

JORDAN DAVIS

The End of the Book of Numbers

Archaeology and Bible

6

Mohr Siebeck

Archaeology and Bible

Edited by

Israel Finkelstein (Tel Aviv) · Deirdre Fulton (Waco, TX)
Oded Lipschits (Tel Aviv) · Christophe Nihan (Lausanne)
Thomas Römer (Lausanne) · Konrad Schmid (Zürich)

6



Jordan Davis

The End of the Book of Numbers

On Pentateuchal Models and
Compositional Issues

Mohr Siebeck

Jordan Davis, born 1983; Master of Divinity (Whitley College – University of Divinity, Melbourne, Australia); Doktor der Theologie (Universität Zürich, Zürich, Switzerland).
orcid.org/0000-0002-6736-762X

Published with the support of the Swiss National Science Foundation.

ISSN 978-3-16-161856-7 / eISBN 978-3-16-161857-4

DOI 10.1628/978-3-16-161857-4

ISSN 2698-4520 / eISSN 2698-4539 (Archaeology and Bible)

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliographie; detailed bibliographic data are available at <http://dnb.dnb.de>.

2022 Mohr Siebeck Tübingen, Germany. www.mohrsiebeck.com

This work is licensed under the license “Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International” (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0). A complete Version of the license text can be found at: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>. Any use not covered by the above license is prohibited and illegal without the permission of the publisher.

The book was typeset by Martin Fischer in Tübingen, printed on non-aging paper by Laupp & Göbel in Gomaringen and bound by Buchbinderei Nädele in Nehren.

Printed in Germany.

For Joanna and Finn.

Preface

The following monograph grew out of a broader project entitled “The History of the Pentateuch: Combining Literary and Archaeological Approaches,” funded by the Swiss National Science Foundation (Sinergia project CRSII160785). The project – a joint venture of the universities of Zurich, Lausanne and Tel Aviv – was directed by Konrad Schmid (Zurich), Christophe Nihan and Thomas Römer (Lausanne), and Israel Finkelstein and Oded Lipschits (Tel Aviv). When I heard that I had been selected to take part in this prestigious project on the formation of the Pentateuch I was elated. However, I must confess that I found the idea of investigating “historical geography” rather daunting. Not only did I have very little exposure to archaeological matters from my previous studies, but I found the concept of looking at place names rather insipid. However, my ignorance proved to be greatly misguided, as it turned out historical geography not only opened the doors to new insights into the biblical text itself but also towards questions of those texts’ place within the formation of the Pentateuch. Furthermore, the geographical findings are arguably the most interesting part of the argument ... *Mea culpa*.

The resulting monograph features only a single name on the cover, however there were, of course, many supporting figures who undeniably helped it reach its final form.

Konrad Schmid, who not only made the decision to accept me as a doctoral student but who also suggested that I apply for the Sinergia project on the formation of the Pentateuch. Konrad not only helped me in his supervisory role but has continued to support me long after this official requirement ended. I feel lucky to have such a role model during this formative stage in my career.

Christian Frevel, for whom I worked as a research assistant during the writing of my dissertation. Christian’s own work on the book of Numbers and the history of ancient Israel provided an enormous influence on my own thinking and I consider myself fortunate to have been in a position to engage with his work so closely. Christian also inspired me with his tireless work ethic and I am especially grateful for the detailed feedback he provided on the final draft of my dissertation.

Many other friends and colleagues contributed to my journey as well: Julia Rhyder, my fellow Aussie in Europe, with whom I had countless fruitful discussions and who continues to be an unending source of encouragement and in-

spiration. Jürg Hutzli, with whom I worked alongside as a co-editor as part of the Sinergia project and who provided welcome feedback on my dealings with the Priestly texts in Genesis. Katharina Pyschny, who shared her expertise on the book of Numbers and provided helpful critiques of my early ideas. Christophe Nihan, who invited me to present a workshop wherein I could discuss my ideas with the research team in Lausanne.

I would also like to thank the editors of ArchB – Israel Finkelstein, Deirdre Fulton, Oded Lipschits, Christophe Nihan, Thomas Römer, and Konrad Schmid – for accepting this monograph into the series and Mohr Siebeck for the publication – especially Elena Müller for her advice and help during the preparation and Markus Kirchner for his detailed feedback.

Finally, I wish to thank my family: My parents – Peter, Anne and Graeme – for their encouragement and support. My son Finn, who was born during the PhD and who provided countless hours of distraction and joy. And my wife, Jo, who left the good life in Melbourne to move to a country whose language we did not speak in pursuit of this crazy academic dream of mine.

Lastly, I would like to mention one study that I only became aware of too late in my own research: Dylan R. Johnson, *Sovereign Authority and the Elaboration of Law in the Bible and the Ancient Near East*. FAT II 122 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2020). Dylan, a fellow researcher at UZH, also has extensive chapters on Num 27 (pp. 217–265) and Num 36 (pp. 266–295).

Table of Contents

List of Figures	XIII
List of Tables	XIV
Chapter 1: Introduction	1
Chapter 2: Setting the Stage: Background for Understanding the Book of Numbers	7
2.1 <i>Pentateuchal Models and the Book of Numbers</i>	7
2.1.1 The Documentary Hypothesis	7
2.1.1.1 A Brief History of the Source Model	7
2.1.1.2 The Problem of Deuteronomy	8
2.1.1.3 The Documentary Hypothesis and the Book of Numbers	10
2.1.2 The Pentateuchal Crisis and the Introduction of New Models	17
2.1.2.1 Farewell to the Yahwist	17
2.1.2.2 The End of Pg and the Holiness Code	18
2.1.2.3 The Bridge-Book Hypothesis	22
2.1.2.4 Numbers as Part of a Pre-Priestly Narrative Composition	31
2.1.2.5 Summary of Pentateuchal Models	40
2.2 <i>Toward Certainty: Increasing the Size of the Data Pool</i>	41
2.2.1 Empirical Evidence Regarding the Conflation of Sources	42
2.2.2 Extra-biblical Evidence and Historical Geography	46
2.2.3 The Samaritan Influence and the Formation of the Pentateuch	49
2.3 <i>In Favour of an Exodus-Conquest Narrative</i>	52
2.3.1 Jeroboam II and the Moses Story	53
2.3.2 Josiah and Early Joshua	56
2.4 <i>The Structure of Numbers</i>	68
Chapter 3: The Occupation of Transjordan	81
3.1 <i>Old Layers and Historical Memories?</i>	82
3.1.1 Reflecting on the Geography of Numbers 32:1	82
3.1.1.1 Literary Geography	84

3.1.1.2 Geographical Analysis	85
3.1.1.3 Historical Analysis	88
3.1.1.4 In Support of the Pre-Sihon Base Layer of Numbers 32	93
3.1.2 More Pre-Sihon Traditions	96
3.1.3 Tracing the Base Layer of Numbers 32	98
3.1.4 Reflections on the Non-Priestly Layer	107
3.2 <i>The Sihon Tradition</i>	109
3.2.1 Deuteronomy 2:24–3:18* and the Problem of Settlement in the Transjordan	110
3.2.2 Numbers 21:21–35*	125
3.2.3 Heshbon, Sihon’s City	134
3.2.4 Sihon the Amorite?	137
3.3 <i>Post-Sihon, Non-Priestly Updates in Numbers 32</i>	139
3.3.1 Numbers 32:34–38	144
3.3.2 Numbers 32:39–42* and the Half-Tribe of Manasseh	148
3.3.3 Summary of the Non-Priestly, Post-Sihon Changes	153
3.4 <i>Transjordan and the Priestly Material</i>	153
3.4.1 Canaan and the Priestly Ideology of Land	154
3.4.2 The Priestly Elements in Numbers 32	159
3.4.3 Reflections on the Priestly Layer	164
3.5 <i>Conquest of the Amorites</i>	165
3.5.1 Deuteronomy Re-Imagines the Promised Land	166
3.5.2 Updating the Sihon Narrative in Numbers 21	169
3.5.3 Further Deuteronomistic Influences in Numbers 32	169
3.6 <i>Joining Priestly and Deuteronomistic Texts</i>	172
3.6.1 Completing the Sihon Narrative	172
3.6.2 Completing Numbers 32	176
3.6.2.1 Leadership Harmonisation	178
3.6.2.2 “City” Harmonisation	179
3.6.2.3 Ideological Harmonisation	182
3.6.2.4 Continuity Harmonisation	183
3.7 <i>Conclusion</i>	188
 Chapter 4: Female Inheritance	 191
4.1 <i>The Legal Conundrum</i>	193
4.2 <i>The Universal Legislation for Heiresses: Num 27:8–11a</i>	194
4.2.1 Property, Marriage and Inheritance in Ancient Israel	195

4.2.2 Supplement or Replacement? Numbers 27:8–11a and Deuteronomy 25:5–10	199
4.2.3 Summary	207
4.3 <i>The Specific Case of Zelophehad's Daughters: Num 27:1–7a</i>	208
4.4 <i>Historical Connection to Zelophehad's Daughters?</i>	218
4.4.1 The Wedge-shape Decorated Bowl	219
4.4.2 The Neo-Assyrian Two-way Deportation	223
4.4.3 On Pots and People	228
4.4.4 Other Biblical Support	229
4.4.4.1 Joshua 17:1–12	232
4.4.4.2 1 Kings 4:7–19	235
4.4.5 Summary	241
4.5 <i>Numbers 36:1–12 in Detail</i>	244
4.6 <i>Conclusion</i>	257
 Chapter 5: Conclusion	 261
5.1 <i>Verifiable* Exegetical Tools</i>	262
5.1.1 “Empirical” Studies on Conflation	262
5.1.2 Extra-biblical Evidence	263
5.1.3 Northern Traditions	263
5.2 <i>Compositional Findings</i>	264
5.2.1 Numbers 32	264
5.3.2 Zelophehad's Daughters	266
5.3 <i>In Models We Trust</i>	268
5.4 <i>Clear Avenues for Further Research</i>	270
 Appendix: Comparison of Recent Models vs the Documentary Hypothesis	 273
 Bibliography	 277
Index of Ancient Sources	305
Index of Authors	308
Index of Subjects	311

List of Figures

Figure 1: Conquest according to Joshua 6–10*	58
Figure 2: Linear geographical structure of the exodus-conquest narrative	72
Figure 3: Generation change layered onto the exodus-conquest narrative	73
Figure 4: The Post-Priestly Pentateuch	74
Figure 5: Multiple structure of Numbers	75
Figure 6: Modified Gantt Chart of Numbers 26–36 with conceptual links	76
Figure 7: Reconstruction of Num 32:1 according to FINKELSTEIN et al.	87
Figure 8: Reconstruction of Num 32:1 according to the present analysis	91
Figure 9: Transjordan of Sihon and Og	113
Figure 10: “Heshbon and all its villages” and the King’s Highway	131
Figure 11: Num 32:34–42 – Territories of Reuben, Gad and Half-Manasseh	145
Figure 12: Cities listed in Num 32:3	181
Figure 13: Map of “Zelophehad’s daughters.”	220
Figure 14: “Solomon’s” districts	240

List of Tables

Table 1: Population changes between the first and second census	5
Table 2: Comparison of Num 22:1b β ; 26:3a γ b; 36:13b	70
Table 3: Numbers 21:24 according to the MT and LXX	94
Table 4: Non-Priestly narrative of Numbers 32	99
Table 5: Tribal naming by verse	99
Table 6: Comparison of Sihon layers in Deuteronomy	112
Table 7: Comparison of Deut 2:24a β b and Deut 2:31	120
Table 8: Original Sihon Layer in Numbers	125
Table 9: Post-Sihon updates to the Non-Priestly narrative	139
Table 10: Side by side – Non-Priestly and Priestly narratives	161
Table 11: Comparison of the Sihon and Og narratives in Deuteronomy	167
Table 12: Numbers 32:1–42	177
Table 13: Comparison of Num 32:32 with Num 32:19b, 27	182
Table 14: Numbers 27:8–11a	194
Table 15: Numbers 27:1–7a	208
Table 16: Comparison of Num 27:7b and Num 27:8b	217
Table 17: Comparison of Num 27:4b and Num 27:7a β	218
Table 18: Numbers 36:1–12	244
Table 19: Comparison of Num 27:1 and Num 36:1	245
Table 20: Comparison of Num 36:6b and Num 36:8a β	256
Table 21: Comparison of Num 36:7 and Num 36:9	256

Chapter 1

Introduction

After the fire had extinguished atop the mountain and the embers had dulled, after the smoke had cleared to be remembered only by its lingering taint upon the clothes of all who had borne witness, after the ringing in the ears from the trumpet blast had faded, after the smell of blood from those slain by the Levites had been blown away, Israel departed the mountain.

It is in the aftermath of this most glorious and terrible scene that the book of Numbers begins. Yet even here, after all that had just transpired, the ineffability of the divine and the chosen nature of Moses still struggled to take root. Before leaving the shadow of the mountain Moses does not turn to ΥHWH for guidance but to his Midianite brother-in-law, Hobab. We are told that they conversed and learn that Moses wants Hobab to join Israel on its journey; although there was likely some degree of familial duty involved, the real reason for the invitation is that Moses does not even know where to camp (Num 10:31). Israel's wilderness journey, then, appears to have been confusing not only for modern readers but for Moses also. As MacDonald observes, "For Israel and for the reader, the book of Numbers is an unwelcome detour on the way to destinations more interesting."¹

Much of Numbers' unpopularity in earlier scholarship was due to three main reasons. First, it was devoid of most of the major themes of the Pentateuch (the history of origins, the patriarchal tradition, Israel's journey to the mountain of God) and so – perhaps justifiably – received less attention than the other Pentateuchal books. Second, of the five books in the Pentateuch, Numbers was the book in which the Documentary Hypothesis was the least effective.² Martin Noth, in particular, brought this observation into the limelight when he observed that had it been analysed in isolation, one would not conclude that Numbers was comprised of the three primary sources. However, the dominance of the Documentary Hypothesis and the lack of any viable alternatives at the time was also aptly demonstrated as Noth went on to conclude that because the source model was so effective at explaining the rest of the Pentateuch, one should also use it

¹ MACDONALD, "Numbers," 113. RÖMER, "périphérie," 3, notes, "peu d'attention est accordée au livre des Nombres cependant" (*Little attention is given to the book of Numbers, however*).

² More accurately, the "New" Documentary Hypothesis, as developed particularly by GRAF, *Bücher*; KUENEN, *Inquiry*; WELLHAUSEN, *Composition*; WELLHAUSEN, *Prolegomena*. For further discussion see, BADEN, *Redaction*; ROGERSON, "Protestant," 211; RÖMER, "Higher"; SMEND, "Work." For a detailed exploration of nineteenth century scholarship on the Hebrew Bible/Old Testament, see SÆBØ, *HBOT* 3.1.

to analyse the book of Numbers.³ Lastly, the book's mixture of narratives, lists and legal materials was also deemed problematic, producing a work that was, at least to some degree, confusing. Binns, for example, observed in his 1927 commentary:

As a piece of literature [the book of Numbers] falls short of the highest class owing to its lack of unity and proportion. At the same time it cannot be denied that it contains narratives of the greatest merit, strung like pearls on a string, but the underlying idea has been obscured by too great a profusion of detail, and the various authors and editors – even down to the unknown scribe who gave the book its final form – were not at one in their aims.⁴

Since the turn of the millennium things have begun to change for the book of Numbers, and it is now experiencing something of a renaissance in Pentateuchal scholarship.⁵ This renaissance has resulted in new models being produced, which among other things seek to better explain the fourth book of the Pentateuch. These new models have only really been possible in light of the weakening of the Documentary Hypothesis, which no longer maintains its monopolistic position. The peculiar nature of Numbers and its contrarian relationship to the Documentary Hypothesis are the precise reasons that make it arguably the best testing ground for new hypotheses. The book of Numbers thus functions as the litmus test for the validity of new theories on the development of the Pentateuch.⁶

Despite being “freed” from the constraints of the Documentary Hypothesis, no new model has attained anywhere near the success of the source model. Indeed, the opposite rather seems to be the case, now more than ever is the field filled with dissenting voices. One major effort in the attempt to bring the wider field into closer alignment resulted in the volume entitled, *The Formation of the Pentateuch: Bridging the Academic Cultures of Europe, Israel, and North America*. In the volume's introduction the editors write:

³ NOTH, *Numbers*, 4–5, writes, “If we were to take the book of Numbers on its own, then we would think not so much of ‘continuous sources’ as of an unsystematic collection of innumerable pieces of tradition of varied content, age and character (‘Fragment Hypothesis’). But it would be contrary to the facts of the matter, as will already be clear from the contents of the book, to treat Numbers in isolation. From the first, the book has belonged, in the Old Testament canon, to the larger whole of the Pentateuch, and scholarly work on the book has consistently maintained that it must be seen in this wider context. It is therefore, justifiable to approach the book of Numbers with the results of Pentateuchal analysis achieved elsewhere and to expect the continuing Pentateuchal ‘sources’ here, too, even if, as we have said, the situation in Numbers, of itself, does not exactly lead us to these results.”

⁴ BINNS, *Numbers*, xiv.

⁵ The title of RÖMER, “périphérie,” rightly captures the idea that the study of Numbers has now moved from “de la périphérie au centre” (*from the periphery to the centre*). FREVEL, “Stücke,” 271, likewise argues that the book of Numbers is now integral to discussions of literary history, the history of religion and theology. See the collected works by RÖMER, “Books;” FREVEL et al., *Torah*.

⁶ This fact led ALBERTZ, “Numeri I,” to begin his analysis with Numbers 20–21, two chapters of renowned redactional complexity.

Recent decades have witnessed not simply a proliferation of intellectual models but, in many ways much more seriously, the fragmentation of discourse altogether as scholarly communities in the three main research centers of Israel, Europe and North America increasingly talk past one another ... scholars tend to operate from such different premises, employ such divergent methods, and reach such inconsistent results that meaningful progress has become impossible. The models continue to proliferate but the communication seems only to diminish.⁷

Although it must be admitted that it is not possible to analyse the Pentateuch without any model or without any presuppositions, it is possible to seek analytical methods that are less tightly correlated with a particular model. The present work, then, suggests some tools that can be used with any model in the hopes of engaging (at least as far as possible) in a text-to-model analysis rather than a model-to-text one. These tools are (1) the increased attention paid to “empirical” evidence for processes of literary production from both biblical and non-biblical literature, (2) non-biblical historical evidence, not least geographical references, and (3) the renewed attention paid to the “Northern Kingdom” (in both preexilic and postexilic periods) in the formation of the Pentateuch.⁸ Why are these tools useful and why are they important?

Recent advances in the history of the ancient Levant have not only increased the reliability of data, but also significantly increased the amount of available data. This increase in data has caused dramatic shifts throughout the broader study of the ancient Near East, not least in Hebrew Bible studies. To provide one key example, the increased number of excavations performed in and around Jerusalem have helped bring the idea of a “Solomonic Golden Age” into serious doubt.⁹ This in turn has given rise to the need for new explanations, not only for

⁷ GERTZ et al., “Convergence,” 2–3.

⁸ Of course, the Northern Kingdom proper ended with the Assyrians, however a blanket term for Yahwists north of Judah/Judea/Yehud is lacking.

⁹ SCHMID, *History*, 50, for example, argues, “viewed historically, we must now distance ourselves both from the political notion of a Davidic-Solomonic empire, projected by the Old Testament literature as a ‘Golden Age,’ and from the idea of a literary industry flowering in that period.” FREVEL, *Geschichte*, 175, summarises: “Nimmt man die archäologischen und historischen Hinweise zusammen, ist die blühende vereinte Monarchie unter Salomo mehr Legende als Wirklichkeit. Die Evidenz reicht nicht aus, um verantwortet an der biblischen Darstellung festzuhalten. Die Legenden weisen zu weiten Teilen auf Zustände des 8. Jh.s v. Chr. Salomos Pracht war nicht Nichts, aber sie war sicher auch nicht groß. Für eine ‘salomonische Aufklärung’ (G. von Rad) jedenfalls fehlen ebenso die Voraussetzungen wie für umfassende Literaturproduktionen und Geschichtswerke. Vor dem Hintergrund der Entstehung der zwei Staaten Israel und Juda und der Erkenntnis, dass von einer vereinten Monarchie Abschied zu nehmen ist, muss die Frage gestellt werden, ob Salomo überhaupt eine historische Person gewesen ist. Die Frage lässt sich anders als bei David bisher nicht durch außerbiblische Zeugnisse positiv beantworten. Vieles lässt sich besser erklären, wenn die literarische Überlieferung zu Salomo in mehreren Schüben zusammen mit der Überzeichnung des Königs David, wie die Darstellung der Reichsteilung und die Darstellung der Frühphase der Königtümer Israel und Juda, als Brücke zwischen der älteren Davidüberlieferung und den Annalen der Omriden ge-

the history of Israel and Judah in general, but also for the formation of the biblical traditions. Although scholars have always tried to link the biblical materials to history, it is not surprising that when one's view of history changes, one's understanding of the biblical traditions is also likely to change. One of the major goals of the present work, then, is to take a closer look at the topographical information contained in the biblical material and to see if new solutions can be found regarding the composition of those biblical texts in light of more up to date archaeological and historical results.

A further key insight used in the ensuing exegesis is the idea that one of the major drivers behind textual modification is ideological divergence. The present work takes this key insight gained from recent empirical investigations on textual conflation and editorial activity, which concludes that when ideological changes are minor, then the editing of the text is correspondingly minor, when a larger ideological shift is introduced, this introduces a much more overt change to the text.

With these tools in hand the question is: Which text(s) to analyse? Even among the newest Pentateuchal models the final chapters of Numbers remain somewhat mysterious. Thomas Römer, in a modified way, follows Noth's proposal that the final section of the book represents something of a "rolling corpus," in which disparate material was simply appended in the order in which it appeared. Reinhard Achenbach argues (with a few exceptions) that the entirety of Numbers 26–36 is the work of the three-part, post-Pentateuchal theocratic redactor (ThB I–III). Rainer Albertz goes even further and suggests that Num 25:19–36:13 is the work of a single redactor, PB5, whose major goal was to compensate for the loss of Joshua when the Hexateuch (Genesis – Joshua) was reduced to the Pentateuch (Genesis – Deuteronomy).¹⁰ Thus, despite the hundreds of pages that have been

schaffen worden ist." (*If the archaeological and historical references are taken together, the flourishing United Monarchy under Solomon is more legend than reality. The evidence is not sufficient to maintain the biblical presentation in a responsible manner. The legend points to conditions of the 8th century BCE. Solomon's splendor was not nothing, but it certainly was not great either. For a 'Solomonic Enlightenment' [G. von Rad], at any rate, the prerequisites are lacking, as are comprehensive literary productions and historical works. Against the background of the emergence of the two states, Israel and Judah, and the realization that it is time to say goodbye to a United Monarchy, the question must be asked whether Solomon was a historical person at all. In contrast to David, this question cannot yet be answered positively by non-biblical testimonies. Much can be better explained if the literary tradition of Solomon was created in several phases together with the exaggeration of King David, such as the depiction of the division of the kingdom and the depiction of the early phase of the kingdoms of Israel and Judah, as a bridge between the older tradition of David and the annals of the Omrides.*) With regards to the biblical depiction of a Solomonic "Golden Age," KNAUF/GUILLAUME, *History*, 76, argue that the story of Solomon projects, "the glory of the Assyrian Empire onto a fabulous past to show how such an empire can only lead to ruin."

¹⁰ This led ALBERTZ, "Redaction," 230, to propose that Numbers 25:19–36:13 was designed as a replacement of the book of Joshua by the editor responsible for shortening the Hexateuch into a Pentateuch. Speaking of the Transjordan conquest in Numbers 32 he writes, "This topic

written on Numbers since its “return to glory,” the issues pertaining to the final section of the book have remained largely unresolved.

The present work analyses two key traditions – one narrative, one legislative – that have a high chance of yielding positive results with regard to compositional questions. Although containing clearly disparate material, the final section of the book of Numbers can be summarised by the themes of conquest and settlement, both in its preparation and its enactment. The dense accumulation of topographic detail in the final section of the book of Numbers allow for recent archaeological advances to play a major role. Furthermore, the final section of Numbers features a curious emphasis on the tribe of Manasseh (cf. table 1), which at least *prima facie* provides a promising avenue for investigating the involvement of Northern scribes and traditions.

The narrative of Numbers 32 and the narrative-legislation of Numbers 27 and 36, then, represent a fortuitous intersection of redaction-critical difficulties, geographical details, and the tribe of Manasseh. Numbers 32 details the settlement of the Transjordan tribes, which includes the sudden and unexpected appearance of the half-tribe of Manasseh in the final verses. Numbers 27:1–11 and 36:1–12 are paired pericopes, united by the inheritance issues relating to the Manassite Zelophehad’s daughters. Thus, these chapters represent fertile ground to make use of the three investigative tools identified above.

Via a detailed exegesis of these key chapters, it will be demonstrated that the compositional growth of the final section of the book of Numbers is neither the result of a disordered series of appendages, nor is it the product of a particularly limited number of late redactors.

Tribe	Population Change between Numbers 1 and Numbers 26	Tribe	Population Change between Numbers 1 and Numbers 26
Reuben	-2770	<i>Manasseh</i>	+20500
Simeon	-37100	Ephraim	-8000
Gad	-5150	Benjamin	+10200
Judah	+1900	Dan	+1700
Issachar	+9900	Asher	+11900
Zebulun	+3100	Naphtali	-8000

Table 1: Population changes between the first and second census

would well fit a redactor who was obliged to exclude the book of Joshua from Israel’s founding document, on the one hand, but did not want to lose its important message within the Pentateuch, on the other hand.”

Chapter 2

Setting the Stage: Background for Understanding the Book of Numbers

It is not possible to understand the current research on Numbers without a sufficient grounding in the underlying discussions on the formation of the Pentateuch. This chapter seeks to provide a general orientation regarding theories on the formation of the Pentateuch. This in turn will lead to a fuller discussion of the three key extra-biblical tools noted in the introduction. With these tools and the foregoing discussion on models, a broad proposal will be made regarding the origins of the Pentateuch. Finally, an overview of the structure of Numbers will be presented, with particular attention given to the final chapters of the book. All in all, this chapter functions as the foundation upon which the following exegetical chapters are built.

2.1 Pentateuchal Models and the Book of Numbers

It should come as no surprise that the resurgence in Numbers' popularity has a high degree of correlation with the recent shifts in Pentateuchal theory, or more precisely, with the models regarding the formation of the Pentateuch. Simply put, it was only after the Documentary Hypothesis lost its monopoly on Pentateuchal scholarship that the book of Numbers became a topic of interest. There are several factors relating to this that will be elaborated below.

2.1.1 *The Documentary Hypothesis*

2.1.1.1 *A Brief History of the Source Model*

As Otto remarks, it is rather ironic that source criticism first arose in order to defend the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch.¹ Astruc's² original conviction that Moses must have consulted various sources in order to write Genesis and the beginning of Exodus was continuously expanded by scholars such as de Wette³

¹ OTTO, "Meaning," 29.

² Astruc only analysed Exodus up to chapter 2 because he believed the rest of the book to be genuinely Mosaic. See discussion in, e.g., HARVEY JR./HALPERN, "Dissertatio," 51-52.

³ DE WETTE, "Dissertatio." See discussion in OTTO, "Truth."

and Hupfeld⁴ to arrive at the idea that the entire Pentateuch was composed from various sources.

This trend in Pentateuchal criticism climaxed at the end of the nineteenth century with the so-called “New” Documentary Hypothesis, which is most famously connected with the names Graf,⁵ Kuenen⁶ and Wellhausen.^{7,8} It was Wellhausen’s *Prolegomena to the History of Israel* that largely settled the debates about the Documentary Hypothesis by concluding that the sources should be chronologically ordered with respect to the development of Israelite society and particularly in relation to cult centralisation – the Covenant Code, as the representative JE text, presented a decentralised cult (see esp. Exod 20:24), Deuteronomy (D) centralised the cult to one place (see esp. Deut 12:13–14), and P presupposed a centralised cult with its single sanctuary administered by a select priestly family – thus arriving at the well-known abbreviated sequence JEDP.⁹ Such was the power of the Documentary Hypothesis as an explanatory framework that it held a virtual monopoly for almost a century, and even now, in the 21st century, it continues to play a significant role.¹⁰

2.1.1.2 *The Problem of Deuteronomy*

Having rearranged the chronological order of the four sources to JEDP, the New Documentary Hypothesis had difficulty explaining the book of Deuteronomy. The first difficulty was that Deuteronomy was the only source that functioned in a more or less standalone way. A more significant issue was that the Priestly source, although being the youngest, was largely absent in the book of Deuteronomy.¹¹ In contrast, de Wette’s earlier model proposed that Deuteronomy was different to the other sources because it constituted the final layer of the Hexateuch/Pentateuch and thus the absence of P in Deuteronomy was not an issue.¹²

In 1943, Martin Noth proposed an answer to this problem that became the mainstay of Old Testament scholarship for the next half century.¹³ Noting the

⁴ See discussion in, e. g., VAN SETERS, *Edited*; BADEN, *Redaction*; RÖMER, “Higher.”

⁵ See discussion in ROGERSON, “Protestant,” 211.

⁶ KUENEN, *Inquiry*. See also SMEND, “Work.”

⁷ WELLHAUSEN, *Prolegomena*.

⁸ See esp. overview in RÖMER, “Higher.”

⁹ WELLHAUSEN, *Prolegomena*, 27–169.

¹⁰ As CARR, “Changes,” 434, observes, “This basic four source theory for the formation of the Pentateuch ... could be presupposed as given by most scholars writing on Pentateuchal topics for over a hundred years. It held sway over virtually all biblical scholarship, particularly in Euro-American contexts more or less linked to Protestant Christianity, from the rise of the Wellhausenian synthesis in the late nineteenth hundreds to the later decades of the twentieth century.”

¹¹ See esp. OTTO, “*Nachpriesterschriftlichen*”; OTTO, “Integration.” This, of course, does not take into account recent discussions regarding the end of P. See below.

¹² See, e. g., OTTO, “Truth,” 21.

¹³ NOTH, *Studien*. See also RÖMER, “History.”

many linguistic and stylistic links between the Former Prophets (Joshua – Kings) and Deuteronomy, Noth argued that these at one point constituted a self-contained epic of Israel's history. Noth proposed that in light of the fall of the kingdom of Judah, a scribe set out to interpret this catastrophe.¹⁴ This explained why the Former Prophets (and Deuteronomy itself) could be seen to share a unified theology.¹⁵ Noth called this composition the "Deuteronomistic History."¹⁶

The Deuteronomistic History introduced many benefits in understanding the structure and ideology of the Former Prophets and provided a simple explanation for the distinctive character of the book of Deuteronomy in the Pentateuch. However, it also meant that an explanation had to be provided for the Tetrateuch (Genesis – Numbers), which, devoid of the conquest and the death of Moses, was difficult to conceive as a complete standalone work.¹⁷ Noth's solution to this problem was to suggest that the original ending of the Tetrateuch was lost or removed once the Pentateuch incorporated the book of Deuteronomy.¹⁸

The secondary literature on the Deuteronomistic History is immense, now spanning approximately 70 years of scholarship, and is still debated today.¹⁹ Even for those in favour of a Deuteronomistic History, the model as originally proposed by Noth is rarely asserted.²⁰ Indeed, as Knauf succinctly observes, "In any case, Noth's Dtr has been abandoned by everyone."²¹

Efforts to retain the core idea of the Deuteronomistic History are achieved by modifying Noth's hypothesis with various expansions and alterations. Thus, Campbell likens the Deuteronomistic History to a house; its foundation and structure were built by Noth, but has become subject to numerous renovations, developments, and redecorations over time.²²

¹⁴ DE PURY/RÖMER, "Historiography," 51.

¹⁵ RÖMER, "History," 648–649.

¹⁶ For a detailed overview of the history of research, see DE PURY/RÖMER, "Historiography."

¹⁷ ROSE, "Ideology," 426–427, for example, notes, "Noth's thesis actually destroys the unity of the Pentateuch (and the Torah) by excising Deuteronomy, which he makes the programmatic introduction of a great historiography." That said, it remains true that Deuteronomy is somehow separate. RÖMER, "Many," 39, for example, notes that of all the books in the Enneateuch (Genesis – 2 Kings) only Genesis, Deuteronomy, and 1 Samuel have "absolute beginnings," i. e., the remaining books open with joining introductions (e. g., "After the death of Moses ..." in Joshua 1:1). On the one hand this does speak to Deuteronomy being separate from the Tetrateuch, but the fact that 1 Samuel also contains an "absolute beginning" actually argues against the idea that Deuteronomy – 2 Kings were an originally stand-alone work.

¹⁸ RÖMER, "Many," 27. Cf. OTTO, "Schlußstein."

¹⁹ To name a few examples: MCKENZIE/GRAHAM, *History*; DE PURY et al., *Israel*; RÖMER, "Future;" GERTZ et al., *Geschichtswerke*.

²⁰ SCHMID, "Wellhausen," 20.

²¹ KNAUF, "Historiography," 390.

²² CAMPBELL, "History," 37. One of the most prominent "renovations" came from the Göttingen model, which asserted that there were three distinct layers of the Deuteronomistic History: a historical redaction (DtrH), a prophetic (DtrP), and a legislative (DtrN). For an overview of the Göttingen model, see, e. g., RÖMER, "History," 649–650.

Although much more could be said, it is sufficient to note that regarding the formation of the Pentateuch the concept of the Deuteronomistic History, in the most basic sense of a standalone work stretching from Deuteronomy – 2 Kings, is increasingly being understood to introduce more problems than it solves.²³ In light of this, it is becoming more common to speak of Deuteronomistic Histories in the plural, which represent editorial harmonisations in light of Deuteronomistic ideology rather than one single historical work.²⁴

2.1.1.3 *The Documentary Hypothesis and the Book of Numbers*

It would be a mistake to suggest that all scholars follow the same concept of how the Documentary Hypothesis works. As Baden, for example, states, “from Wellhausen to Richard Elliott Friedman, virtually all adherents of the Documentary Hypothesis have posited three distinct redactions: J and E into ‘JE,’ by a redactor ‘R^{JE}’; ‘JE’ and D into ‘JED’ by a redactor ‘R^{JED}’; and JED and P into the canonical Pentateuch by the final reactor, ‘R.’”²⁵ Yet Baden goes on to argue that this multiple compilation is not supported by the literary evidence and concludes, “There is, in short, no literary reason to assume more than one compiler for the canonical Pentateuch.”²⁶

However, for the purposes of the present discussion attention need not be given to these distinctions. Rather, the focus will rest upon the fundamental idea that, in all its variations, the Documentary Hypothesis assumes the Pentateuch is primarily composed from four originally standalone sources. Three of these sources – J, E and P – comprised narratives that spanned the whole pre-history of Israel, from creation until (at least) the death of Moses. The key point being

²³ To give only a sample of the criticisms now brought against the Deuteronomistic History. See, e.g., ALBERTZ, “Search;” FREVEL, “Geschichtswerk;” FREVEL, “Wiederkehr;” KNOPPERS, “Future;” KRATZ, “Ort;” SCHMID, “Emergence;” SCHMID, “Wellhausen;” VAN SETERS, *History*; VAN SETERS, “Redaction.”

²⁴ As SCHMID, “Deuteronomy,” 28, writes, “Regarding the thesis of a ‘Deuteronomistic History,’ it is clear in view of these considerations that this expression is only correct in the plural. There were various ‘Deuteronomistic Histories’ in the Enneateuch. One can discern an initial ‘Deuteronomistic History’ in Samuel – 2 Kings that was shaped not by Deut 12 but by the cult centralization in Jerusalem. Another ‘Deuteronomistic History’ is perceptible in Exodus – Joshua + Samuel – 2 Kings and is shaped by the first commandment, deriving its theological thrust through the literary arches of Exod 32 and 1 Kgs 12 as well as through the twofold theme of ‘exodus from Egypt’ and ‘return to Egypt’ in 2 Kgs 25:26 (‘From Egypt to Egypt’). Finally, a third and, to my mind, post-Priestly ‘Deuteronomistic History’ is recognizable in Genesis – 2 Kings, which is already dominated by the notion of the ‘Torah of Moses’ that it applies to the story. Genesis – 2 Kings also coins the great literary inclusion stretching from Joseph in Egypt to King Jehoiachin at the table of the Babylonian king Amel-Marduk, thereby representing a diaspora theology for Israel.” See also KNOPPERS, “Future;” FREVEL, “Geschichtswerk;” RÖMER, “History.”

²⁵ BADEN, *Composition*, 218.

²⁶ BADEN, *Composition*, 221.

Index of Ancient Sources

Genesis

1:28 61, 106
 12:6–8 52
 12:8 48
 13:6 155–156
 14:13 138
 15:18–19 187
 17:8 154–155, 170
 28:1 156
 31:48 152
 32:2 152
 36:6 173
 36:7 155
 36:8 156
 38 193, 205–206

Exodus

6:4 157
 6:8 158
 7:3 120, 166
 13:17 67
 14 81
 16:35b 157
 20:24 8
 22:15–17 195
 30 24
 35 24

Leviticus

4 24
 10 24
 14:34a 157
 18:3 157
 20:10 203
 20:21 203–204
 25:8–16 250
 25:23 154
 25:38 157
 27:16–24 250

Numbers

1:1 23
 1:3 158
 13:17a 157
 13:17b–20 157
 13:17b 157

13:29 138
 16–17 212–213
 20:1 97
 20:17 130
 20:21 125–126, 141
 20:22 97
 21:4–9 214
 21:4 97
 21:10–20 97
 21:12 97–98
 21:13 97–98
 21:14 135
 21:20 97–98
 21:21 125–127
 21:22 127–132
 21:23 130, 132–133
 21:24 129, 133
 21:25 129, 133, 142–143, 184
 21:26 133
 21:27–30 134–136
 21:31–35 134
 21:32 134, 173–175
 21:33–35 126, 175
 22–24 174
 25:1 96, 98
 26–36 74–79
 26:3 70, 77
 26:5–9 214
 26:29–32 150
 26:52–56 246, 251
 27:1–7a 208–218
 27:2 209–211
 27–3–4 211–215
 27:5–7a 216–218
 27:8–11a 199–207
 27:21 163, 179
 32:1 82–93, 100–101
 32:2 161–162, 178–179
 32:3 179–180
 32:4 161–162, 178–179
 32:5 104–106, 162
 32:6 104
 32:7–15 183–187
 32:16–17 181–182
 32:16 102–104
 32:17a 101–102

32:17b	104, 170–171, 180–182	4:5	114
32:18	169–171	4:45	114
32:19	169–171	7:1	115, 118, 120, 127, 137, 166–167
32:20	107, 162		
32:21	162	11:25	166
32:22	107	12:13–14	8
32:23	187	13:1	42
32:24	107	20:10–15	115, 124–125
32:25	161–162	20:10	116
32:26	162	20:15	115, 124, 137
32:27	163	20:16–17	168
32:28	163, 179	20:17	115, 118, 120, 127, 137, 166–167
32:29	163		
32:30	163–164	21:15–17	198
32:31–32	182–183	23:3	118
32:33	107, 171	23:4	170
32:34–38	107, 140–148	23:7	118
32:34–36	140	23:8	187
32:36	180–182	25:5–10	199–207
32:39–42	148–153		
32:40	172	<i>Joshua</i>	
33:50–56	79	3:15–17	108
33:54	246	4:12–13	102
34:13	246	6–10	58–60
36:1	244–246	10:40–42	59–62
36:2	246–248	11:15–23	61
36:3–4	248–252	13	84–85
36:5	252–254	13:8	183
36:6	254–255	13:18	132, 147
36:7	255–256	13:21	78
36:8–9	256–257	13:25–26	90
36:10–12	257	17:1–12	232–235
		18:1	61, 106
		21:37	132
<i>Deuteronomy</i>		22:4	183
1:20–27	139	22:9	162
2:6	117	22:19	164–165
2:8	119, 130–132	22:23	165
2:9	140		
2:13	97, 114	<i>Judges</i>	
2:19	175	1:27–28	235
2:24–25	115–116, 166	5:14	151
2:26	116	5:16	100
2:27–29	116–120	5:17	151
2:30	120, 166	10:17	152
2:31	120–121, 166	11:19–22	109
2:32–35	121, 166		
2:36–37	121–122	<i>Ruth</i>	
3:1–11	122, 167–169	2:1	207
3:12	123–124	4:5	205
3:13	123–124	4:6	208
3:14	123	4:10	205
3:15	123	4:14–17	205
3:16–17	123		

<i>1 Samuel</i>		<i>Ezra</i>	
10a:6-9	170	2:61-63	202
12:8	57		
<i>2 Samuel</i>		<i>Nehemiah</i>	
9:4	151	7:63	202
9:5	151	11:1	247
17:27	151		
24:5	85	<i>Isaiah</i>	
		15:4	94
<i>1 Kings</i>		16:8-9	94
4:7-19	235-240	16:9	85
11:26-12:25	54		
<i>2 Kings</i>		<i>Jeremiah</i>	
10:33	89	41:5	49
13:17	89	48:2	94
13:25	89	48:32	85
15:29	92	48:34	94
17:6	223	48:45	94
17:24-27	229-230	<i>Hosea</i>	
17:24	223	6:8	84
21:11	138		
23:4	47	<i>Amos</i>	
23:15	47	6:13	90
24:2	142		
<i>1 Chronicles</i>		<i>Tobit</i>	
2:21-23	251	6:12	205
2:34-35	205		
23:22	205		

Index of Authors

- Aaron, David H. 191–192, 211, 250
Achenbach, Reinhard 21, 25–27, 73, 82, 85,
95, 105–107, 109, 117, 119, 132, 149, 155,
158, 170, 172, 199, 209, 243, 247–248
Aharoni, Yohanan 89, 219, 235–238
Albertz, Rainer 16, 27–30, 39, 43, 54, 60,
126, 132, 172, 184
Alt, Albrecht 235–236
Arie, Eran 89
Artus, Olivier 183, 186–187
Ashley, Timothy R. 70
Assis, Elie 165
Astruc, Jean 7
- Baden, Joel 10, 19, 27, 43, 213
Baentsch, Bruno 83
Ballhorn, Egbert 233–234
Barkay, Gabriel 239
Bartlett, John R. 126, 133
Bauks, Michaela 154
Ben-Barak, Zafira 195–196
Benjamin, Don C. 195, 206
Berner, Christoph 34
Bieberstein, Klaus 34
Bienkowski, Piotr 92–93
Binns, L. Elliott 2
Blanco Wißmann, Filipe 55
Blenkinsopp, Joseph 47
Blum, Erhard 21, 32–33, 36, 42, 89,
141–142
Boer, Roland 195
Boling, Robert G. 138, 151, 232
Boorer, Suzanne 186
Brett, Mark G. 155, 242
Brettler, Marc 61
Briant, Pierre 231
Budd, Philip J. 11–12, 70, 83, 199
Bunimovitz, Shlomo 228–229
Butler, Trent C. 60
- Campbell, Anthony 9
Campbell Jr., Edward F. 207
Carr, David M. 8, 17–18, 21, 33, 43–44, 53,
63, 106–107, 154, 172, 256, 263
Chavel, Simeon 191–192, 201, 206, 253, 256
- Cocco, Francesco 69, 204, 212
Cortese, Enzo 235
Crawford, Sidnie 72
Cross, Frank Moore 50, 90
- Daviau, Paulette M. M. 147
Davies, Eryl 13, 70, 199, 202, 206, 254
Davies, G. I. 97
Davies, Philip R. 65
de Pury, Albert 19, 155
de Vaulx, J. 83
de Vaux, R. 218
de Wette, Wilhelm M. L. 7–8, 50
Dearman, J. Andrew 101, 146
Douglass, Mary 71
- Elliger, Karl 21
Eskenazi, Tamara C. 196
- Faust, Avraham 228
Finkelstein, Israel 48, 53, 59, 62–66, 86–88,
142, 228, 251
Fischer, Irmtraud 143
Fishbane, Michael 192, 212
Fistill, Ulrich 69, 83
Fleming, Daniel E. 56–57, 109, 138
Forrer, Emil 92, 239
Forsling, Josef 70
Frankel, David 213
Frevel, Christian 3, 23, 37–40, 45–46, 54,
57–61, 66, 69–71, 74, 78, 93, 118, 142–143,
162, 191, 210, 213, 253–254
Frey, Jörg 50
Frolov, Serge 151
- Galil, Gershom 92
Gaß, Erasmus 133, 233, 235
Germany, Stephen 35–36, 43, 59, 61–62, 83,
116, 118, 120–121, 124, 135, 157, 167–168,
174, 247
Gertz, Jan Christian 3
Graf, Karl Heinrich 1
Gray, George B. 82
Guillaume, Phillippe 4, 19, 63–65, 90, 143,
154, 163–164, 250

- Gunkel, Hermann 141
 Gunneweg, A.H. 161
- Haran, Menahem 18
 Hawk, L. Daniel 230, 233–234
 Hensel, Benedikt 50–51, 55, 142, 224, 243
 Hjelm, Ingrid 52
 Hobson, Russell 242
 Holzinger, Hermann 230
 Homsher, Robert S. 137
 Hupfeld, Hermann 8
 Hutchens, Kenneth D. 158
 Hutzli, Jürg 155, 158
- Itach, Gilad 219–223
- Japhet, Sara 251
 Jeon, Jaeyoung 159
 Jericke, Detlef 138, 186
 Ji, Chang-Ho C. 130
- Kilchör, Benjamin 202–203
 Kislev, Itamar 214, 251, 254–255
 Kleiman, Assaf 53
 Klostermann, August 21
 Knauf, Ernst Axel 9, 29, 47–48, 55–56,
 60–61, 64–65, 68, 90, 101, 106, 117,
 135–136, 139, 142–143, 151, 164–165,
 170, 179, 186–187, 210, 217, 232, 235
 Knierim, Rolf P. 249
 Knohl, Israel 21–22
 Knoppers, Gary N. 51–52, 55, 226, 251
 Köckert, Matthias 155
 Kratz, Reinhard G. 34–37, 40–41, 43, 59,
 66
 Kuenen, Avraham 18, 53
- Lemaire, André 89, 95, 151–152, 218, 238
 Levine, Baruch 13–14, 82, 86, 96, 128, 174,
 199–200, 212–213, 232, 249
 Levy, Daniel 209
 Lipschits, Oded 47–48
 Litke, John D. 199, 216, 257
 Liverani, Mario 226
 Lohfink, Norbert 110
 London, Gloria 222–223
 Loneragan, Bernard 47
 Lundbom, Jack R. 206
- MacDonald, Burton 130
 MacDonald, Nathan 1, 68–69
 Magen, Yitzhak 50, 55
- Marquis, Liane M. 83, 102, 106, 162–163,
 184
 Matthews, Victor H. 206
 Mazar, Amihai 158
 Mendenhall, George E. 137
 Milgrom, Jacob 12, 69, 74, 102–103, 105,
 129, 157, 192, 199, 209–211, 215, 255, 257
 Miller, J. Maxwell 97
 Mittmann, Siegfried 83, 122, 129, 144
- Na'aman, Nadav 46, 48, 63–64, 225–227,
 230, 236, 239
 Niditch, Susan 118
 Nihan, Christoph 18, 21–22, 24, 34, 52,
 61–62, 203–204
 Nodet, Etienne 52
 Nöldeke, Theodore 18
 Noth, Martin 1–2, 8–9, 11, 24, 70, 74, 82, 98,
 100, 130, 138, 144, 158, 191, 209, 249, 252
- Oded, Bustanay 230
 Olson, Dennis T. 68–70
 Oswald, Wolfgang 143
 Otto, Eckart 7, 26, 72, 96, 116–117, 119,
 122–123, 127, 168–169, 206
- Pakkala, Juha 42–46
 Parker, Bradley J. 226
 Perlitt, Lothar 19–20
 Pitkänen, Pekka 252
 Plöger, Josef G. 120, 122
- Rendtorff, Rolf 13, 17–18
 Robker, Jonathan M. 174
 Röllig, Wolfgang 138
 Römer, Thomas 1–2, 9, 19, 22–24, 33, 44,
 57, 60–61, 109, 142
 Rose, Martin 9
 Roskop (Erisman), Angela 42, 93, 173
- Samuel, Harald 210
 Satlow, Michael L. 195–198
 Schenker, Adrian 204
 Schmid, Hans Heinrich 31–32
 Schmid, Konrad 3, 10, 17–18, 34, 54, 56,
 141–142
 Schmidt, Ludwig 14–15, 70, 81, 83, 100,
 104–105, 107, 122, 125–127, 168, 170, 175,
 191, 205, 247
 Schmitt, Hans-Christoph 135–136
 Schorch, Stefan 52
 Schorn, Ulrike 83, 90, 100, 102, 148

- Schwartz, Baruch J. 22
Seebass, Horst 15–16, 83, 106, 133, 158,
174–175, 201–202, 210, 230–231,
245–246, 249, 253
Sergi, Omer 49, 95, 142
Singer-Avitz, Lily 48, 239
Ska, Jean Louis 18–19
Smelik, K.A.D. 146
Snaith, Norman H. 151, 245
Staubli, Thomas 83
Stern, Ephraim 224, 239
Stordalen, Terje 135
- Tammuz, Oded 230
Tobolowsky, Andrew 143
Tolkien, J.R.R. 49
- Van Der Toorn, Karel 54
Van Seters, John 31–32, 59, 83, 109, 126,
133, 174
- Weingreen, Jacob 192
Weippert, Manfred 122, 135
Wellhausen, Julius 11, 18, 236
Wenham, Gordon J. 200
Wevers, John W. 178
Wöhrlé, Jakob 20, 141–142, 155–156
Wolff, Hans Walter 53
Wright, John W. 231
Wüst, Manfred 83, 100–102, 231, 247
- Yasur-Landau, Asaf 228–229
- Zenger, Erich 17, 37–40, 96
Zertal, Adam 218–223, 225–228, 238
Ziemer, Benjamin 43

Subject Index

- Aaron/Aaronites 209
Abra(ha)m 20, 48, 52, 61, 155–157, 187,
243, 268
Ammon 87, 93–95, 134, 147, 151
Amorites 115, 137–139, 165–169
Assyria(ns) 62–68, 90–93, 223–228,
239–240
- Babylon(ians) 20
– Exiles *see Golah*
Bethel 47–49
- Canaan 20–21, 93, 154–159, 164–165
Cisjordan *see Canaan*
- Deuteronomistic History 8–10
Documentary Hypothesis 7–16
- Edom 117–119
Eleazar 161, 163, 178–179, 209, 245–246
“Empirical” evidence 42–46
- Farewell to the Yahwist 17–18
- Gad 101, 140–144
Gilead
– Land 84–95, 162–163
– Ancestor 150–152, 218–219
Golah 20–21, 67–68, 156, 250
- Hazael 66, 89
Heshbon
– City 95, 134–136, 180
– Sihon, king of 110–125
– Song of 134–136
Holiness Code 21–22
- Israel
– Northern Kingdom 53–56, 62–67, 88–93
– Pan/All 141–144
– Pre-Monarchic/United 65–66, 235–236
– ‘True’ *see Golah*
– Postexilic community *see Samaria*
- Jacob 141–144
Jazer 84–95, 134, 174–175
Jeroboam II 53–56
Jordan 56, 67, 81–82, 93
Joshua 56–68
Josiah *see Joshua*
Judah
– Exiled *see Golah*
– Land 56–68
- Manasseh 148–153, 218–219, 232–235
Mesha 88–90, 96–97, 101, 140–141,
146–147
Moab 70–72, 81, 88–90, 93–94, 96–98
Moses 161–162, 252–254
- Nimshi(des) 53–56, 107–109
- Og 115, 121–122, 149, 152–153
Omri(des) 65–66, 88–90, 93
- Priestly Writings 20–22, 153–165, 208–218
- Refugees 62–65
Reuben 90, 128
- Samaria/Samaritans 49–52, 218–244
Sihon 109–139, 165–169
- Zelophehad
– Daughters 218–244
– Self 212–216
– Wife 193, 199–200