emphasized by Greenspoon, *Textual*, 379: “The OG translator rendered, to the best of his considerable abilities, the Hebrew text that lay before him. His knowledge of Hebrew and his fidelity to that Hebrew are to be rated far higher than the derogatory comments of some previous scholars would allow.” See also E. Tov, “Literary Development of the Book of Joshua as Reflected in the MT, the LXX, and 4QJosh^a,” in *The Book of Joshua* (ed. E. Noort; Leuven: Peeters, 2012), 66–67.

12 In this study, plusses are plusses are underlined and differently formulated expressions are printed with a grey background. The words with no markings are similar in all of the four witnesses. Variation caused by the choices of different translation equivalents are not noted. As we compare four different texts, all the intricacies of the relationships of the texts cannot be displayed in the table.

13 “The sons of Israel” is missing from the B-text and some other Greek MSS. While the B-text seems to otherwise correct its reading of v. 6 towards the Hebrew text, the miss-

<i>Josh 24:28–31 (MT)</i>	<i>Josh 24:28–31 (LXX)</i>	<i>Judg 2:6–9 (MT)</i>	<i>Judg 2:6–9 (LXX A)</i>
אִישׁ לְנַחֲלָתוֹ	ἕκαστος εἰς τὸν τόπον αὐτοῦ.	אִישׁ לְנַחֲלָתוֹ	ἕκαστος εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰς τὴν κληρονο- μίαν αὐτοῦ τοῦ κατακληρονο- μῆσαι τὴν γῆν.
29 καὶ ἐλάτρευσεν Ἰσραηλ τῷ κυρίῳ πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας Ἰησοῦ καὶ πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας τῶν πρεσβυτέρων, ὅσοι ἐφείλκυσαν τὸν χρόνον μετὰ Ἰησοῦ καὶ ὅσοι εἶδσαν πάντα τὰ ἔργα κυρίου, ὅσα ἐποίησεν τῷ Ἰσραηλ.	7 7 καὶ ἐδούλευσεν ὁ λαὸς τῷ κυρίῳ πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας Ἰησοῦ καὶ πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας τῶν πρεσβυτέρων, ὅσοι ἐμακροημέ- ρευσαν μετὰ Ἰησοῦν, ὅσοι ἔγνωσαν πάν τὸ ἔργον κυρίου τὸ μέγα, ὃ ἐποίησεν τῷ Ἰσραηλ.	7 7 καὶ ἐδούλευσεν ὁ λαὸς τῷ κυρίῳ πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας Ἰησοῦ καὶ πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας τῶν πρεσβυτέρων, ὅσοι ἐμακροημέ- ρευσαν μετὰ Ἰησοῦν, ὅσοι ἔγνωσαν πάν τὸ ἔργον κυρίου τὸ μέγα, ὃ ἐποίησεν τῷ Ἰσραηλ.	7 7 καὶ ἐδούλευσεν ὁ λαὸς τῷ κυρίῳ πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας Ἰησοῦ καὶ πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας τῶν πρεσβυτέρων, ὅσοι ἐμακροημέ- ρευσαν μετὰ Ἰησοῦν, ὅσοι ἔγνωσαν πάν τὸ ἔργον κυρίου τὸ μέγα, ὃ ἐποίησεν τῷ Ἰσραηλ.
29 וַיְהִי אַחֲרֵי הַדְּבָרִים הָאֵלֶּה וַיָּמָת יְהוֹשֻׁעַ בְּנֵנוּן עֶבֶד יְהוָה בְּנִימָאָה וָעֶשְׂרֵי שָׁנִים	30 Καὶ ἐγένετο μετ’ ἐκεῖνα καὶ ἀπέθαιεν Ἰησοῦς υἱὸς Ναυη δούλος κυρίου ἑκατὸν δέκα ἑτῶν.	8 8 וַיָּמָת יְהוֹשֻׁעַ בְּנֵנוּן עֶבֶד יְהוָה בְּנִימָאָה וָעֶשְׂרֵי שָׁנִים	8 8 καὶ ἐτελεύτησεν Ἰησοῦς υἱὸς Ναυη δούλος κυρίου υἱὸς ἑκατὸν δέκα ἑτῶν.
30 וַיִּקְבְּרוּ אֹתוֹ בְּגִבּוֹל נַחֲלָתוֹ בְּתַמְנַת־סָרַח אֲשֶׁר בְּהַר־אֶפְרַיִם	31 καὶ ἔθαψαν αὐτὸν πρὸς τοῖς ὀρίοις τοῦ κλήρου αὐτοῦ ἐν Θαμναθασαχαρά ἐν τῷ ὄρει τῷ Εφραιμ	9 9 וַיִּקְבְּרוּ אוֹתוֹ בְּגִבּוֹל נַחֲלָתוֹ בְּתַמְנַת־סָרַח בְּהַר אֶפְרַיִם	9 9 καὶ ἔθαψαν αὐτὸν ἐν ὀρίῳ τῆς κληρονομίας αὐτοῦ ἐν Θαμναθαρες ἐν ὄρει Εφραιμ

ing of “the sons of Israel” might be a feature of the OG. The matter, however, does not need to be settled here.

<i>Josh 24:28–31 (MT)</i>	<i>Josh 24:28–31 (LXX)</i>	<i>Judg 2:6–9 (MT)</i>	<i>Judg 2:6–9 (LXX A)</i>
מִצְפֹּן לְהִרְגָעֵשׁ	ἀπὸ βορρᾶ τοῦ ὄρους Γααζ·	מִצְפֹּן לְהִרְגָעֵשׁ	ἀπὸ βορρᾶ τοῦ ὄρους Γααζ·

31a
 ἐκεῖ ἔθηκαν μετ’
 αὐτοῦ
 εἰς τὸ μνημα,
 εἰς ὃ ἔθαψαν αὐτὸν
 ἐκεῖ,
 τὰς μαχαίρας τὰς
 πετρίνας,
 ἐν αἷς περιέτεμεν
 τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἰσραηλ
 ἐν Γαλγαλοῖς, ὅτε
 ἐξήγαγεν
 αὐτοὺς ἐξ Αἰγύπτου,
 καθὰ συνέταξεν
 αὐτοῖς κύριος, καὶ ἐκεῖ
 εἰσιν ἕως τῆς σήμερον
 ἡμέρας.

31
 וַיַּעֲבֹד יִשְׂרָאֵל
 אֶת־יְהוָה
 כָּל־יְמֵי יְהוֹשֻׁעַ
 וְכָל־יְמֵי
 הַזְּקֵנִים
 אֲשֶׁר הָאָרִיכוּ יָמִים
 אַחֲרֵי יְהוֹשֻׁעַ
 וְאֲשֶׁר יָדְעוּ
 אֵת כָּל־מַעֲשֵׂה
 יְהוָה
 אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה לְיִשְׂרָאֵל

<i>Josh 24:28–31 (MT)</i> ¹⁴	<i>Josh 24:28–31 (LXX)</i>	<i>Judg 2:6–9 (MT)</i>	<i>Judg 2:6–9 (LXX)</i>
28. And Joshua sent away the people	28. And Joshua sent away the people, <u>and they went</u>	6. And Joshua sent away the people, <u>and they went,</u> <u>the sons of Israel,</u>	6. And Joshua sent away the people, <u>and they went,</u> <u>the sons of Israel,</u> each <u>to his house and</u>
each	each	each	each
to his inheritance.	to his place.	to his inheritance	to his inheritance

14 The translations are based on NRSV (MT) and NETS (LXX); however, I deviate from them in many instances in order to highlight the similarities and dissimilarities between the original Hebrew and Greek texts.

<i>Josh 24:28–31 (MT)</i>	<i>Josh 24:28–31 (LXX)</i>	<i>Judg 2:6–9 (MT)</i>	<i>Judg 2:6–9 (LXX)</i>
		<u>to take possession of the land.</u>	<u>to take possession of the land.</u>
	29. And Israel served the Lord all the days of Joshua and all the days of the elders who outlived Joshua <u>and</u> who <u>had seen</u> all the work that the Lord did for Israel.	7. And the people served the Lord all the days of Joshua and all the days of the elders who outlived Joshua, who <u>had seen</u> all the <u>great</u> work that YHWH did for Israel.	7. And the people served the Lord all the days of Joshua and all the days of the elders, who outlived Joshua, who <u>had known</u> all the <u>great</u> work that the Lord did for Israel.
<u>29. And it happened after these things:</u> that Joshua son of Nun, servant of YHWH, died at one hundred and ten years.	<u>30. After these things</u> Joshua son of Nun, servant of the Lord, died at one hundred and ten years old.	8. And Joshua son of Nun, servant of YHWH, died at one hundred and ten years.	8. And Joshua son of Nun, servant of the Lord, died at one hundred and ten years.
30. And they buried him at the borders of his inheritance in Timnath-serah in Mount Ephraim, north of Mount Gaash.	31. And they buried him at the borders of his inheritance in Timnath-serah in Mount Ephraim, north of Mount Gaas.	9. And they buried him at the borders of his inheritance in Timnath-heres in Mount Ephraim, north of Mount Gaash.	9. And they buried him at the borders of his inheritance in Timnath-heres in Mount Ephraim, north of Mount Gaas.
	31a. There they put with him, into the tomb in which they buried him, the flint knives with which he circumcised the sons of Israel in Galgala, when he led them out of Egypt, as the Lord instructed them, and there they are until this very day.		

31. And Israel
 served
 the Lord all the
 days of Joshua and
 all the days of the
 elders who outlived
 Joshua and who
 had known all the
 work that
 the Lord did for
 Israel.

3.1 Different sequence in MT Joshua

The first revealing difference between the four versions is the different sequence in MT Joshua. The last verse in MT Joshua (28:31) is situated after Joshua's death and burial. By contrast, in all the other witnesses it is situated before his death. In terms of content, MT Josh 24:31 highlights the people's fidelity to YHWH during Joshua's lifetime and during the lifetime of the elders that outlived Joshua and knew YHWH's deeds. In a sense, MT Josh 24:31 assumes that the days of Joshua will end, but it does not require that Joshua's death be reported right before the verse.¹⁵ Moreover, the death and burial report is formulaic (cf. Gen 35:28–29, 50:26, Deut 34:5–7) and is not dependent upon MT Josh 24:31. The death and burial verses (MT Josh 24:29–30) and the verse on the fidelity of the people (MT Josh 24:31) are therefore not dependent on each other which explains why their mutual order can be different in various textual versions.

Overall, the fidelity notice (MT Josh 24:31, LXX Josh 24:29, Judg 2:7) is better suited to the context of Joshua 24 than Judges 2, and it probably originated there. The main structure of Joshua 24 is a dialogue between Joshua and the people in which the question of loyalty to YHWH is central. This dialogue ends with a triple promise by the people to serve only YHWH (vv. 18–20, 21, and 24). In verse 24:31 (MT), the realization of this promise is narrated. That the verse was originally written for Joshua 24 is corroborated

¹⁵ Contra Rösel, "Die Überleitungen," 344. The reference to the days of the elders who outlived Joshua can be read as an anticipatory statement. The emphasis of "the elders who outlived Joshua" is not so much about the death of Joshua; rather, it binds the fidelity statement together with the mention of the elders at the beginning of the chapter (24:1).

by vocabulary and themes similar to other verses in Joshua 24.¹⁶ The parallel verse Judg 2:7, however, is in contradiction with its context and especially the preceding verses, e.g. Judg 2:2 that recalls the infidelity of the Israelites. Moreover, the context in Judges is not occupied with the “days of Joshua” as verse Judg 2:7 would imply. For instance, Judg 2:1–5 deals with the angel of YHWH and his message. Therefore, Judg 2:7 forms a back-reference to the themes in Joshua 24 and does not originally belong to Judges 2.¹⁷

Is the earlier location for MT verse 24:31 before or after Joshua’s death has been narrated? The main narrative of Joshua’s speech and his dialogue with the people is located in verses 24:1–28, while verses 29–33 deal with the burials of three great men (Joshua, Joseph, and Eleazar). MT verse 24:31, emphasizing the realization of the people’s fidelity to YHWH, is more connected with the former entity. Therefore MT Josh 24:31 can be seen as a realization and conclusion to the dialogue in 24:1–28 created by the original author or a redactor.¹⁸ In LXX Joshua 24 this function is preserved since the verse directly follows the dialogue. The order preserved in LXX Joshua and both versions of Judges is then probably earlier and the sequence in MT Joshua is secondary.¹⁹ The argument for the secondary status of the MT sequence is strengthened by a comparison with the sequence of events in Deuteronomy 34. There, the death of Moses is narrated. The sequence of events is similar to that of MT Joshua 24. First, Moses dies and is buried (Deut 34:5–6, Josh 24:29–30) and then the fidelity of the Israelites after the death of Moses is narrated (Deut 34:9, MT Josh 24:31). Thus it seems that the order in MT Joshua reflects harmonization with the death account of Moses. The sequence may have been adjusted in order to make the ending of Joshua

16 The main characters of MT Josh 24:31 are taken from Josh 24 (Joshua, the people, and YHWH). Similar expressions include: to serve YHWH (vv. 24:14–24), the elders (24:1), and a reference to the deeds that YHWH did for Israel (24:17).

17 Contra A. G. Auld, *Joshua Retold: Synoptic Perspectives* (Bloomsbury: T&T Clark, 2005), 82–83.

18 The nature of the verse as a positive conclusion to the dialogue is also reflected in the comments of M. H. Woudstra, *The Book of Joshua* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981), 360.

19 Thus also A. Schulz, *Das Buch Josue* (HSAT 2/3, Bonn: Peter Hanstein Verlag, 1924), 76; R. G. Boling & G. E. Wright, *Joshua. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1982), 541; Rofé, *The End*, 22 and Auld, *Joshua Retold*, 81. Contra, for example, M. O’Brien, *The Deuteronomistic History Hypothesis: A Reassessment* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989), 81 who argues that LXX Josh 24 secondarily changes the sequence due to the sequence in Judg 2:6–7. His argument relies on the literary critical assumption that in the original text of the DtrH there was no assembly or dismissal but only verses MT Josh 24:29–31. This does not seem probable since MT Josh 24:31 probably owes its content to Josh 24:1–28.

24 correspond more closely with Deuteronomy 34. This could be seen as an attempt to derive more authority from the figure of Moses.²⁰

Furthermore, the sequential difference is probably connected to the variant beginnings of the next verse that reports the death of Joshua (MT Josh 24:29, LXX Josh 24:30, Judg 2:8). Contrary to the death report in Judges, MT and LXX Joshua have an introductory formula (“and it happened after these things”) before the death is narrated.²¹ Such an introductory formula might be an indication that the death and burial account has been secondarily added to the chapter.²² The death account in Joshua preserves this redactional link. The lack of the introduction in Judges can be explained as an intentional omission due to a new context in Judges. In the context of Joshua, the introduction was needed to link the dialogue part (LXX 24:1–29) with the death and burial notices (LXX 24:30 ff.). In Judges, this link was no longer needed. Therefore, Joshua preserves the roughness that may have been created by earlier editing while Judges smoothens it out.

The most plausible development here is as following.²³ The earliest ending for the covenant scene is preserved in LXX Josh 24:28–29. At some point, the death and burial notice of Joshua (LXX Josh 24:30–31a) was added to the covenant scene. A sign of this addition is preserved in both the LXX and MT Joshua (“and it happened after these things”). Judges 2:6–9 secondarily adapted LXX Josh 24:28–31 into a new context in which the verse reporting the fidelity of the people was contrasted with the infidelity of the new generations (Judg 2:10).²⁴ Due to this dependence both LXX Josh 24:28–31 and Judg 2:6–9 preserve the earliest sequence of the pericope. Furthermore,

20 For the depiction of Joshua as a second Moses in Joshua 24, see T. Römer, “Book-Endings in Joshua and the Question of the So-Called Deuteronomistic History,” in *Raising Up a Faithful Exegete* (ed. K. L. Noll and B. Schramm; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2010), 97. Rofé, *The End*, 23 argues that the relocation was made since a scribe perceived that the verse dealt primarily with the times of the elders after the death of Joshua. The sequence was thus made more logical.

21 According to Rofé, “The End, 23,” the phrase *καὶ ἐγένετο μετ’ ἐκεῖνα* in LXX Joshua can not be a translation of the MT phrase *wayhî ’ahārē haddēbārîm hā’ellē*. Instead, the LXX *Vorlage* would have read *wayhî ’ahārē*.

22 As argued by, for example, H. N. Rösel, *Joshua. Historical Commentary on the Old Testament* (Leuven: Peeters, 2011), 376.

23 Much has been written on the problem of the earlier sequence of these events. At this point, unfortunately, I do not have room to interact more with these several models. The strength of my proposition is that it explains all of the available evidence, also that of the LXX, in a relatively simple manner (*Occam’s razor*). My proposition does not require resorting to complex literary and redaction critical explanations or assumptions on the relationship of the books of Joshua and Judges.

24 That Judg 2:6–9 is a later adaptation is also seen in several secondary textual developments that will be analyzed below.

MT Josh 24:28–31 reflects a secondary reworking of the sequence of events. This reworking might have been prompted by an editorial motive to better integrate the added death and burial notice(s) with the verse reporting the fidelity of the Israelites after the “days of Joshua”. It might have also been influenced by a harmonization with the death and burial account of Moses. This is an intriguing option since, as we see later, there are also other editorial developments behind MT Josh 24 that aim at emphasizing the role of Moses.

3.2 Omission of LXX Josh 24:31a

The other notable variant in these verses is the long plus in LXX Joshua that is not present anywhere else.²⁵ That the Greek translator would have created such a verse goes against what we have concluded about the nature of the translation. Even though the translator possessed some degree of freedom, he would not have conjured up such a long addition as a part of the translation process. It is also not plausible that the plus was lost due to a scribal lapse since a similar plus missing in the MT also exists in LXX Josh 21:42d: “And Iesus took the flint knives with which he circumcised the sons of Israel born on the way in the wilderness, and he put them in Thamnasarach” (NETS). We have, then, two possible explanations. Either both of these plusses are secondary additions made to the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the LXX or they are earlier material intentionally omitted in the proto-MT editing.

First we should explore whether this verse could be a secondary addition made to the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the LXX. There is some appeal to this argument. Hartmut Rösel has noted that the presumably added verse is connected with Josh 5:4–5 which narrates the circumcision performed by Joshua. In addition, Rösel notes that the beginning of the LXX addition in 24:33b is similar to verse 28 (ἕκαστος εἰς τὸν τόπον αὐτῶν) which forms a resumptive repetition, providing additional support for the assumed lateness of the plusses between them.²⁶ The problem with this argument is, however, that it presumes that all the plusses in the LXX verses 31–33 can be explained together. In my opinion, this *Wiederaufnahme* would only support the secondary nature of all or some of the plusses in verse 33. It does not prove the secondary nature of verse 31a.

²⁵ The plus is also probably somehow connected with the longer ending in LXX Josh 24:33a–b. In this study, I will exclude the analysis of those verses and focus on 31a.

The analysis of this plus is also interesting in its own right since it is usually explained together with the longer ending (e.g. Rösel, *Die Überleitungen*; and Rofé, *The End*).

²⁶ Rösel, *Die Überleitungen*, 349.

If LXX verse 31a were a secondary addition, the motives for such an expansion would be hard to imagine. Arnold Ehrlich suggested in his early commentary that this could be an addition made by a Hellenistic Jew (the LXX translator) who found the idea of Joshua circumcising the people embarrassing and wanted to make sure that the “grotesque rite” was buried with Joshua.²⁷ This is a highly conjectural statement. A more plausible motive could be the desire to indicate the final repository of the flint knives with which an important covenantal act was performed. In verse 32, the burial of Joseph’s bones was reported and that could have given the spark for an editor to include the flint knives in Joshua’s burial. While this is a possible explanation, the theological peculiarity and the connections of this verse with earlier material in LXX Joshua opens up a much more persuasive explanation.

The theological peculiarity of this material lies in two claims that it makes: that the Israelites buried the same flint knives with Joshua with which he once circumcised them (Josh 5:2–9) and that it was primarily Joshua, not Moses, who lead the Israelites out of Egypt.²⁸ The first point concerning the burying of the flint knives implies that these objects were revered. They were perceived as religious relics.²⁹ Whereas Rösel claims that there is nothing novel in this plus in relation to Josh 5,³⁰ it seems apparent that the importance put on material objects is new here. This point alone would be enough for a late editor to omit this plus since the reverence of an object could be perceived as idolatry by later editors. There might, however, also be a more thorough editing process behind the plus which can be seen in the earlier material in LXX Joshua.

Josh. 5:4–5, 9 (MT)

Josh. 5:4–5, 9 (LXX)

4 וְזֶה הַדְּבָר אֲשֶׁר־מִלְּיְהוֹשֻׁעַ כָּל־הָעָם הֵיטָא מִמִּצְרַיִם הַזְּכָרִים כֹּל אֲנָשֵׁי הַמִּלְחָמָה מֵתוּ בַּמִּדְבָּר בַּדֶּרֶךְ בְּצִאתֵם מִמִּצְרַיִם	4 ὃν δὲ τρόπον περιεκάθαρεν Ἰησοῦς τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἰσραὴλ, ὅσοι ποτὲ ἐγένοντο ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ καὶ ὅσοι ποτὲ ἀπερίτμητοι ἦσαν τῶν ἔξεληλυθότων ἐξ Αἰγύπτου,
5 כִּי־מַלְיָם הָיוּ כָל־הָעָם הַיְצֵאִים וְכָל־הָעָם הַיִּלְדִים בַּמִּדְבָּר בַּדֶּרֶךְ בְּצִאתֵם מִמִּצְרַיִם לְאֶמְלֹךְ	5 πάντας τούτους περιέτεμεν Ἰησοῦς.

27 Arnold Ehrlich, *Randglossen zur Hebräischen Bibel. Textkritisches, Sprachliches und Sachliches. Dritter Band* (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1910), 66. This explanation is taken up by Rösel, *Joshua*, 377.

28 These theological peculiarities were also noted by Rofé, *The End*, 23–24.

29 Thus also Rofé, *The End*, 24.

30 Rösel, *Die Überleitungen*, 349.

Josh. 5:4–5, 9 (MT)

Josh. 5:4–5, 9 (LXX)

...	...
9	9
וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֶל־יְהוֹשֻׁעַ הַיּוֹם גָּלוּתִי אֶת־הָרַפָּת מִצְרַיִם מֵעַלְיָכֶם וַיִּקְרָא שֵׁם הַמָּקוֹם הַהוּא גִלְגָּל עַד הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה	καὶ εἶπεν κύριος τῷ Ἰησοῖ <u>ὕψ</u> Ναυη Ἐν τῇ σήμερον ἡμέρα ἀφείλον τὸν ὄνειδισμὸν Αἰγύπτου ἀφ’ ὑμῶν. καὶ ἐκάλεσεν τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ τόπου ἐκείνου Γαλαγαλα.

Josh. 5:4–5, 9 (MT)

Josh. 5:4–5, 9 (LXX)

4. This is why Joshua circumcised them: all the males of the people who came out of Egypt, all the warriors, had died on the way through the wilderness after they had come out of Egypt.

5. Although all the people who came out had been circumcised, yet all the people born on the journey through the wilderness after they had come out of Egypt had not been circumcised.

...

9. And YHWH said to Joshua, “Today I have taken away the disgrace of Egypt from you.” And he called the name of that place Gilgal to this day.

4. And how Joshua purified the sons of Israel: as many as were born on the way and as many as were uncircumcised of those who had come out of Egypt,

5. all these Joshua circumcised.

...

And the Lord said to Joshua son of Nun: “Today I have taken away the disgrace of Egypt from you.” And he called the name of that place Galgala.

In the MT in relation to the LXX, Josh 5:4–5 differs almost completely. One of the witnesses probably reflects extensive rewriting.³¹ The most notable difference is that LXX Joshua claims that many of the Israelites coming out of Egypt were uncircumcised. MT Joshua, however, specifies extensively that everyone coming out of Egypt was circumcised and Joshua only had to circumcise those who were born in the wilderness. The reading in MT Joshua is problematic since the circumcision performed by Joshua is said to have removed the “disgrace of Egypt” (Josh 5:9, *’et herppat mišrayim*) and there would be no disgrace left if everyone in Egypt was circumcised.³²

31 There are many differences between the circumcision accounts (Josh 5:2–9). I will focus on these two verses and their major thematic difference since it has an impact on the plus in LXX Josh 24:31.

32 M. van der Meer, *Formation*, 311–315 correctly points out that multiple interpretations have been given for the expression “disgrace of Egypt.” From this, it does not follow that the phrase “does not refer to the circumcision mentioned in the preceding verses 5:2–9” (M. Van der Meer, *Formation*, 314). In other words, that the expression might have multiple meanings does not rule out the most obvious interpretation emerging from the current context.

An expansive rewriting in the proto-MT phase of 5:4–5 best explains the differences.³³ Such a rewriting could have been triggered by the worrying notion in the earlier text, preserved in the LXX, that there was uncircumcised people among the Israelites coming out of Egypt. An editor wanted to omit this and “correct” the reasons for the circumcision performed by Joshua. When YHWH had so greatly helped the Israelites in getting out of Egypt, surely they would have had to have been loyal in circumcision. Thus, only those born in the wilderness needed to be circumcised. A second motivation for the rewriting behind the MT was the need to emphasize that the generation that came out of Egypt died (MT Josh 5:4) and that it was a new generation (MT Josh 5:5) that went to conquer the promised land. This is a harmonization towards Deut 1:34–46 in which a punishment was given that the exodus generation would not see the promised land. The editor behind the MT reading sharpened the difference between two generations in Josh 5:4–5 in order to make sure that the punishment given in Deuteronomy was realized. As Richard Nelson notes, the revised text (MT) “sharpen the differentiation between the old disobedient generation – and the new obedient generation”.³⁴ The claim that the earliest version is preserved in LXX Joshua is also corroborated by it being the shorter text (*lectio brevior*).³⁵

Josh. 21:42 (MT)

Josh. 21:42 (LXX)

... 42d καὶ ἔλαβεν Ἰησοῦς τὰς μαχαίρας
τὰς πετρίνας, ἐν αἷς περιέτεμεν τοὺς
υἱοὺς Ἰσραὴλ τοὺς γενομένους ἐν τῇ
ὁδοῦ ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, καὶ ἔθηκεν αὐτὰς ἐν
Θαμνασαραχ.

... 42d And Joshua took the flint knives
with which he circumcised the sons of
Israel born on the way in the wilderness,
and he put them in Timnat-serah.

³³ Thus, also S. Holmes, *Joshua. The Hebrew and Greek Texts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1914), 9–10, 28–30; and R. D. Nelson, *Joshua. The Old Testament Library* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1997), 71–83.

³⁴ R. D. Nelson, *Joshua*, 77.

³⁵ K. Bieberstein, *Josua – Jordan – Jericho. Archäologie, Geschichte und Theologie der Landnahme-erzählungen Josua 1–6* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995), 198–206 argued that the LXX is secondary and the differences are due to the interpretative actions of the Greek translator who wanted to harmonize the passage with the Pentateuch. There is no room here to give a detailed counterargument but overall the assumed references to the Pentateuch are, in my opinion, too vague to override the well-documented assumption that the translator would not take such liberties.

In LXX Joshua 21:42, there are several plusses not present in the MT. The last plus (42d) pertains to LXX Josh 24:31a and is therefore interesting for us.³⁶ An omission of both of these plusses in the MT could well be connected to the rewriting that took place in the proto-MT editing of 5:4–5. The editor who wanted to delete the presence of uncircumcised Israelites coming out of Egypt would have wanted to remove these verses since they commemorate the flint knives with which the Israelites were “purified” (περικαθαίρω, LXX Josh 5:4).³⁷ The editor who was disturbed by the notion that the Israelites did not universally practice circumcision in Egypt wanted to omit any recollections of that.³⁸ Thus, an omission of 21:42d and 24:31a downplayed the importance of the flint knives and the memory of the uncircumcised Israelites in Egypt.

In the plus LXX Josh 24:31a, the second offensive issue is that it was actually Joshua who brought the people out of Egypt and that, for this exodus, he was given the instructions by YHWH. There is no mention of Moses here. What makes it even more significant is that the LXX is missing the reference to Moses present in MT Joshua 24:5 (*wāʿešlah ʿet mōšē wēʿet ʾahārōn*). It is thus possible that the same editor was responsible for omitting verse 31a from the proto-MT text and adding the reference to Moses in verse 5 in order to introduce Moses into the exodus. In the LXX version of Joshua 24, there are numerous references to the exodus but no references to Moses. It seems, then, that we might have here a remnant of a version of the exodus tradition that emphasizes Joshua’s role in leading the people out of Egypt. This verse could, interestingly, have an impact on the reconstruction of the evolution of the exodus traditions. At least, the portrayal of Joshua as a leader of the exodus was softened by introducing Moses into verse 5 and removing verse 31a. In this way, the proto-MT editor was interested in introducing the authority of Moses into the chapter.³⁹

36 Already Holmes, *Joshua*, 74 noted that this plus “stands or falls” with 24:31a.

37 The Greek περικαθαίρω “to purify” is obviously not a standard equivalent for *mōl* “to circumcise.” The translation choice is one of the interpretive initiatives that the OG translator takes in translating Josh 5:2–12. For more on these, see M. van der Meer, *Formation*, 334–416. The translation of Josh 5:2–12 is one example of the freedoms that the translator could take in choosing varying Greek equivalents in respect to his Hebrew *Vorlage*. The freedom in producing contextualized Greek does not, however, mean that the whole rewriting reflected in Josh 5:2–12 could be attributed to the translator as Van der Meer argues in his treatment.

38 Thus also Holmes, *Joshua*, 9–10.

39 Thus also Rofé, *The End*, 23–24. A subtle strengthening of the role of Moses might, in fact, be a trait of the proto-MT editing in the book of Joshua as a whole. There are six instances where Moses is secondarily added to the MT and he is missing in the earlier

Even if one does not accept the connections drawn here between chapter 5 and the plus in verse 24:31a, the theological peculiarities alone make it much more likely that verse 31a is an omission in the proto-MT tradition and not a late secondary addition. It is simply not plausible that a Hebrew editor would have added such a polemic verse in a late context where the position of Moses and the authority of the Pentateuch had been firmly established. Hence, LXX Joshua preserves an earlier verse linked with the death and burial of Joshua while MT Joshua omits the verse out of theological consideration. The absence of the verse in Judges is understandable since Judg 2:6–9 represents a later adaptation of the pericope whose aim is to reverse the theme of the fidelity of the Israelites. The burial of the flint knives or Joseph’s bones is not as such of interest in this new context.⁴⁰

3.3 Other minor variants

Many minor variants corroborate the assumption that LXX Josh 24:28–31 generally preserves the earliest text. In the first verse, Joshua sends the people away. While the first sentence is similar in all readings, there are considerable differences in the latter part that reports the people going back to their inheritance or place.⁴¹ Two of these reveal the secondary nature of Judg 2:6. First, in Joshua the people are referred to only as *ʾiš* while Judges gives as a plus a more specific *bēnē yišrāʾēl* which should be seen as a later addition harmonizing the text with the preceding verse in the context of Judges (Judg 2:4).⁴² Second, Judg 2:6 includes a report that the Israelites went to take possession of the land (*ʾet hāʾāreṣ lārešet*). This expression might well be a

OG readings (Josh 1:14; 4:10; 13:33; 14:2, 3; 24:5). Furthermore, the title of Moses as “servant of YHWH” is secondarily added in four verses in the MT (Josh 1:1, 15; 12:6; 22:4).

40 We do not know whether the editor of Judges knew LXX Josh 24:31a or the other burial notices (Josh 24:31–33) when he adapted LXX Josh 24:28–31 into his new composition. On the one hand, since he follows the sequence of LXX Josh 24:28–31 it is possible that he was aware of the verse dealing with the flint knives. On the other hand, the verse might have been omitted in such an early stage that the *Vorlage* of the editor of Judges did not have it. In any case, the themes introduced in Judg 2:10 was the reason for including verses from the end of Josh 24 in the first place.

41 LXX Josh 24:28 might reflect a different Hebrew *Vorlage* in reading “each to his place.” See Koopmans, *Joshua* 24, 263–264.

42 It would be harder to explain why *bēnē yišrāʾēl* would have been omitted in Joshua. There are no possible stylistic reasons or ideological motives that would cause such an omission.

late Deuteronomically inspired insertion.⁴³ The shorter version preserved in Joshua would certainly be good soil for such an addition.⁴⁴

In the second verse (LXX Josh 24:29, MT Josh 24:31, Judg 2:7), there is variation between the verbs *r'h* and *yd^c*. The *Vorlage* of LXX Joshua probably reflects *r'h* since the verb *yd^c* is never translated with ὀράω in Joshua.⁴⁵ MT Judges also uses *r'h*, while MT Joshua and LXX Judges employ *yd^c* (LXX Judges ἔγνωσαν). It is not easy to decide which verb is earlier since both can be used synonymously. Still, verb *r'h* might well be the more original because the elders concerned are perceived as eyewitnesses to the deeds of YHWH. Verb *yd^c* would then be a later change to a verb with a wider semantic field that would include even people who had not seen the deeds of YHWH but knew of them. This hypothesis would strengthen the conclusions that LXX Joshua holds the more original text of this verse that has been further edited in MT Joshua and – in this case – LXX Judges.⁴⁶ This conclusion should, however, be viewed with caution as these verbs can be used quite synonymously.

There is also, in the verse reporting the fidelity in Judg 2:7, the plus *haggādōl* reflected by both the LXX and the MT. It seems to be a late addition as it interrupts the fluent syntax that can be observed in Joshua. The function of this addition is to further emphasize the mightiness of YHWH's works. It is, as Rösel puts it, "eine sekundäre Verstärkung."⁴⁷ Once again,

43 The verb *yrš* occurs 34 times in Deuteronomy. Compared to the second largest occurrence rate of 8 in Joshua, the concept of "taking possession of the land" is clearly linked with Deuteronomistic ideology. See also G. N. Knoppers, "Establishing the Rule of Law? The Composition Num 33,50–56 and the Relationship Among the Pentateuch, the Hexateuch and the Deuteronomistic History," in *Das Deuteronomium Zwischen Pentateuch und Deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerk* (ed. R. Achenbach and E. Otto; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2005), 147–148. This expression is also seen as a late addition by Rösel, *Die Überleitungen*, 344.

44 Otherwise, one would have to argue why MT and LXX Joshua omit this expression. A parablepsis is not possible here. Thus, the omission would be intentional. Auld, *Joshua Retold*, 82, argues that Joshua indeed omits this phrase, which belongs to the more original reading. According to Auld, the omission is made because the book of Joshua aims to give the impression that the settlement of the land was completed before Joshua's death. This argument could, however, also be used in the other direction: maybe the editor of Judges added the notion in order to highlight that the taking possession of the land was not yet completed.

45 The most common equivalent for *yd^c* in Joshua is γινώσκω.

46 However, OG Judg 2:6 might have also read "had seen" since the Old Latin manuscript La¹⁰⁰ reads *viderunt*. "Had known" would then be a secondary development in the Greek text of Judges. That *viderunt* might reflect a different Greek *Vorlage* of OL is corroborated by the observation that this is the only place in OL Judges where *videō* is used for γινώσκω.

47 Rösel, *Die Überleitungen*, 344.

the addition further strengthens the argument that the version in Judges is secondary to Joshua.⁴⁸

3.4 Text-critical conclusions

The textual growth of the death and burial of Joshua visible in documented evidence can be summarized as follows. The earliest extant version is mostly preserved in LXX Joshua. This version is generally the shortest but ends with one large plus that contains material that reflects thoughts that were deleted by a later editor. The version preserved by MT Joshua is the result of expansions, a relocation, and an omission from this shorter version. The version present in MT Judges, in turn, is a later adaptation to a new context and it has emerged mainly through expansive harmonization. MT Judges agrees with LXX Joshua in its arrangement and in some other minor details against MT Joshua. Hence, the editor of Judges probably used a version similar to the Hebrew *Vorlage* of LXX Joshua as his source text. Therefore, the account in MT Judges preserves textual features that are earlier than MT Joshua, most prominently the earlier sequence of the verses. Moreover, LXX Judges translates the expanded version in MT Judges almost word for word and should not be regarded as a different literary version.

4. Repercussions for literary and redaction criticism

In the narrative concerning Joshua's death documented evidence exists for the latest literary growth of these four verses. It can be concluded with a good degree of probability that LXX Joshua preserves the earliest text behind this textual growth. Therefore any literary critic wanting to reconstruct the compositional stages of the pericope may not neglect the LXX. Literary and redaction criticism based only on the MT versions is problematic. This point has been rightfully stressed by several scholars working with different books

⁴⁸ I would not read too much into the various names of the burial place. Where MT Joshua reads *timnat-serah*, MT Judges has *timnat-heres*. This could be a simple metathesis either way. In LXX Joshua, B reads θαμναθασαχαρα and A θαμνασαχαρ. Whichever is the correct OG reading, it still probably reflects the Hebrew *timnat-serah* since in Judges *timnat-heres* is transcribed with either θαμναθαρες (B) or θαμναθαρεως (A). If the change was intentional, the more original reading would probably be *timnat-heres* since it can be perceived as more offensive. This, however, is speculative as the offensiveness of this place name is not that obvious. Thus either one could be the more original reading.

of the Hebrew Bible.⁴⁹ In the case of the book of Joshua, Kristin De Troyer, for one, has argued for the text-critical value of LXX Joshua and articulated the need for taking the “results of a renewed textual criticism” into account in literary and redaction criticism.⁵⁰

Many important texts remain understudied in the light of this growing demand for crossing arbitrary methodological boundaries. Joshua 24 belongs to one of the most important, complex, and contested texts in the historical books of the Hebrew Bible. At the seam of the “Hexateuch” and the Former Prophets it takes a differing role in several different compositional theories. Thus it seems that a fresh analysis of LXX Joshua 24 and its impact on literary and redaction criticism is in order. Since we have, in this study, analyzed only four verses of Joshua 24 a complete discussion of the literary development of Joshua 24 is not possible.⁵¹ Accordingly, I will limit the remaining discussion to examining some repercussion of the text-critical evidence on literary and redaction criticism of Joshua 24.

When evaluating literary and redaction critical models in the light of textual evidence, my main argument is: textual criticism sets boundaries for what can be argued in literary and redaction criticism. This argument follows logically if one accepts the text-critical conclusion that the differences between LXX and MT represent the latest stages in the literary growth of the book of Joshua. Therefore, textual criticism overrules some possibilities for what can be argued in terms of the compositional history of Joshua. At least three current compositional positions are overruled or in need of adjustments in the light of the textual evidence analyzed in this study.

49 For example, Edenburg and Pakkala write that “it is necessary to bring the text-critical evidence to the fore in the discussion about redactions” in C. Edenburg and J. Pakkala, “Is Samuel among the Deuteronomists?” in *Is Samuel among the Deuteronomists? Current Views on the Place of Samuel in a Deuteronomistic History* (ed. C. Edenburg and J. Pakkala; Atlanta: SBL, 2013), 12–13. The idea of integrating documented or “empirical” evidence from variant versions witnessing to the same text to the discussion concerning the editorial processes of the Hebrew Bible was greatly advanced by J. H. Tigay (ed.), *Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1985). This line of inquiry has been further pursued by, for example, D. Carr, *The Formation of the Hebrew Bible: A New Reconstruction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011); and R. Müller et al., *Evidence of Editing: Growth and Change of Texts in the Hebrew Bible* (Atlanta: SBL, 2014). Evaluating and refining literary criticism with the help of documented evidence is also one of the aims of the research team *Literary Criticism in the Light of Documented Evidence* working in the Helsinki Centre of Excellence *Changes in Sacred Texts and Traditions* (www.cstt.fi).

50 K. De Troyer, *Rewriting the Sacred Texts: What the Old Greek Tells Us about the Literary Growth of the Bible* (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 127–128. See also K. De Troyer, “Reconstructing the Older Hebrew Text of the Book of Joshua,” *Text 26* (2013): 1–33.

51 Such an analysis will be available in my upcoming dissertation. See footnote 3.

First, one of the main questions of literary criticism is the unity or disunity of a particular text. Recently several scholars have put forth models arguing that Joshua 24 is, for the most part, a unified text in which different literary strata should not be reconstructed. In these models, Joshua 24 is often regarded as a late postexilic and post-Dtr literary composition. The important work of Erhard Blum should be mentioned. Blum has suggested that Joshua 24 is the work of a Hexateuchal redactor. This redactor composed the chapter as a concluding statement for a late Hexateuch connecting the books from Genesis to Joshua.⁵² Also John Van Seters has argued for the basic unity of Joshua 24 and regarded it as the work of a post-Dtr author. Van Seters has identified this author as the Yahwist who he has postulated in several other instances.⁵³ The recent emphasis on the assumed unity of Joshua 24 is echoed in a citation from Thomas Römer: “There is no need for or evidence of reconstructing an older version of the account, which would not have contained this speech or would have contained only parts of it and which would have predated Joshua 23. Except for some glosses, there are very few indications of later insertions.”⁵⁴

In my view, the repercussions for this discussion from the text-critical findings are, simply put: Documented evidence suggests that it is hard to regard Joshua 24 as a literary unity. At least two of the text-critical findings support this claim. Firstly, the omission of LXX Josh 24:31a in the proto-MT phase of editing should be seen as part of the diachronic development of Joshua 24. The omission was not an isolated or random deletion but part of a theologically motivated editorial intrusion. The effects of this editing can be seen at least in three different parts of the book of Joshua (Josh 5:2–9; 21:42; 24:5, 31). While this editorial intrusion should probably not be labeled as a redaction, it is a phase in the diachronic development of Joshua. Secondly, the uncertainty of the correct location of MT Josh 24:31 speaks against an assumption that the ending of Joshua 24 has been a literary unity from its beginnings. That the order in Josh 24:28–31 was rearranged in the course of the transmission history of Joshua 24 reveals that there has been consid-

52 E. Blum, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch* (BZAW 189; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1990), 364–365; and “Der kompositionelle Knoten am Übergang von Josua zu Richter: Ein Entflechtungsvorschlag,” in *Deuteronomy and Deuteronomistic Literature* (ed. M. Vervenne and J. Lust; BETL 132; Leuven: Peeters, 1997), 194–206.

53 J. Van Seters, “Joshua 24 and the Problem of Tradition in the Old Testament,” in *In the Shelter of Elyon: Essays on Ancient Palestinian Life and Literature in Honour of G. W. Ahlström* (ed. W. B. Barrick and J. R. Spencer; JSOTSUP 31; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1984), 139–158. Also S. D. Sperling, “Joshua 24 Re-examined,” *HUCA* (1987): 119–136 regards Joshua 24 as a unity but gives it an early 8th century dating.

54 T. Römer, “Book-Endings,” 95–96.

erable editorial activity at the end of the chapter. “Movable units” like MT Josh 24:31 attest to the complexity of the compositional processes at play and undermine assuming a literary unity.⁵⁵

Several editorial phases need to be assumed already in order to explain all of the documented changes. Consequently, it is probable that such editing has taken place in Joshua 24, out of which documented evidence has not been preserved.⁵⁶ We can assume that the manifold traces of editing preserved in the textual evidence of Joshua 24 are only the tip of the iceberg: The text has most probably undergone several stages of early literary development.⁵⁷

To be sure, in this study I have not analyzed the textual variants in 24:1–27. It could be argued that the death and burial accounts at the end of Joshua 24 are later additions but vv. 1–27(28) are a literary unity. The question cannot be settled here but based on my own findings elsewhere and analyses by other scholars,⁵⁸ it seems that already the text-critical situation in 24:1–27(28) points towards several stages of editing. The MT exhibits many secondary readings in relation to the LXX. Interestingly, several of these variants concentrate around verses which have often been evaluated in literary criticism as secondary. For example, it is probably not a coinci-

55 On “movable units” and their implications see, for example, T. Barrera, “Textual Criticism and the Composition History of Samuel. Connections Between Pericopes in 1 Samuel 1–4,” *Archaeology of the Books of Samuel. The Entangling of the Textual and Literary History* (ed. P. Hugo and A. Schenker; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 261–264.

56 Regardless of the trend towards viewing Josh 24 as a literary unity many recent models give suggestions on these undocumented editorial processes. For example, R. Müller, *Königtum und Gottesherrschaft: Untersuchungen zur alttestamentlichen Monarchiekritik* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), 251–254; U. Becker, “Endredaktionelle Kontextvernetzungen des Josua-Buches,” in *Die deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerke. Redaktions- und religionsgeschichtliche Perspektiven zur “Deuteronomismus”-Diskussion in Tora und Vorderen Propheten* (ed. M. Witte, K. Schmid, D. Prechel and J. C. Gertz; BZAW 365, Berlin: de Gruyter, 2006), 139–162; Aurelius, “Zur Entstehung”; C. Levin, “On the Cohesion and Separation of Books within the Enneateuch,” in *Re-Reading the Scriptures: Essays on the Literary History of the Old Testament* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), 125–128. However, none of these models adequately integrate the LXX into their discussion.

57 In my opinion, the conclusion by Müller *et al.* is applicable also in the case of the compositional history of Joshua 24: “- we can assume that these documented cases attest to merely a fraction of the actual changes that have taken place in the transmission - - there are good reasons to assume that similar editorial processes took place during the earlier periods of the textual transmission that are largely undocumented by variant editions.” R. Müller *et al.*, *Evidence of Editing*, 9.

58 See, for example, the text-critical analyses in Holmes, *Joshua*, 78–80; Nielsen, *Shechem: A Traditio-Historical Investigation* (Copenhagen: G. E. C. Gad, 1955), 86–141 and Koopmans, *Joshua 24*, 241–270.

dence that the secondary addition of *wā'ôšî' ʿet-ʿăbôtêkem* “and I took your fathers” (MT Josh 24:6) fits well together with the mention of the fathers by the sea (vv. 6–7) which has been regarded by some as a late addition to the historical summary.⁵⁹ The short addition in MT Josh 24:6 might have been motivated by a desire to bind the earlier added mention of the fathers closer together with the rest of the text. In this way, the short addition revealed by text-critical evidence strengthens an earlier literary critical observation. Since many such instances are found in the text-critical evidence it overrules the possibility that Josh 24:1–27(28) is a literary unity.

Second, some models explaining the book seam between Joshua and Judges regard, contrary to the textual analysis in this study, the death account in Joshua secondary in relation to Judges. A common explanation within the paradigm of the Deuteronomistic history (DtrH) is that the original connection between Joshua and Judges continued from Josh 24:28 to Judg 2:7–10. Most recently this has been argued by Christoph Levin.⁶⁰ According to Levin, short versions of the books of Joshua and Judges were once joined together. The text of this original DtrH ran from Josh 11:23b (“and the land had rest from war”), to the dismissal notice in 24:28, and further to the assumed original death notice in Judg 2:7–10.⁶¹ The next developmental stage was that Judg 2:1–5 was inserted between the conquest narrative and the death account of Joshua which resulted into the repetition of the original dismissal notice in Judg 2:6.⁶² Several minor additions were made to the book of Joshua while Joshua and Judges were still a unity. Among these was an early short form of the assembly at Shechem in Joshua 24.⁶³ A decisive moment in the development of the text was when the books of Joshua and Judges were secondarily separated. After this book separation, the death of Joshua was secondarily repeated at the end of Joshua 24. Also the whole division of the land was added (Joshua 13–22) to the book of Joshua. Therefore, according to Levin, “half of today’s book came into being after the separation”.⁶⁴

⁵⁹ See, for example, the literary model by R. Müller, *Königtum*, 253.

⁶⁰ The position has also been articulated by, for example, K. Latvus, *God, Anger and Ideology: The Anger of God in Joshua and Judges in Relation to Deuteronomy and the Priestly Writings* (JSOTSup 279, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 36. It goes back to the work of M. Noth, *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien: Erster Teil* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1963), 8–9.

⁶¹ C. Levin, “On the Cohesion,” 126.

⁶² *Ibid.*, 127.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, 128.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, 125–128.

When this model of the Dtr book connection between Joshua and Judges is evaluated in the light of our textual analysis, some critical remarks arise. First of all, as a positive remark, the notion that the dismissal notice in Judg 2:6 was secondarily repeated from Josh 24:28 is confirmed. Our text-critical evaluation revealed that Judg 2:6 is in fact secondary in relation to Josh 24:28. However, the notion that the death and burial account in Judg 2:7–9 is earlier than the one in Josh 24:29–31 is questionable.⁶⁵ When one neglects the LXX version of Josh 24:28–31, the account in Judg 2:7–9 might seem earlier since the sequence of events is better. Yet this sequence is already present in the earlier LXX version of Josh 24:29–31 and is secondarily followed by Judges. Since the sequence in MT Josh 24:29–31 is secondarily modified, it is understandable that ignoring LXX Josh 24 might lead one to conclude that the death account in Judg 2:7–9 is earlier. However, bringing the LXX into the fore of the comparison changes the picture.⁶⁶

Also the absence of the verse reporting the burial of the flint knives has to be taken into account when evaluating the burial report in Judg 2:9. Its absence reveals that we are not dealing with the original burial account but with a selective later adaptation. In order to be regarded as a compelling solution, a model of an early Dtr-connection between the books would have to account for the omitted verse preserved by the LXX. Theoretically, in the framework of Levin's model, the verse with the flint knives could be explained as a literary addition together with the addition of Joseph's bones to the burial account.⁶⁷ These two verses, however, make such different textual connections that they would have to be explained as non-interdependent additions. The verse with the flint knives is closely connected with the inner-compositional rewriting in Joshua while Joseph's bones refer back to Gen 50:25. Therefore if one accepts that the verse with the flint knives is earlier and has been secondarily omitted, one cannot accept the Dtr-connection between Joshua and Judges as such but the model needs to be modified.

65 Already without taking the LXX into account, within the different composition models of the DtrH, different solutions have been convincingly argued. For example, by M. O'Brien, *The Deuteronomistic History Hypothesis: A Reassessment* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989), 81 argues for the originality of Josh 24:29–31 which was followed by Judg 2:10. Such a book connection would perhaps be more in line with the documented evidence.

66 In Levin's article, the only reference to text-critical evidence is given in the claim that the originality of Judg 2:7–10 can be "shown by details in the text" (C. Levin, "On the Cohesion," 125). In the footnote, reference is given to Auld, "Judges I". I have interacted with Auld's arguments in my textual analysis in some detail. See, for example, footnote 44.

67 C. Levin, "On the Cohesion," 126, 132.

Third, basically all of the models on the literary and redaction history of Joshua 24 and its relationship with Judges assume that the development of these texts took place only through additions and transpositions.⁶⁸ The documented evidence analyzed in this study, however, has shown that also omissions and rewritings have taken place in the textual history of the book of Joshua.⁶⁹ LXX Josh 24:31 revealed that a large section was probably omitted in the editing of the proto-MT version. In the circumcision account of Josh 5:2–9 a complete rewriting deleted older ideas from the text. If a literary analysis, aimed at finding out the earlier forms of these verses, was carried out based only on the MT versions of these texts, the omitted verse 31a and the shorter version of 5:2–9 could hardly be reconstructed. There are no traces left in the MT that would alert the literary critic that something has been omitted. Any plausible model on the literary development of Joshua 24 or the book seam of Joshua–Judges needs to explain these omissions. Moreover, when performing literary and redaction criticism on a complex text, such as Joshua 24, one should keep in mind that all of the textual material might simply not be available to the modern scholar. Things may have simply been dropped out in the course of editing. This, in turn, reminds us of the tentative nature of our diachronic models and cautions against extracting too many literary layers behind a particular text.⁷⁰ While texts probably have developed in several layers, our methods for convincingly reconstructing these layers are limited.

5. Discussion

In this study, I have proposed one model on the textual growth of the account of Joshua's death and burial as preserved in Josh 24:28–31 and Judg 2:6–9. In many cases, the evaluation of textual changes is complicated and a

⁶⁸ One exception on the book connection from Joshua to Judges is the model of A. Rofé, "The End of the Book of Joshua according to the Septuagint," *Shmaton* 2 (1977): 217–227 which assumes that the original material preserved in LXX Joshua has been lost in the MT.

⁶⁹ The tendency in literary criticism to assume that the development of texts took place mainly through additions was recently criticized in J. Pakkala, *God's Word Omitted: Omissions in the Transmission of the Hebrew Bible* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013).

⁷⁰ For example, the identification of seven literary layers, as postulated in the model of R. Müller, *Königtum*, 253, seems too audacious. Even if the text had been developed in seven different layers, it is questionable whether we can recognize them anymore since also omissions and rewritings have taken place.

number of uncertainty inevitably remains. Constructing a model of textual growth with the help of documented evidence, however, offers more objectivity in the field of textual studies, which is often accused of being overly subjective.

In the future, a careful analysis of Joshua 24 as a whole is needed taking into account the methodological aspects discussed in this study; that is, the analysis has to begin by evaluating variant textual versions which, in turn, sets boundaries and offers guidelines for what can be argued in literary and redaction criticism. In this context, the LXX has been and will be one of the most important textual witnesses. Nevertheless, in the study of the book of Joshua there are several other textual traditions that need to be integrated into the discussion. These include, for example, the witnesses among the Dead Sea Scrolls and perhaps also the Samaritan versions of the book of Joshua.⁷¹ An adequate model describing the diachronic development of Joshua – or any texts of the Hebrew Bible for that matter – explains the relationships of all of the textual witnesses and the peculiarities within individual witnesses. Such a model will undoubtedly not be a single line of development as it is so often imagined in traditional textual and literary criticism. It will rather be true to the textual plurality and complexity reflected already by documented evidence.

The analysis of Josh 24:28–31 and Judg 2:6–9 provides an excellent litmus test on different methodological approaches taken in the study of textual history. It reveals that methodological boundaries are often artificial. They can blind the scholar from seeing relevant evidence. In order to produce a reliable model on the textual history of Joshua 24, one needs to take all of the available evidence into account. Thomas Dozeman has appropriately noted that “The tendency among redaction critics is all too often to privilege or even limit research to the MT in determining the final form of Joshua or any book for that matter.”⁷² There are no good reasons for executing a literary or redaction critical analysis based only on the MT in the form we have it pre-

71 In this study, Qumran has not been mentioned since there are no witnesses to Josh 24:28–31 and Judg 2:6–9 among the Dead Sea Scrolls. Overall, the Joshua scrolls from Qumran attest to the textual plurality of Joshua in the late Second Temple Period. See, for example, F. C. Martínez, “Light on the Joshua Books from the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *After Qumran: Old and Modern Editions of the Biblical Texts – The Historical Books* (ed. H. Ausloos, B. Lemmeljin and J. T. Barrera; Leuven: Peeters, 2012), 145–159. For a brief overview of the Samaritan versions see, for example, I. Hjelm, *The Samaritans and Early Judaism: A Literary Analysis* (London: T&T Clark, 2000), 98–99.

72 T. Dozeman, “Joshua as an Intertext,” in *Pentateuch, Hexateuch, or Enneateuch? Identifying Literary Works in Genesis Through Kings* (Atlanta: SBL, 2011), 189–190.

served today. In some respects, this makes the work of a textual scholar more demanding. However, this is no reason for neglecting relevant evidence.

Ville Mäkipelto
Department of Biblical Studies
University of Helsinki
“Changes in Sacred Texts and Traditions”-
Finnish Academy’s Centre of Excellence
Helsinki, PL 4, 00014
ville.makipelto@helsinki.fi

Emanuel Tov

The Publication of the *Textual History of the Bible* in Light of the Progress in Textual Scholarship

Much significant progress in textual criticism occurred in the 20th century, as is visible in new primary evidence, understanding the textual witnesses, approaches to textual criticism, textual theories, computer-assisted research, and text editions. This review article discusses how these new data and theories are handled in a new research tool, the *Textual History of the Bible (THB)*. The *THB* makes it easier for scholars to handle this wealth of information and its dispersion in a multitude of studies and tools. The *THB* is innovative and a storehouse of many views. Although the *THB* is comprehensive, it does not deal with all aspects of the textual criticism of the Hebrew and translated Bible.

Keywords: textual criticism, Masoretic Text, Dead Sea Scrolls, Septuagint, ancient translations

In 2016 a major new research tool on the textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible was launched, the *Textual History of the Bible (THB)*.¹ After an introductory description of this handbook, I will discuss the necessity of such a tool for scholarship at the beginning of the 21st century. The *THB* will then be addressed at greater length.

The *THB* was devised by Armin Lange as a handbook for the text of the scriptural books in the wide sense of the word. Published by Brill, the *THB* is both a handbook and an encyclopedia. It records the story of the transmission of the biblical text, describes the many textual forms of the Bible, evaluates them, and helps the reader to find his or her way in the labyrinth

¹ A. Lange and E. Tov (ed.), *Textual History of the Bible Online*, Vol. 1 (Leiden: Brill, 2015); see <http://www.brill.com/products/book/textual-history-bible-vol-1a>. The printed version of *Textual History of the Bible* (vol. 1A, 1B, 1C) contains 353 articles in more than 2000 pages. Volumes 2–3 will be, respectively, Matthias Henze and Frank Feder (ed.), *Deuterocanonical Scriptures*; and Russell E. Fuller, Armin Lange, and Hanna Tervanotko (ed.), *A Companion to Textual Criticism*; vol. 4 will then be *Indices and Manuscript Catalogues*.

that is “the text of the Bible,” something that is not found in a single source, but rather in all the sources containing a biblical text.

The *THB* is a theoretical handbook that does not provide practical help. That is, the *THB* provides background information about several hundreds of ancient texts, for example, the Masoretic Text of Genesis, the Septuagint of Judges, and the Armenian translation of Isaiah. However, the *THB* does not provide texts, does not list variants in an organized way, and does not help in solving textual problems. In fact, there are hardly any guides that aid in solving such problems, except perhaps the textual handbooks by J. de Waard and E. A. Nida on Ruth (1992)² or that by R. L. Omanson and P. A. Noss on Esther (1997).³ In other words, the *THB* is not an aid for practicing textual criticism. For that purpose, one would have to participate in courses in textual criticism in which textual problems are analyzed. Even mature scholars often lack such experience.

I now turn to the necessity of a new tool for the study of textual criticism at the beginning of the 21st century, necessitated by progress in textual scholarship, new textual evidence, progress in understanding the textual witnesses, etc.

Progress in Textual Scholarship. In the second decade of the 21st century, we can comfortably look back at previous centuries in order to capture the highlights of developments in textual criticism during those periods. Most of the significant progress in textual criticism took place in the 20th century, but that progress would not have taken place without the seeds sown by German scholarship of the second part of the 19th century, or the insights of some giants of the 17th and 18th centuries in Europe. The first extensive textual treatises are those by J. Morinus, L. Cappellus, and Richard Simon.⁴ They are usually colored by Catholic–Protestant polemics, which stressed the importance of either the MT or one or more of the other versions. A reader of Cappellus’ *Critica Sacra* (1650) will be amazed at the level of knowledge, acumen, and critical insight displayed by this scholar, foreshadowing all

2 J. de Waard and E. A. Nida, *A Handbook on the Book of Ruth* (2nd ed.; New York: United Bible Societies, 1992).

3 R. L. Omanson and P. A. Noss, *A Handbook on the Book of Esther: The Hebrew and Greek Texts* (UBS Handbook Series; New York: American Bible Society, 1997).

4 L. Cappellus, *Critica Sacra sive de variis quae in sacris Veteris Testamenti libris occurrunt lectionibus libri sex* (Paris: Cramoisy, 1650; Halle: Hendel, 1775–[1786]); J. Morinus, *Exercitationum biblicarum de hebraei graecique textus sinceritate libri duo* (Paris: 1633; and for the 2nd ed., G. Meturas: 1660); Richard Simon, *Histoire critique du Vieux Testament* (Paris: Éditions de Paris, 1680/Rotterdam: Leers, 1685; repr. Frankfurt: Minerva, 1973) = *A Critical History of the Old Testament* (London: Davis, 1682).

modern analyses. After the middle of the 17th century, a great many critical treatises appeared on the Scriptural text, though it should be recognized that philological analysis and theological discussion often went hand in hand in this and the following century. The three aforementioned studies, as well as many by J. Buxtorf, Glassius, J.H. Hottinger, A. F. Houbigant, B. Kennicott, E. F. C. Rosenmüller, and G. B. de Rossi,⁵ greatly contributed to the critical approach to the biblical text. Among the many names from the 19th century alone, see especially de P. de Lagarde, F. Perles, C. H. Cornill, and J. Wellhausen,⁶ who displayed remarkable insight into textual criticism. The 20th century marked significant advancement in the understanding of all the ancient texts, and in the preparation of good text editions of Hebrew Scripture, as well as almost all of its translations, usually produced by research projects and committees. Probably more than any other discipline of biblical research, there has been enormous progress in textual criticism over the last century.

New textual evidence. The discovery of new textual sources in almost every area of textual studies greatly improved the understanding of each area in textual criticism.

– Pride of place goes to the major find of the 20th century: the scripture fragments in Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek from the Judean Desert, as well as non-biblical texts quoting and expanding on the Bible. Relevant in this respect are the “early” sites of Qumran and Masada and the “later” sites elsewhere in the Judean Desert. The major find site is Qumran, where between 1947 and 1956 fragments of some 240 Hebrew and Aramaic biblical scrolls were found in eleven caves. The Judean Desert texts contribute much to our

5 J. Buxtorf, *Tiberias, sive Commentarius Masoreticus* (Basil: Rauracorum, 1620); *Salomonis Glassii Philologia Sacra his temporibus accomodata ... II, 1, Critica Sacra* (ed. G. L. Bauer; Leipzig: Sumptibus Weygandianis, 1795); J. H. Hottinger(us), *Exercitationes anti-Moriniane de Pentateucho Samaritano, ejusque uidentica authentia*. (Zurich: Bodmer, 1644); A. F. Houbigant, *Notae criticae in universos Veteris Testamenti libros* (Frankfurt: Varrentrapp Filium & Wenner, 1777); B. Kennicott, *Vetus Testamentum hebraicum, cum variis lectionibus*, vols. I–II (Oxford: Clarendon, 1776–1780; repr. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag, 2003); E. F. C. Rosenmüller, *Handbuch für die Literatur der biblischen Kritik und Exegese*, Vol. 1 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1797), and G. B. de Rossi, *Variae lectiones Veteris Testamenti*, Vols. 1–4 (Parma: Regio, 1784–1788; repr. Amsterdam: Philo, 1969).

6 P. de Lagarde, *Anmerkungen zur griechischen Übersetzung der Proverben* (Leipzig: Brockhaus, 1863); F. Perles, *Analekten zur Textkritik des Alten Testaments*, Vol. 1 (Munich: Ackermann, 1895); Vol. II (Leipzig: Engel, 1922); C. H. Cornill, *Das Buch des Propheten Ezechiel* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1886); J. Wellhausen, *Der Text der Bücher Samuëlis* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1871).

knowledge of the biblical text at the time of the Second Temple, a period for which there was hardly any Hebrew evidence before 1947. Until that time, scholars necessarily based their analyses mainly on manuscripts from the Middle Ages. The Qumran evidence enriches our knowledge in the following areas: 1) previously unknown readings help us to better understand many details in the biblical text, often pertaining to matters of substance; 2) the textual variety reflected in the Qumran scrolls provides a good overview of the condition of the biblical text in the Second Temple period; 3) the scrolls provide much background information on the copying of biblical texts and their transmission in the Second Temple period; and 4) the reliability of the reconstructed *Vorlage* of the ancient translations, especially the LXX, is supported by the Qumran texts. Septuagint studies flourished before the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls, including the reconstruction of its Hebrew *Vorlage*. But not until Hebrew texts were found with readings identical to that *Vorlage* was confidence established in the reconstruction procedure. By the same token, the place of the Samaritan Pentateuch in the history of the development of the Hebrew text was understood only with the discovery of pre-Samaritan texts in Qumran.

– A very large amount of Hebrew fragments found in the Cairo *Genizah* at the end of the 19th century provide much welcome background material for the vocalized and unvocalized medieval MT text, as well as for the Targumim and Aquila's Greek translation.

– Previously unknown uncial manuscripts and groups of LXX papyrus fragments helped us in understanding the condition of the LXX text before the era of the *Hexapla*, whose textual tradition penetrated almost all Greek texts.

– The Targum literature was much enriched by the discovery in the Vatican library of an early Torah Targum (i. e., codex Neophyti 1) from 1504, which was probably based on sources from the 2nd or 1st century C.E.⁷

Progress in understanding the textual witnesses. Opinions are divided with regard to the evaluation of the textual witnesses. However, some issues are beyond doubt. Old theories have fallen and new ones have arisen. Some highlights:

- The nature and background of the MT may always remain enigmatic.
- A multitude of studies analyze the impact of the Dead Sea Scrolls on our understanding of the individual biblical books.

⁷ See A. Díez Macho, *Neophyti I*, Vols. I–V (Madrid: CSIC, 1968–1978).

– The LXX and some Qumran scrolls reflect some texts that differ from the MT at the literary (redactional) level.

– LXX research has been revolutionized in the wake of the research of D. Barthélemy.⁸ This scholar identified an anonymous revision of the LXX in the Minor Prophets scroll from Nahal Hever (namely, *kaige*-Theodotion), as well as in various segments within the so-called “LXX” canon. In the wake of Barthélemy’s research, the internal structure of the LXX has become much clearer, because we now realize that that corpus consists of books and parts of books reflecting the original translation (the “Old Greek” translation), as well as books incorporating later translations ascribed to the mentioned *kaige*-Theodotion group and to Aquila. For a summary of the research, see the *THB*, 1.3.1.2.

– The study of the Qumran scrolls has given rise to the understanding that in the last centuries B.C.E. and the 1st century C.E. textual diversity (the existence of different text forms) characterized the Qumran community and ancient Israel as a whole.

– There has been much progress in understanding the varied nature of the Peshitta and the Aramaic translations in the different Scripture books, as well as their internal relation.

Approaches to textual criticism. Over the course of the 20th century, scholars’ basic approaches to textual criticism probably have not changed. There have always been those who ignored the textual evidence beyond the MT, and for whom the MT served as *the* Bible, while others paid much attention to the totality of the textual sources. Among the former are scholars, critical or not, religious (Jewish and Christian) or not, who ignored the non-Masoretic evidence, consciously or not. Among the latter are critical scholars who specialize in textual criticism and therefore are more inclined to take non-Masoretic evidence into consideration. There is definitely a shift towards a greater integration of the textual data into the study of Hebrew Scripture, probably because of the popularity of the Dead Sea Scrolls.

Textual theories. Several textual theories have been launched to describe the development of the biblical text, especially in the 20th century, though some go back to the 19th century. Such theories describe the development of the biblical text based on preconceived ideas that do not directly derive from the evidence itself. The most well known of these are those of P. de Lagarde, P. Kahle, W. F. Albright, and F. M. Cross. While Lagarde wrote long

8 D. Barthélemy, *Les devanciers d’Aquila* (VTSup 10; Leiden: Brill, 1963).

before the Dead Sea Scrolls were found, Kahle did review the new discoveries, thinking that they reflected his views. Albright and Cross launched a completely novel theory based on the scrolls in which they propagated the idea of different local texts that developed in isolation in different areas. I reviewed these theories briefly,⁹ while adding my own view according to which the textual reality of the Second Temple period was one of an almost endless textual plurality.¹⁰

Text editions. A wealth of existing text editions and continued work on them have transformed textual criticism into a vibrant area of scholarship marked by different editorial concepts: the MT without an exact indication of the source, the adherence to the Second Rabbinic Bible (RB2), the adherence to the Ben-Asher tradition, the representation of a single manuscript, the addition of an apparatus of variants to the text of critical editions, and the development of so-called “eclectic” editions.¹¹

Computer-assisted research: Since the last quarter of the 20th century, computer-assisted tools and research have greatly aided the study of textual criticism. Such tools consist of flexible, interactive databases and programs that aid the researcher in obtaining and analyzing data, while the research presents non-flexible results of investigations that were compiled with the aid of machine-readable data. This type of research benefits all corners of text-critical research.

These are only some of the aspects that make textual criticism into an area in which many developments have taken place over the last half century that could not easily be monitored with the tools preceding those analyzed in this review.

Textual History of the Bible. When Armin Lange asked me five years ago to join him in a new encyclopedic enterprise that would cover the textual history of the Bible, I gladly agreed.

9 See my *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (3rd rev. ed.; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2012), 169–174, 180–190. Henceforth: *TCHB*.

10 At the same time, in my most recent research, I see a structure in this plurality in the case of the Torah, as is clear from the title of my forthcoming publication: “The Development of the Text of the Torah in Two Major Text Blocks,” *Textus*.

11 For examples of the various types of approaches as embodied in the different text editions, see my study “Modern Editions of the Hebrew Bible,” in *From the Beginnings to 600*, Vol. 1 of *The New Cambridge History of the Bible* (ed. J. C. Paget & J. Schaper; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 365–385.

Structure of the *THB*, vol. 1. This volume contains:

1. Introductory articles on each of the texts of the Hebrew and translated Bible (1.1–1.7.2), starting with a fifty-page introduction to the Textual History of the Hebrew Bible by E. Tov and E. Ulrich (1.1.1).

2. Overview articles on the textual history of each of the biblical books (e.g., 2.1 Textual History of the Pentateuch; 3.1 Textual History of Joshua; 4.1 Textual History of Judges, etc.).

3. Detailed articles on the textual nature of *each* biblical book as presented in all of the textual witnesses listed below:

– Ancient and Late Ancient Hebrew Manuscript Evidence, e.g. 5.3.1 on the Judean Desert finds in Samuel–Kings.

– Masoretic Texts and Ancient Texts Close to the MT, e.g. 5.3.2 covering Samuel–Kings.

– Other Hebrew texts, e.g., 5.3.3 covering the Judean Desert finds in Samuel–Kings.

– SP (Samaritan Pentateuch) and texts close to SP, covering each of the five books of the SP.

– Sundry additional Hebrew evidence that cannot be entered in any category, such as *tefillin* and *mezuzot* (2.2.5.2), Papyrus Nash (2.2.5.2), etc.

– Each of the primary translations: LXX, Pre-Hexaplaric Translations, Hexapla, post-Hexaplaric translations, Samareitikon, the many Targumim, Peshitta, Vulgate, Arabic (Rabbanite, Karaite, Christian, and Samaritan) translations.

– Each of the secondary translations, mainly translated from the LXX: Latin (Old Latin, review article 1.4.1), Coptic (1.4.2), Ethiopic (1.4.3), Syriac (Syro-Lucianic, 1.4.4; Syro-Hexapla 1.4.5; Jacob of Edessa’s Syriac translation 1.4.6; altogether deemed “late Syriac translations”), Armenian (1.4.7), Georgian (1.4.8), Christian Palestinian Aramaic or CPA (1.4.9), Old Church Slavonic (1.4.10), Arabic (1.4.11), and Gothic (1.4.12). Furthermore, some Arabic translations of the Pentateuch (2.5.8.1) and the Prophets (6–9.2.8) are made from the Peshitta.

– The Masorah, described in several articles referring to parts of the Bible.

– The biblical text as attested within ancient literature (e.g., 21.1.1 Jubilees; 21.1.2 Pseudo-Philo).

Coverage (scope). As in all multi-volume, multi-article works, a first step in building a project is to determine its scope, which is problematic because there is always a tendency to expand the coverage. In our case, the scope is the books of the Hebrew-Aramaic canon, together with their textual witnesses in the original languages and in all the ancient primary and second-

ary translations. This definition includes, for example, the Hebrew-Aramaic book of Daniel and its two Greek translations (Septuagint and Theodotion), but not the Greek Additions to Daniel that will be covered in the next volume of the *THB*, vol. 2. The compositions that the LXX, Vulgate, Peshitta and the secondary translations have in excess of the Hebrew canon (the so-called Apocrypha) are likewise not covered by vol. 1.

Each book in the Hebrew Scripture or its translations, such as the Peshitta of Chronicles (20.3.4), is described in a separate article, while some clusters were created, especially in the secondary translations, if too little information is known about each of the separate units.

The scope of the *THB*, covering all the primary and secondary translations, is wider than that of any other modern tool on the text of the Bible. This type of coverage differs from that of modern handbooks, such as my own introduction to textual criticism,¹² since the articles in the *THB* also describe at length exegetical and linguistic tendencies visible in Hebrew and translated witnesses. In articles covering the Hebrew text, this coverage may involve linguistic and orthographic tendencies of the scribe of 1QIsa^a (6.2.1). In translation units, such as Old Greek translation of Isaiah, this may involve a description of its exegetical tendencies, which are provided in detail in 6.1. These tendencies are described at length in the case of the Targumim, in which almost no Hebrew variants are reflected and in which the main interest centers around their exegetical tendencies (see the overview articles 1.3.3; 2.4.3.1; 2.4.3.2–4).

The wide coverage of the *THB* is not novel in the history of biblical scholarship, since it was sometimes offered to readers in the early days of biblical introductions. At the beginning of the critical inquiry into Hebrew Scripture and its translations, scholars were accustomed to describe indiscriminately the richly available evidence for the early text of the Bible. They did not necessarily have the critical insight to realize the different contributions made by these sources to the understanding of the ancient Hebrew text. That is, an ancient translation like the LXX reflecting a Hebrew *Vorlage* that could have differed greatly from the MT may have been given the same or even less attention than other translations attesting to greatly deviating exegetical traditions yet were rendered from a text resembling the MT. A good example of this trend is the influential *Einleitung* of J. G. Eichhorn (1780–1823)¹³ that

¹² Tov, *TCHB*.

¹³ J. G. Eichhorn, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (Leipzig: Weidmanns, 1780–1783; 2nd ed.: Leipzig: Weidmanns, 1787; note also 3rd ed.: Leipzig: Weidmanns, 1803 and 4th ed.: Göttingen: Rosenbusch, 1823).

devotes 107 pages to the Syriac translations, 98 pages to the Arabic translations, 123 pages to the Targumim, and a “mere” 73 pages to the LXX.¹⁴

Chronological boundaries of the scope. When the project was planned, there were no clearly defined chronological boundaries for the coverage of the *THB*. Obviously the earliest scrolls from the Judean Desert were included (mid-3rd century B.C.E.), and the much earlier silver scrolls from Ketef Hinnom (2.2.5.3) were also covered. The Ben Asher master codices and latest Arabic primary translations were thought of in a general sense as the final boundary. Little did we know, however, that in the case of the Ethiopic translations we would also be talking about manuscript groups from the 18th century or later (1.4.3).

History of the *THB*, vol. 1. The *THB* was created piecemeal, article by article, in an unorganized fashion, due to the fact that some authors were more prompt in finishing their assignments than others. Most assignments of articles were made in 2010, while some were made at a later stage. Upon completion, articles were reviewed by area editors specializing in the source texts (Hebrew and Aramaic), primary translations (Greek, Syriac, Aramaic, Latin, Arabic), and secondary translations (Latin, Coptic, Ethiopic, Armenian, Georgian, Old Church Slavonic, Arabic). Secondarily articles were reviewed by the volume editors and were copy-edited. The review articles analyzing the textual history of the individual books were created on the basis of the completed articles.

Exegesis. One of the practical results of textual criticism is that it creates tools for the exegesis of Hebrew-Aramaic Scripture. In short, the textual critic, commentator, and literary critic place the textual details – or more precisely, mainly the details preferable to the MT – in the larger context of the biblical verse. The articles in the *THB* thus summarize the relevance of the textual data or textual history of a book for its exegesis. Summaries of this type are found in the overview articles and in some but not all of the articles about the translational units. Some of them analyze tendencies,

¹⁴ Eichhorn, *Einleitung*. In the fourth edition, the Targumim are discussed in Vol. II.1–123, the translations from Hebrew and Greek into Syriac in Vol. II.123–230, and various types of Arabic translations in II.231–329. See further the analysis of the translations into Armenian (329–349), Ethiopic (349–354), “Egyptian” (355–375), Persian (376–383), Slavonic (383–384), Georgian (385–388), and Latin (398–437). The section on the LXX is contained in Vol. I.447–520.

whereas others speak about individual cases, because the exegesis embedded in these units is not of the same type. A good example is LXX-Job (11.3.1.5).

LXX-Job contributes to our understanding of Job as it was read by one prodigious, insightful scholar in the Alexandrian Jewish community in the late 2nd century B.C.E. For example, the translation contains a well-developed vocabulary related to wrongdoing. Generally, the numerous Hebrew words for wrong are reduced to ἀδικία, “injustice,” ἀνομία, “lawlessness,” ἀσέβεια, “impiety,” and their cognates. The ἀδικία word group renders eleven different Hebrew words, while the ἀνομία word group renders five. Or LXX-Gen (2.4.1.1.7): “The Greek book of Genesis is of great importance with regard to the early reception history of the Hebrew Bible and the development of several theological ideas in the Second Temple period, of which only a few can be listed here. Worth mentioning is the influence of Platonic ideas on the creation account, which subsequently impacted the ideas of Philo.”

Differing views. The *THB* reflects a wide range of views, and cross-references to different types of articles sometimes help in obtaining a more balanced view. I give an example close to my heart. An article on LXX-Jer necessarily has to come to grips with an explanation of the nature of this translation which is much shorter than the MT. If there is such a thing as a scholarly consensus, it is that this translation reflects a short Hebrew text represented by 4QJer^b and 4QJer^d.¹⁵ That view underlies the overview article on the text of Jeremiah (7.1) and the article on the MT version of that book (7.2.2.2), but the article on LXX-Jer itself (7.3) ascribes most of these differences to the translator (7.3.6). When read together, these articles reflect the whole range of views, while each individual article also refers to alternative views. In the different case of 11QPs^a, according to all scholars the details in this scroll need to be taken into consideration in the textual criticism of the book of Psalms. Nevertheless, some scholars consider this to be a very aberrant Psalter text that reflects a different edition of the book (1.1.1 Table 2), while others view this scroll as an ancient prayer book, that is therefore only partially relevant to the composition of the book of Psalms (10.2.1.2; 10.2.3).

Differences of opinion are also visible in terminology, for example the use of the term “MT-like scrolls” in articles written by myself (1.1.1; 2.1) as opposed to the term “semi-Masoretic scrolls” in articles written by Armin Lange (1.2.2). Both terms refer to Qumran scrolls of the Masoretic family

¹⁵ For my own view, see Tov, *TCHB*, 286–294.

that differ in a minor way from the medieval text, probably up to 2 percent of the readings.¹⁶

Unique contribution of the *THB*. In the world of 2017, in principle anyone who wants to start an investigation of a textual problem in the field of the Hebrew Bible and its translations could and should start with the *THB*. It provides the most updated information on a great variety of textual issues on the textual witnesses with updated bibliographies. In some areas it provides good summaries and novel insights, while in other areas it goes beyond anything that exists in the scholarly literature. Let me mention a few examples of the unique contribution of *THB* 1, presented in a subjective fashion.

1. The *THB* is the only tool that provides an analysis of every single textual witness, book by book. At the same time, a few partial tools are available such as the handbook on the biblical Dead Sea Scrolls by Lange¹⁷ and the 2015 *Companion to the Septuagint* by J.K. Aitken.¹⁸ The *THB* is an essential tool for scholars working on any of these texts.

2. The systematic study of several secondary translations was *terra incognita* before *THB* had begun, and therefore most of the research on the Coptic, secondary Syriac, Armenian, Ethiopic, Georgian, Arabic, and Old Church Slavonic translations is still based on manuscripts and not on editions. The collections of articles in the *THB* should be considered little monographs. As further research continues, the description in these areas may soon be more in need of updating than the other areas in the *THB*.

3. The *THB* vol. 1 provides the first comprehensive treatment of all the witnesses to the Hebrew text of the Bible.

4. The collection of descriptions of the textual developments of each book of Hebrew Scripture is unique in the scholarly literature.

5. The section “The Biblical Text as Attested in Ancient Literature” is unique in the scholarly literature, including such articles as describing Philo, Pseudo-Philo; Greek, Syriac and Coptic Church Fathers.

6. The detailed collection of articles on the pre-Hexaplaric translations, the Hexapla and the post-Hexaplaric translations, the Peshitta, Targumim and Vulgate is unique in the scholarly literature.

7. The detailed discussion of the characteristics of the combined primary (1.3) and secondary translations (1.4) is unique in the scholarly literature. If

¹⁶ See *ibid.*, 31. The so-called proto-Masoretic texts are virtually identical to the medieval text or differ from them as much as the medieval texts differ from one another.

¹⁷ A. Lange, *Die Handschriften biblischer Bücher von Qumran und den anderen Fundorten*, Vol. 1 of *Handbuch der Textfunde vom Toten Meer* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009).

¹⁸ J.K. Aitken, *T&T Clark Companion to the Septuagint* (London: Bloomsbury, 2015).

all articles of the *THB* vol. 1 on a given biblical book are read together, often new insights develop.

The *THB* and other biblical disciplines. As mentioned, one of the practical results of the textual analysis found in the *THB* is that it creates tools for the exegesis of Hebrew–Aramaic scripture, but the results pertain to more than exegesis. All other disciplines, such as the historical, geographical, and linguistic analyses of Scripture, operate from a text base as well. In each case, the scholar has to define the text base or bases for the analysis. All these disciplines draw information from textual sources, especially linguistic analysis. However, the *THB* does not pay special attention to what information these disciplines can learn from non-Masoretic sources. That is, the focus of the *THB* vol. 1 is on text units and not on disciplines. Therefore, there are no articles on the indebtedness of historical analysis to textual data, such as in the historical books or on the importance of the Judean Desert scrolls for linguistic analysis. The *THB* is not alone in its systematic negligence regarding the study of non-Masoretic linguistic traditions in the study of “biblical Hebrew.” “Qumran Hebrew” is studied, but as an area in its own right, not as part of biblical Hebrew. Even in the articles in the *Encyclopedia of Hebrew Language and Linguistics* non-Masoretic Hebrew traditions are usually not treated within the study of “Biblical Hebrew,” but rather in separate articles dealing with the linguistic traditions reflected in the Judean Desert texts.

How to find one’s topic of interest in the *THB*. In order to find the topic in which one is interested, a certain knowledge of the subject material is needed. In the online version every topic is within reach through the search engine, while in the printed version the index is of help. The general structure of the *THB* helps in the search for the needed topic:

1. Introductory articles (1).
2. Articles on the individual textual witnesses in Hebrew and translation in the sequence of the Scripture books (2–19).
3. The biblical text as attested in ancient literature (20).

Thus articles about one of the translations are located through the Table of Contents, the search engine, or the overview of the primary (1.3) and secondary (1.4) translations. Descriptions of Dead Sea Scrolls such as 4QNum^b can be located under “Ancient and Late Ancient Hebrew and Aramaic Texts” (1.2.2). Thus the first reference to and description of 4QSam^a is found in 5.3.1, further elaborated upon in 5.3.3. In the case of Jeremiah, the totality of the evidence is mentioned in 7.2.1 “Ancient Manuscript Evidence,” and here we find brief, initial discussions of 4QJer^{a,b,c,d,e} and more detailed

discussions under “Masoretic Texts and Ancient Texts Close to MT” (7.2.2) and “Other Texts” (7.2.3) because basically all texts are covered by the latter two categories.

Comparison with other tools. When comparing *THB* with an introduction to textual criticism like my own book *TCHB* (see n. 9), it is important to describe the strengths of both tools.

1. *TCHB* contains a “mere” 480 pages while the *THB* contains more than 2000 pages. The *THB* is much wider in conception, so that several areas are not at all covered by *TCHB*: the secondary translations, the extensive coverage of most of the primary translations except for the LXX, and the textual description of the individual witnesses in the biblical books.

2. On the other hand, *TCHB* has a much longer discussion of the textual transmission of the biblical text,¹⁹ and the *THB* does not devote separate attention to evaluating textual evidence (*TCHB* chapter 6), to conjectural criticism (*TCHB* chapter 8), or to the editions of the Bible (*TCHB* chapter 9). Some attention to these topics will be included in *THB* vol. 3.

3. *TCHB* is a tightly closed unit from which one can study textual criticism according to one scholar’s view, while the *THB* reflects many different views.

Use of the Content Management System (CMS).²⁰ The first project for which Brill publishers employed a fully automatic electronic managing system is the current project. The advantage of the CMS is that authors can upload their articles, editors and copy-editors can review and correct these articles, and the proofreading, indexing, and printing of the articles can be done directly from the CMS. A great advantage for the editors is that last minute changes can be inserted easily. Over the years I started liking the system more than I did initially, but its word-processing possibilities are still far behind those of the regular word processor programs, e. g. in the handling of fonts, letter sizes, tracking changes, use of colors, handling of footnotes, and general user-friendliness.

Editors. In vol. 1, I was the editor responsible for the primary versions, as well as the Samaritan Pentateuch and the Masoretic text, including the corresponding overview articles. Lange had the editorial responsibility for the

¹⁹ For a brief discussion in the *THB*, see sect. 1.1.1.6 entitled “Scribal Transmission of the Biblical Text.”

²⁰ See the “Author Manual for the Content Management System,” n.p. [cited 1 May 2016]. Online: http://brill.stippweb.nl/srw/producten/srw_thb/downloads/doc_10_35.pdf

ancient Hebrew biblical texts, the secondary translations, and the biblical text as attested in ancient literature, including their corresponding overview articles. In addition, I was responsible for entries 1.1.1 and 1.2.3, while Lange worked on entries 1.1.2; 1.2.1; 1.2.2; 1.4; 1.7.1; and 1.7.2.

Online and printed versions. After the printed versions were published in 2016 and 2017, the online version will be updated from time to time, with indication of the changes. Brill now has a large number of such reference works in a special online library (BrillOnline Reference Works) to be accessed through a special personal or institutional subscription.

Summary. Much significant progress in textual criticism occurred in the 20th century, as is visible in new primary evidence, understanding the textual witnesses, approaches to textual criticism, textual theories, computer-assisted research, and text editions. The *THB* is making it easier for scholars to handle this wealth of information and its dispersion in a multitude of studies and tools. The *THB* is easy to use, innovative, and a storehouse of many views. Although the *THB* is comprehensive, it does not deal with all aspects of the textual criticism of the Hebrew and translated Bible.

Emanuel Tov
Department of Bible
The Hebrew University of Jerusalem
Jerusalem
Emanuel.tov@mail.huji.ac.il