

Book-Seams in the Hexateuch I

The Literary Transitions between the Books
of Genesis/Exodus and Joshua/Judges

edited by

Christoph Berner and Harald Samuel

with the assistance of

Stephen Germany

Mohr Siebeck

e-offprint of the author with publisher's permission

Christoph Berner, born 1976; 1996–2002 university education in Protestant Theology, Jewish Studies and Ancient Near Eastern Studies in Göttingen; 2006 Dr. theol. in Jewish Studies/ New Testament from the University of Göttingen; 2010 Privatdozent in Old Testament Studies/ Hebrew Bible, University of Göttingen; 2010–18 fellow in the Heisenberg Programme of the DFG and visiting professor at the universities of Osnabrück, Berlin (HU), Erlangen, Heidelberg (HfJS) and Hamburg.

orcid.org/0000-0003-0641-0249

Harald Samuel, born 1979; 1999–2008 university education in Protestant Theology and Jewish Studies in Leipzig, Jerusalem and Göttingen; 2014 Dr. theol. in Old Testament Studies/Hebrew Bible from the University of Göttingen; since 2014 Postdoctoral Researcher at the University of Göttingen.

ISBN 978-3-16-154403-3 / eISBN 978-3-16-154404-0

DOI 10.1628/978-3-16-154404-0

ISSN 0940-4155 / eISSN 2568-8359 (Forschungen zum Alten Testament)

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

© 2018 by Mohr Siebeck, Tübingen, Germany. www.mohrsiebeck.com

This book may not be reproduced, in whole or in part, in any form (beyond that permitted by copyright law) without the publisher's written permission. This applies particularly to reproductions, translations and storage and processing in electronic systems.

The book was printed by Gulde Druck in Tübingen on non-aging paper and bound by Buchbinderei Spinner in Ottersweier.

Printed in Germany.

Contents

Preface.....	V
Introduction.....	1

Part I

The Literary Transition between the Books of Genesis and Exodus

1. Material Evidence

Christoph Berner

The Attestation of the Book-Seam in the Early Textual Witnesses and its Literary-Historical Implications	5
---	---

2. Literary-Historical Approaches

2.1. History of Research

Konrad Schmid

The Sources of the Pentateuch, Their Literary Extent and the Bridge between Genesis and Exodus: A Survey of Scholarship since Astruc.....	21
--	----

2.2. Contemporary Approaches

Joel S. Baden

The Lack of Transition between Genesis 50 and Exodus 1	43
--	----

Jan Christian Gertz

The Relative Independence of the Books of Genesis and Exodus	55
--	----

Reinhard Müller

Response to Joel S. Baden and Jan Christian Gertz	73
---	----

3. *The Larger Context*

3.1. *The Literary Place of the Joseph Story*

David M. Carr

Joseph Between Ancestors and Exodus: A Gradual Process of Connection 85

Franziska Ede

The Literary Development of the Joseph Story 105

Bernd U. Schipper

Genesis 37–50 and the Model of a Gradual Extension:

A Response to David M. Carr and Franziska Ede 121

3.2. *Exodus Material in the Book of Genesis and Genesis Material in the Book of Exodus*

Detlef Jericke

Exodus Material in the Book of Genesis 137

Wolfgang Oswald

Genesis Material in the Book of Exodus: Explicit Back References 157

Hans-Christoph Schmitt

Parallel Narrative Patterns between Exodus 1–14* and the Ancestral
Stories in Genesis 24* and 29–31* 171

Part II

The Literary Transition between the Books of Joshua and Judges

1. *Material Evidence*

Harald Samuel

The Attestation of the Book-Seam in the Early Textual Witnesses
and its Literary-Historical Implications 187

2. *Literary-Historical Approaches*

2.1. *History of Research*

Erasmus Gaß

Joshua's Death Told Twice – Perspectives from the History of Research 199

2.2. *Contemporary Approaches*

Erhard Blum

Once Again: The Compositional Knot at the Transition
between Joshua and Judges 221

Reinhard G. Kratz

The Literary Transition in Joshua 23–Judges 2: Observations
and Considerations..... 241

Sarah Schulz

The Literary Transition between the Books of Joshua and Judges 257

Christian Frevel

On Untying Tangles and Tying Knots in Joshua 23–Judges 3:6:
A Response to Erhard Blum, Reinhard G. Kratz and Sarah Schulz..... 281

3. *The Larger Context*

3.1. *The Place of the Book of Joshua in the Hexateuch and/or in the So-Called Deuteronomistic History*

Zev I. Farber and Jacob L. Wright

The Savior of Gibeon: Reconstructing the Prehistory of the Joshua Account... 295

Daniel E. Fleming

The Shiloh Ritual in Joshua 18 as Origin of the Territorial Division by Lot..... 311

3.2. *The Place of the Book of Judges in the So-Called Deuteronomistic History*

Uwe Becker

The Place of the Book of Judges in the So-Called Deuteronomistic History:
Some Remarks on Recent Research..... 339

<i>Cynthia Edenburg</i>	
Envelopes and Seams: How Judges Fits (or not) within the Deuteronomistic History	353

<i>Peter Porzig</i>	
The Book of Judges within the Deuteronomistic History	371

Part III

The Transitions between the Books of Genesis/Exodus and Joshua/Judges and their Literary Relationship

1. Material Evidence

<i>Christoph Berner</i>	
The two Book-Seams and their Interconnections	381

2. Contemporary Approaches

<i>Stephen Germany</i>	
The Literary Relationship between Genesis 50–Exodus 1 and Joshua 24–Judges 2.....	385
<i>Jean Louis Ska</i>	
Plot and Story in Genesis–Exodus and Joshua–Judges	401
Bibliography	411
List of Contributors.....	435
Index of Sources	437
Index of Modern Authors	450

Joshua's Death Told Twice – Perspectives from the History of Research

Erasmus Gaß

The twice-told death of Joshua in Josh 24:29–30 and Judg 2:8–9 has puzzled generations of scholars, all the more so as there is another reference to Joshua's death in Judg 1:1. The obvious duplication of the notice of Joshua's death is further complicated by even more doublets at the seam of both books, such as two assemblies with two concluding dtr farewell speeches delivered by Joshua in Josh 23:1–16 and Josh 24:1–28¹ and two introductions to the book of Judges in Judg 1:1–2:5 and Judg 2:6–10.²

The older opinion that the author simply repeated his own verses in Judg 2:6–9³ is rather improbable for logical reasons. Judg 1:1–2:5 happen after Joshua's death (Judg 1:1) and are more elaborate than the parallels in the book of Joshua. There is no reason for the author to refer to Joshua's death again in Judg 2:6–9. Moreover, at least Judg 2:1–5 competes with Josh 23–24, such that Judg 1:1–2:5 – the part between the doublet – seems to be a later addition.⁴

The following discussion will present different redactional and text-critical models that try to untangle the compositional knot between the books of Joshua and Judges. Before the chronological sequence of the doublets can be discussed, some basic questions related to the literary history of Josh-Judg should be raised. First, it will be shown that both doublets might be incoherent (A) so that unilinear solutions are problematic regarding either Josh 24:29–31 or Judg 2:7–9 as source texts. Second, the different sequence of both texts is analyzed (B) against the backdrop of determining the original tradition. Third, the text-critical problem of the variant LXX-tradition in Josh 24:31, 33 should be evaluated (C), especially whether LXX might have preserved an earlier tradition which linked Joshua with Judges. Fourth, the di-

¹ See RÖSEL, 'Überleitungen', 343.

² See RÖSEL, 'Überleitungen', 343; IDEM, *Von Josua bis Jojachin*, 50. However, according to JERICKE, 'Josuas Tod', 350, the real doublet of Joshua's death is relativized by overstraining the parallels. On the problems within Josh 23–Judg 2 see also FREVEL, 'Josua-Palimpsest', 50–56.

³ See KEIL, *Josua, Richter und Rut*, 200.

⁴ Yet Judg 2:6 cannot follow directly after Josh 24:31 either; see RICHTER, *Bearbeitungen*, 45.

vergent burial-site of Joshua might reveal some indications for dating the parallels (D). All of these aspects have been integrated in redactional theories (E) analyzing the book-seam between Joshua and Judges. Some of the arguments must be quoted several times, giving this overview some redundancy. This is necessary, however, since many arguments are equivocal and used for different reconstructions.

A. Incoherent Passages in Josh 24 and Judg 2

At least Josh 24:28 does not belong to Joshua's death notice, since Josh 24:29 begins with a separate formula and is set off by a *petucha*.⁵ Yet even Josh 24:29–33 might not be coherent. Scholars have developed the following options regarding the stratification of the remaining unit in Josh 24:29–33:

a) vv. 29–30, 33 and vv. 31–32:⁶ The different layers are assigned to redactions which are attributed to either dtr or Priestly editors.⁷ Perhaps the earliest layer in vv. 29–30, 33 represents local grave traditions about Joshua and Eleazar.⁸ The second burial notice of Eleazar in v. 33 might have evolved out of an etiology of the Ephraimite toponym Gibeah of Phinehas.⁹

b) vv. 29–30, 32–33 and v. 31:¹⁰ The older source in vv. 29–30, 32–33 was expanded by a dtr addition in v. 31. The earliest layer is often attributed to the Elohist stratum.¹¹

c) vv. 29–31 and vv. 32–33:¹² The references to the graves of Joseph and Phinehas (vv. 32–33) might be literary additions to the earlier tradition in Josh 24:29–31. In this respect, vv. 32–33 would be post-Priestly expansions.¹³

⁵ See RÖSEL, 'Redaktion', 187–188.

⁶ See KNAUF, *Josua*, 199. Similarly GÖRG, *Josua*, 109, who regards vv. 29–30, 33 as a pre-dtr source. Görg regards v. 31 as dtr and v. 32 as post-dtr/Priestly. On v. 31 as a dtr addition see SCHÄFER-LICHTENBERGER, *Josua und Salomo*, 222.

⁷ For KNAUF, *Josua*, 199, vv. 29–30, 33 stand in the Priestly tradition and vv. 31–32 in the dtr tradition. Similarly NOTH, *Josua*, 9, 141, who regards v. 31 as dtr and v. 32 as a secondary addition that builds upon the other grave traditions in vv. 29–30, 33.

⁸ See NOTH, *Josua*, 140–141.

⁹ See NOTH, *Josua*, 141; SOGGIN, *Joshua*, 245.

¹⁰ For the evaluation of v. 31 as dtr and vv. 29–30, 32–33 as Elohist see already OETTLI, *Deuteronomium*, 126; HOLZINGER, *Josua*, 99–100; SMEND, *Erzählung*, 337; EISSFELDT, *Hexateuch-Synopse*, 81; WELLHAUSEN, *Composition*, 133.

¹¹ See STEURNAGEL, *Deuteronomium und Josua*, 304.

¹² See FRITZ, *Josua*, 251; BECKER, 'Kontextvernetzungen', 159. On vv. 32–33 as later additions, see already O'DOHERTY, 'Problem', 4; NOTH, *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien*, 8–9 n. 3. NENTEL, *Trägerschaft*, 108–109, considers Josh 24:32–33 to be a late dtr addition by his DtrS.

¹³ See FRITZ, *Josua*, 250–252. According to NELSON, *Joshua*, 278, MT, with its reference to the bones of Joseph, which are considered an inheritance for the tribe of Joseph,

The reference to the reburial of Joseph's bones near Shechem in v. 32 ties the book of Joshua to Genesis, whereas Eleazar's death and the reference to Phinehas link v. 33 to the next generation.¹⁴ Perhaps vv. 32–33 are later additions closing a narrative thread found already in the Pentateuch (Gen 33:19; 50:26; Exod 13:19).¹⁵ In this respect, the burial notices in Josh 24 are the final words of a Hexateuch. Furthermore, the end of Joshua imitates the end of Genesis. In this regard, Genesis and Joshua are related to each other somehow.¹⁶ Perhaps the first edition of Joshua ended with Joshua's death and burial notice. Afterwards, this ending was expanded with similar information on Joseph and Eleazar.¹⁷

All in all, the alleged redactional strata are delimited mostly on stylistic/linguistic observations (dtr, Priestly etc.), content-related arguments (different topic) or redactional alignments (links to the Hexateuch), some of them persuasive, some of them not. It is questionable whether there are clear literary-critical tensions.

Judg 2:6–10 might have several redactional layers as well. Different proposals have been suggested:

a) vv. 6, 8–9 and vv. 7, 10.¹⁸ The earliest dtr layer might be found in vv. 6, 8–9, whereas vv. 7, 10 is a second dtr layer that first displaced vv. 6, 8–9 to the end of Joshua so that Judges began with vv. 7, 10. A later redaction, which added Judg 1:1–2:5, was responsible for the doublet that created two separate but related books. Therefore, two dtr redactions might have formed Judg 2:6–10.

b) vv. 6–7 and vv. 8–9.¹⁹ Perhaps vv. 8–9 belonged to the earlier DtrH, whereas vv. 6–7 are related to the later DtrN. Further tensions within Judg 2:6–9 might be explained traditio-historically. In this regard, vv. 6a, 7a might represent an earlier, pre-dtr stratum.²⁰

c) vv. 7–10 and v. 6.²¹ Perhaps only v. 6 is a later addition to vv. 7–10. At least vv. 7–10 seem to be without tensions. Moreover, v. 10 refers back to v. 7 by the idiom *הדור ההוא* "this generation". Moreover, Joshua's death

was offensive to later orthodoxy and therefore this plural form was altered in the versions to singular. On this problem see also RÖSEL, *Joshua*, 378.

¹⁴ See HESS, *Joshua*, 342.

¹⁵ See RÖSEL, *Joshua*, 377. Similarly already SOGGIN, *Joshua*, 245; MILLER/TUCKER, *Joshua*, 183; TENGSTRÖM, *Hexateucherzählung*, 40–41; WEIMAR, *Untersuchungen*, 169; GÖRG, *Josua*, 110; VAN SETERS, *Life*, 18.

¹⁶ See RÖMER, 'Ende', 544–545. Similarly BLUM, 'Knoten', 206, 210, who thinks that v. 32 might belong to a Hexateuch redaction and that v. 33 is a late Priestly addition.

¹⁷ See BOLING, *Joshua*, 541.

¹⁸ See BUDDE, *Richter*, 21–22.

¹⁹ See BECKER, *Richterzeit*, 62–72.

²⁰ See JERICKE, 'Josuas Tod', 357.

²¹ See RICHTER, *Bearbeitungen*, 48.

(v. 8) and a new generation (v. 10) belong together due to the parallel in Exod 1.²² Furthermore, Judg 2:11ff. are a good continuation of Judg 2:7–10, since Israel’s abandonment of YHWH in Judg 2:11ff. is motivated by the gap of generations mentioned in v. 10. In addition, Judg 2:11ff cannot be linked to Judg 1:1–2:5, since it lacks the notion that there were people left in Israel.

All things considered, tensions in Judg 2:6–10 are difficult to substantiate, since dtr language is used throughout. It is questionable whether these dtr verses can be segmented in two different dtr editions. It is not surprising that the different layers in Judg 2 might complicate matters, since they could be linked to Josh 24 in different ways within the scope of redaction criticism. Unsurprisingly, some scholars have proposed rather complex redactional processes (see section E 3 below).

B. Different Sequences in Josh 24 and Judg 2

Apart from the possible tensions within Josh 24:28–31 and Judg 2:6–9, the arrangement of Josh 24:28–31 seems to be in disarray, since it differs significantly from its parallel in Judg 2:6–9.²³ Several proposals have been made:

a) Judg 2:6–9 in its original sequence: The doublet in Judg 2:6–9 might have preserved the original order since it is the *lectio difficilior*. The compositional reordering in Josh 24 is easier to explain than vice versa.²⁴ Even the sequence in Judg 2:6–9 (dismissal of the assembly – obedience of the people – Joshua’s death – Joshua’s burial) might be more logical than the arrangement in Josh 24:28–31.²⁵ Perhaps the rearrangement in Josh 24 with the people’s obedience at the end (Josh 24:31) serves to give the story a satisfactory conclusion.²⁶

b) Josh 24 in its original sequence: In contrast, the sequence in Josh 24 MT might be more original for several reasons. The transitional idiom ויהי אחריו האלה “after these things” in the earlier Josh 24:29 was deleted in

²² See GROß, *Richter*, 184. For this parallel see already RENDTORFF, ‘Jahwist’, 166, who considers this literary form to be dtn-dtr.

²³ In this respect, a verse-by-verse comparison of both texts is not possible, since one has to prefer one version over the other; see JERICKE, ‘Josuas Tod’, 351 n. 34.

²⁴ See BOLING, *Joshua*, 541; BECKER, *Richterzeit*, 65. See already NÖTSCHER, *Josua*, 71, who prefers the sequence of Josh 24 LXX.

²⁵ See JERICKE, ‘Josuas Tod’, 353.

²⁶ See NOTH, *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien*, 9 n. 3. However, GÖRG, *Josua*, 109–110, maintains that v. 31 does not give a negative judgment on the following generations.

Judg 2:8.²⁷ This idiom had to be discarded in Judg 2:8 to prevent logical problems, since in Judg 2:7 the obedience of Joshua's generation is mentioned and the context is no longer the covenant ceremony.²⁸ Moreover, the obedience to YHWH by Joshua and the generation surviving Joshua fits better after the death notice, such that Josh 24 has the better sequence.²⁹ Therefore, Josh 24:31 clearly marks the end of the period under Joshua's leadership. In this respect, the note about the elders is placed perfectly after Joshua's death.³⁰ Furthermore, the idiom אשר האריכו ימים אחרי יהושע "who lived longer than Joshua" logically requires the preceding notice of Joshua's death. An evaluation of a whole generation makes better sense after the death of Joshua. Consequently, the sequence in Josh 24:29–31 is a deliberate closure of the earlier generation. On the contrary, the contrast between the positive and negative generation in Judg 2:6–10 is stressed better by putting this note (Josh 24:31) in front of the death notice. This could have prompted the reorganization in Judg 2.³¹ Perhaps the reorganized sequence of Judg 2:6–10 is due to the secondary addition of a further period within Israel's history. Whereas Josh 24:28–31 describe two periods (tribes before Joshua's death and the generation who outlived Joshua), Judg 2:6–10 have three consecutive periods of Israel's history, from the time before Joshua's death (Judg 2:6–7a) to the time of the generation who outlived Joshua (Judg 2:7b) and finally to the time of the generation after Joshua who did not know the great deeds of YHWH (Judg 2:10b). Thus, Judg 2 reordered the better periodization found in Josh 24 by putting the transition from period 1 to 2 – which is marked by Joshua's death (Judg 2:8–9) – after period 2 (Judg 2:7b), which goes against chronological logic but separates periods 2 and 3 categorically.³²

c) Josh 24 LXX in its original sequence: Perhaps the different sequence has to be explained text-critically.³³ The position of the death notice in Josh 24:29 disrupts the narrative sequence. The perfect connection between the dismissal and obedience of Israel (Josh 24:28, 31) is interrupted by Joshua's death (Josh 24:29–30). Beyond that, Josh 24:31 looks back again to the time of Joshua, who nevertheless died shortly before in Josh 24:29. In Judg 2:6–10 the narrative order is more fitting, since it mentions the generations first and then Joshua's death. However, Judg 2:10 is linked lexically to

²⁷ See NELSON, *Joshua*, 281; BUTLER, *Joshua 13–24*, 335. According to BECKER, *Richterzeit*, 67, the idiom "after these things" might be an addition in Josh 24:29 or a deletion in Judg 2:6–9. This idiom seems to be content-related.

²⁸ See also KOOPMANS, *Joshua 24*, 368.

²⁹ On the better sequence in Josh 24 MT see OETTLI, *Deuteronomium*, 204; SMEND, *Erzählung*, 337; RICHTER, *Bearbeitungen*, 47; SOGGIN, *Judges*, 38; BECKER, *Richterzeit*, 65.

³⁰ See SOGGIN, *Judges*, 38.

³¹ See RÖSEL, 'Überleitungen', 344–345.

³² See O'CONNELL, *Rhetoric*, 72–73.

³³ On what follows see LUCASSEN, 'Josua', 383–384.

Judg 2:7 and refers once again to the generation. Thus, Judg 2:10 seems to be a *Wiederaufnahme* of Judg 2:7 that was added because Josua's death disrupted the narrative flow. Therefore, it appears that Judg 2:6–9 are taken from the LXX version of Josh 24:28–31. The sequence in Josh 24 LXX might be more original, whereas Josh 24 MT has been changed to conclude the Joshua narrative with the theological motif of obedience. Thus, the arrangement of Josh 24 LXX might have priority over Josh 24 MT.³⁴ However, the *Wiederaufnahme* of Judg 2:7 in Judg 2:10 proves nothing. It is also possible that LXX has harmonized the different order of Judg 2 and Josh 24 by adopting the arrangement of Judg 2 in Josh 24 as well,³⁵ so that the death and burial of Joshua have the last word on him. Since the structure of Judg 2 is more logical, it was preferred by LXX.

d) Sequence dependent on function: The distinctive sequence might have been caused by the different function of both sections,³⁶ so that a definite diachronic assessment cannot be established. Whereas the version in Joshua seeks to stress the faithfulness of Joshua and his generation, the version in Judges emphasizes the difference from the following generation and has placed v. 31 – which refers to the loyalty of the people during Joshua's lifetime – in front of Joshua's death notice. The different sequence in Josh 24 and Judg 2 has substantial consequences. Whereas the period of obedience lasts throughout Joshua's lifetime in Josh 24, with his death signaling the end of that period, there seems to be another period of obedience by the generation outliving Joshua in Judg 2, thus extending the salvific period under Joshua. After that, the following generation disobeys. Thus, there are at least three periods in Judg 2. In this regard, the concept of Judg 2:7–10 with the disobedience of the generation after the death of the leader alludes to the cyclical pattern of the Judges period.³⁷

All things considered, an appropriate diachronic decision over which sequence is earlier than the other is not possible, since the order in Josh 24 with the reference to the behavior of the Israelites during Joshua's lifetime after Joshua's death (Josh 24:31) at the end is no more probable than the look ahead to the post-Joshua generation already during Joshua's lifetime (Judg 2:7).³⁸ Furthermore, as seen in the discussion, not all arguments are

³⁴ See AULD, 'Judges I', 264.

³⁵ See JERICKE, 'Josuas Tod', 353; NELSON, *Joshua*, 282; BUTLER, *Joshua 13–24*, 335.

³⁶ On a deliberate arrangement in both sections see NOORT, 'Jos 24,28–31', 115; NELSON, *Joshua*, 282; BUTLER, *Judges*, 42; IDEM, *Joshua 13–24*, 335. See already BERTHEAU, *Richter und Rut*, 55: "An beiden Orten ist die eingehaltene Reihenfolge durchaus passend".

³⁷ See RAKE, *Juda*, 128–129. According to SCHÄFER-LICHTENBERGER, *Josua und Salomo*, 360, Joshua gave the following generation a good example of true obedience so that they could live in accord with YHWH.

³⁸ See RAKE, *Juda*, 128.

decisive, but can be used both ways. Therefore, it is problematic to use the different sequence for redactional theories, as will be seen below.

C. The Different LXX Version

Some parts of the conclusion to Joshua are only preserved in the LXX. The longer text of the LXX might either be a later addition³⁹ or might display the original tradition on which the MT has drawn.⁴⁰ The arguments for both interpretations should be evaluated here.

1. The LXX plus in v. 31

Especially the obvious heresy of Joshua being the leader from Egypt and the remark about the flint circumcision knives which is maintained by v. 31 LXX might indicate its originality and authenticity.⁴¹ Both statements have been offensive for orthodox readers, such that this text must have been excluded in later times.⁴² Furthermore, there seems to be no reason for these elements to be appended at a later time. In addition, it appears that the longer LXX version had a Hebrew *Vorlage*, since both additions can be easily retranslated into Hebrew.⁴³

However, Josh 24:31 LXX with the report on the flint circumcision knives might be a midrashic expansion that draws on Josh 5:4. In addition, the statement about Joshua as the leader of the exodus builds on the reference to the exodus in Josh 5:4.⁴⁴ Thus, both notes (Joshua as leader of the exodus and the flint circumcision knives) are most probably linked to Josh 5:4. Furthermore, the combination of covenant and circumcision is late and dependent on the late Priestly text in Gen 17.⁴⁵ Moreover, the LXX version develops the concept of Joshua as the leader of the exodus already in Josh 24:5, since the

³⁹ RÖMER, 'Ende', 545 thinks that LXX has intensified the idea of a Hexateuch by its additions. LUCASSEN, 'Josua', 394, assumes that Josh 24:33 LXX are late additions to round out the book of Joshua, but not an indication that Judg 3:12 follows directly upon Josh 24. Already RUDOLPH, *Elohist*, 253, regarded the LXX pluses as secondary; similarly FRITZ, *Josua*, 250; NELSON, *Joshua*, 281.

⁴⁰ See ROFÉ, 'End', 30. For a critique of the view that LXX is earlier than MT see SCHMID, *Erzväter*, 218–219; KRATZ, 'Hexateuch', 304–305.

⁴¹ See ROFÉ, 'End', 24; BUTLER, *Joshua 13–24*, 335. However, RÖSEL, 'Septuagint-Version', 18, thinks that this notion is a particular accent of the LXX translator.

⁴² See ROFÉ, 'End', 23–24.

⁴³ See GREENSPOON, 'Joshua', 241. See already ROFÉ, 'End', 32 and part II, section 1 of this volume.

⁴⁴ See RÖSEL, 'Überleitungen', 349; NELSON, *Joshua*, 282; contrary to LUCASSEN, 'Josua', 387–389, who holds the LXX version to be original.

⁴⁵ See JERICKE, 'Josuas Tod', 353.

reference to Moses and Aaron is deleted there.⁴⁶ Therefore, Josh 24:31 LXX is a later addition as well.

2. *The LXX plus in v. 33*

Sometimes the longer LXX text of v. 33 is considered to be more original than MT. If this is indeed the case, Judg 1:1–3:11 might be a secondary addition to the book of Judges, since it evolved from the LXX plus. In this respect, the original text of Judges might have begun with the oppression by Eglon.⁴⁷ Apparently the longer version of Joshua LXX was still in use at Qumran, since CD V:3–4 knows especially about the Ark of the Covenant and the veneration of the Astartes by the Israelites in the context of Joshua's and Eleazar's death.⁴⁸ Perhaps the longer part of the LXX text was later deleted for theological reasons in order to eliminate the idea of a Hexateuch and to strengthen the notion of the Pentateuch as a discrete literary work.

However, it is questionable whether Qumran has still retained a pre-dtr version. Moreover, the relevant passage in CD only alludes to the events mentioned in the LXX pluses but does not correspond to a possible Hebrew reconstruction of the LXX.⁴⁹ Thus, it seems that the LXX text is secondary. By adding further information in v. 33, the LXX might have tied Joshua and Judges together.⁵⁰ The LXX plus begins with an introductory formula and repeats information from Judg 3, such that it might not be original but instead dependent on the Judges tradition, since the content of this addition refers to Judges, not to Joshua. Therefore, v. 33 LXX might be a redactional appendix to stress the link between Joshua and Judges, not only by the parallel in Judg 2:6–9, but also by supplements in Josh 24:33. Hence, the LXX expansion is due to “intertextual bridge building”⁵¹, indicating that the plus in v. 33 LXX is not original, but redactional.⁵² The LXX additions in v. 33 might be related to Judg 2:6, 11–13 and 3:7, 12–14 so that they display not the original tradition, but are simply arbitrary supplements.⁵³ The LXX additions allude to themes in the book of Judges and show that apostasy happened

⁴⁶ See RÖSEL, ‘Septuagint-Version’, 15.

⁴⁷ See ROFÉ, ‘End’, 28–30. On an earlier connection between Josh 24:33 LXX + Judg 3:15 see BLUM, ‘Connection’, 101; SPRONK, ‘From Joshua to Samuel’, 149.

⁴⁸ See ROFÉ, ‘End’, 28–29; LUCASSEN, ‘Josua’, 378–379; RAKE, *Juda*, 138–139 n. 435.

⁴⁹ See the critique by VAN DER MEER, *Formation*, 61.

⁵⁰ See NELSON, *Joshua*, 282.

⁵¹ NELSON, *Joshua*, 282.

⁵² See RÖSEL, *Joshua*, 377. According to RÖSEL, ‘Überleitungen’, 349, the idiom ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ “on that day” is linked to Judg 20:27–28, and the setting at Γαββαθ τῆ ἐανροῦ “Gibeah which belonged to him” might indicate redactional reworking. Moreover, the beginning of Josh 24:33b is paralleled by Josh 24:28.

⁵³ See already KEIL, *Josua, Richter und Rut*, 174.

already at the very beginnings of Israel.⁵⁴ Moreover, the LXX additions might indicate that Joshua was translated prior to other historical books, such that the translator added material from other books.⁵⁵

All in all, it seems that the LXX tradition in Josh 24:31, 33 is later than the MT version and reflects the theological agenda of the LXX translator. Therefore, it is difficult to use the divergent LXX version in redactional theories.

D. The Tomb of Joshua at Timnath-Heres or Timnath-Serah?

The tradition of Joshua's tomb in Ephraim does not seem to be invented nor is it biased.⁵⁶ There might have been a preexilic tradition of the tomb of Joshua which became important when the Joshua narrative was interpreted in a pan-Israelite way.⁵⁷ Joshua's tomb was located on his own inheritance. Thus, there was no need to purchase burial ground, unlike the case of the former patriarchs.⁵⁸ Since the location of Timnath-Serah is difficult,⁵⁹ this place was associated with Mt. Gaash which is also unknown otherwise.⁶⁰

The original reading of the toponym Timnath-Heres/Timnath-Serah is far from certain.⁶¹ Sometimes the priority of one name over the other is used to prove the direction of the dependence between both passages.⁶² Three different interpretations have been considered regarding the original name form of Joshua's burial site:

a) Some scholars think that Timnath-Heres (Judg 2:9) is more original than Timnath-Serah (Josh 24:30). The name Timnath-Heres was later changed to Timnath-Serah, since *heres* "sun" might be related to a forbidden solar cult.⁶³

⁵⁴ See RÖSEL, 'Septuagint-Version', 18.

⁵⁵ See RÖSEL, 'Septuagint-Version', 19.

⁵⁶ See ALT, 'Josua', 186.

⁵⁷ See FRITZ, *Josua*, 250.

⁵⁸ See WOULDSTRA, *Joshua*, 360.

⁵⁹ The toponym Timnath-Serah/Timnath-Heres is identified either with *Hirbet Tibne* (1603.1573) or with *Kafr Hāris* (1637.1691), both with early Jewish, Samaritan, Christian or Muslim traditions. On both places see HERTZBERG, 'Tradition', 89–90; GAB, *Ortsnamen*, 198 n. 1505; RÖSEL, *Joshua*, 376. For different traditions see NOORT, 'Jos 24,28–31', 109–111. Since the necropolis of *Kafr Hāris* lacks evidence from the Iron Age, the Biblical toponym might be identified with nearby *Hirbet et-Tell* (1638.1691); see NOORT, 'Jos 24,28–31', 126.

⁶⁰ See NELSON, *Joshua*, 279.

⁶¹ LXX has a variant reading potentially reflecting Hebrew סחר; see BOLING, *Joshua*, 532; NELSON, *Joshua*, 279.

⁶² Yet this cannot prove anything; see KOOPMANS, *Joshua* 24, 369 n. 109.

⁶³ For the possible originality of Timnath-Heres see OETTLI, *Deuteronomium*, 228; NÖTSCHER, *Richter*, 12; MILLER/TUCKER, *Joshua*, 154; AULD, 'Judges I', 264; BOLING, *Judges*, 72; HERTZBERG, *Josua, Richter, Ruth*, 139; GRAY, *Joshua, Judges, Ruth*, 160;

Thus, the offensive name form of original Timnath-Heres was slightly altered for pious reasons.

b) However, it is questionable why the allegedly negative toponym Timnath-Heres was not changed in Judg 2:9 as well and why all other toponyms with *heres* or *šemeš* have been sustained contrary to the burial site of Joshua.⁶⁴ Therefore, Timnath-Serah (Josh 24:30) might be considered more original. Perhaps the copyist of Judges reversed the consonants of *serah* to *heres*.⁶⁵ In this respect, Timnath-Serah might be the proper toponym.⁶⁶ Furthermore, the accidental or deliberate alteration to Timnath-Heres in Judg 2:9 links the toponym of Joshua's burial site to the sun miracle of Josh 10:12–14.⁶⁷ Hence, there are good reasons for changing Timnath-Serah to Timnath-Heres.

c) Moreover, the modifier *serah* might have had a negative connotation (“stink”) as well, such that it was deliberately altered by later scribes to *heres*.⁶⁸ In this respect, Timnath-Heres might be a deliberate change based on Har-Heres mentioned already in Judg 1:35.⁶⁹ Therefore, Timnath-Serah might be the original name.

All in all, the name Timnath-Serah seems to be more original than Timnath-Heres. However, this observation helps little in establishing the redaction criticism of Josh 24 and Judg 2, since Timnath-Serah might have been altered in Judg 2:9 independently of all other redactional processes.

E. Different Solutions Regarding the Doublets

Sometimes the doublet of Joshua's twice-told death is solved by synchronic readings. In this way, the second occurrence in Judg 2 is seen as a flashback,⁷⁰ although the syntax does not support such a chronological retrospec-

BECKER, *Richterzeit*, 67; JERICKE, ‘Josuas Tod’, 354; BLUM, ‘Knoten’, 184 n. 10; NELSON, *Joshua*, 280; BUTLER, *Judges*, 37; IDEM, *Joshua 13–24*, 335.

⁶⁴ See NOORT, ‘Jos 24,28–31’, 112–113.

⁶⁵ See WOODSTRA, *Joshua*, 359; WEBB, *Judges*, 138, who thinks that Timnath-Heres is either an alternative name or a scribal error. See already BERTHEAU, *Richter und Rut*, 57.

⁶⁶ NOORT, ‘Jos 24,28–31’, 115, adds that the version of Josh 24:29–31 seems to be more original than Judg 2:6–9.

⁶⁷ See NOORT, ‘Jos 24,28–31’, 126–130; RÖSEL, *Joshua*, 376. This interpretation can be found in rabbinic sources as well; see BERTHEAU, *Richter und Rut*, 57.

⁶⁸ See GAß, *Ortsnamen*, 197; GROß, *Richter*, 200. Only an etymological interpretation of *serah* as “leftover portion” might be a positive pun related to the inheritance of Joshua, since he received his inheritance only after the distribution of the rest of the land.

⁶⁹ For this option see BECKER, *Richterzeit*, 67.

⁷⁰ See WEBB, *Judges*, 134.

tion in Judg 2:6–9.⁷¹ Perhaps Judg 2:6–9 are a deliberate element of the retrospective that begins in Judg 1:27–33 and deals with the time before Judg 1:1–26. This retrospective might be indicated by the use of *x-qatal* in Judg 1:27 versus *wayyiqtol* in Judg 1:26.⁷² Therefore, the notice in Judg 2:6 that Israel has to take over its allotments does not contradict Josh 24:28 with Israel already possessing its inheritance, since Judg 1:27–2:9 are set in the time before Josh 24. All the other differences in both doublets might be explained pragmatically, since they were necessary to create two separate books that refer to each other.

However, a diachronic development seems evident due to the many duplications within Josh 23–Judg 2. In former times, the traditional sources of the Pentateuch have been expanded to the book of Joshua to form a Hexateuch. Therefore, Josh 23 was regarded as dtr, whereas Josh 24 was attributed to an Elohist or Jahwistic source⁷³ that was expanded by dtr additions.⁷⁴

The correct evaluation of Josh 24 is problematic, since it shows dtr language but also non-dtr elements.⁷⁵ Since Josh 24 is a mixture of different phraseology (dtn, dtr, Priestly), it surely must be a late text.⁷⁶ However, there are also indications that the basic text behind Josh 24 might be older than Josh 23.⁷⁷ Josh 23:2 copies Josh 24:1 without Shechem, the place for the assembly. Josh 23 has no real end, which might indicate that Josh 24 was already in existence. The idiom *ויהי אחרי הדברים האלה* “after these things” in Josh 24:29 marks a clear *caesura* which is referred to in Josh 23:14. Josh 24 recapitulates the Hexateuch from Gen 11–Josh 24, whereas Josh 23:6 already

⁷¹ See O’CONNELL, *Rhetoric*, 72; GROB, *Richter*, 185. Either the syntax is defective, or it is a quote from Josh 24:28–31 without changing the syntax, or Judg 2:6 originally followed directly after Josh 23; see WEBB, *Judges*, 134. KEIL, *Josua, Richter und Rut*, 200, thinks that the syntax expresses the sequence of thought and not of tenses.

⁷² See FROLOV, ‘Demise’, 316–323.

⁷³ For an attribution to the Elohist source see OETTLI, *Deuteronomium*, 126; SMEND, *Erzählung*, 337; WELLHAUSEN, *Composition*, 133–134, and to the Yahwistic source see RUDOLPH, *Elohist*, 244–250. For similar earlier positions see SCHMID, *Erzväter*, 213: Josh 24 was regarded either as the closure of the Elohist or Yahwistic source. It could also be a mixed, Jehovistic text.

⁷⁴ Contrary to GREBMAN, *Anfänge*, 156–157, who regards Josh 24 mainly as dtr; Josh 24:29–33 are dtr notes.

⁷⁵ See KRATZ, ‘Hexateuch’, 301; RÖMER, ‘Ende’, 526.

⁷⁶ See KRATZ, ‘Hexateuch’, 301. MAYES, *Story of Israel*, 50–57, regards Josh 24:1–28 as a late insertion into a dtr work. According to SCHMID, *Erzväter*, 216–218, Josh 24 is post-dtr and therefore later than Josh 23. BREKELMANS, ‘Joshua xxiv’, 6–7, has shown that Josh 24 not only looks back, but also forward to the following period. Thus, it cannot be part only of a pentateuchal source. Since Josh 24 takes up topics from the ancestral narratives as well as the following narrative of the monarchy, it is considered a late text with Josh 23 even dependent on it; see BECKER, ‘Kontextvernetzungen’, 141–151.

⁷⁷ On what follows see KNAUF, ‘Buchschlüsse’, 221–222.

knows about the canonical division between Torah and Prophets. But if Josh 24 is older than Josh 23, it is questionable why the younger text precedes the older one so that Josh 24 has the last word and not Josh 23.⁷⁸

All in all, it is difficult to correctly evaluate the chronological setting of both chapters Josh 23 and Josh 24. This question is further complicated by the dtr language used in both texts. If Josh 24 is dtr like Josh 23, only one dtr author being responsible for Deut–2 Kgs is questionable. Instead, to solve the problem of dtr doublets, it is wiser to postulate more than one dtr redaction. Therefore, the doublets are usually attributed to two dtr layers (DtrH and DtrN).⁷⁹ However, it is far from certain which dtr tradition is older than the other, such that the assignment of the separate text editions to specific dtr layers is disputed.⁸⁰ In addition, one can also regard the dtr additions as *Fortschreibungen*.⁸¹

While it is undisputed that dtr editors have reworked the book-seam between Joshua and Judges, it is an open question which parallel represents the original tradition. At least three different proposals with many variations have been suggested.

1. Josh 24:28–31 as the oldest tradition

There are many arguments for the literary dependence of Judg 2:6–9 on Josh 24:28–31. Many observations are best explained with Josh 24 being the source text of Judg 2:

a) Judg 2:6 repeats and expands upon Josh 24:28, which concludes the scene of the assembly at Shechem. In Judg 2:6 the takeover of the still unconquered land is added.⁸² This might be a contextual addition which was needed in the book of Judges.⁸³ The infinitive with final meaning (לרשת) requires וילכו בני ישראל “and Israel went”, which is a further addition to pre-

⁷⁸ See RÖMER, ‘Ende’, 526–527. Therefore, it is also possible that Josh 23 with Judg 2:6ff. constituted the link between Joshua and Judges which was augmented by Josh 24 – a nearly homogeneous unit according to SCHMID, *Erzväter*, 214–215 – aiming to delineate a Hexateuch.

⁷⁹ See FRITZ, *Josua*, 235–239; LATVUS, *God*, 39–40; contrary to RÖSEL, ‘Redaktion’, 188, who does not find a coherent redactional stratum of DtrN in Joshua. Josh 23 was simply created to link Joshua and Judges.

⁸⁰ MILLER/TUCKER, *Josua*, 7–8, regard Josh 23 as dtr, whereas Josh 24 reworked older traditions.

⁸¹ RÖMER, ‘Ende’, 527, complains about an inflation of dtr additions, such that dtr layers should be substituted by dtr “Fortschreibung”.

⁸² See BECKER, *Richterzeit*, 66. According to RAKE, *Juda*, 136 n. 431, Judg 2:6 needs Judg 1, since the hitherto unconquered land had to be subdued. Similarly already RICHTER, *Bearbeitungen*, 46–47; SOGGIN, *Judges*, 41.

⁸³ See FREVEL, ‘Wiederkehr’, 40.

vent too many nouns.⁸⁴ Moreover, the term בני ישראל is used often in the book of Judges, but in Josh 23–24 only in Josh 24:32. There is no reason for deleting the phrase וילכו בני ישראל in Josh 24:28.⁸⁵

b) Since the notice of the dismissal of the Shechem assembly in Josh 24:28⁸⁶ is not necessary in Judg 2, this information in Judg 2:6 is due to the *Vorlage* in Josh 24:28. Therefore, Judg 2 knows the version of Josh 24 and added the notion that the land had to be taken in possession.

c) Since the topic of the dismissal of the people in Judg 2:6 is not useful for the opening of a book, the version in Josh 24:28–31 might be earlier than its parallel in Judg 2:6–9.⁸⁷ Most probably the redactor knew Josh 24:1–28 + Josh 24:29–31 and picked up Josh 24:28 to form Judg 2:6.⁸⁸

d) By adding בני ישראל “Israelites” in Judg 2:6, the redactor formed an *inclusio* with Judg 2:10 (ישראל). Moreover, he used the lexeme עם “people” in Judg 2:6–7, thus deliberately changing ישראל “Israel” (Josh 24:31) to עם “people” (Judg 2:7).⁸⁹ Therefore, the reference to “Israel” and “people” in Judg 2:7 might be due to a later reworking of Josh 24:31.

e) Furthermore, Judg 2:7 refers to the מעשה יהוה הגדול “YHWH’s great work”. By doing so, it magnifies God’s work.⁹⁰ There is no reason for the authors of Josh 24 to delete הגדול “great” and to minimize God’s action in that verse. Thus, Judg 2:6–9 knows and intensifies the older version of Josh 24.⁹¹ Thus, the idiom מעשה יהוה הגדול “YHWH’s great work” in Judg 2:7 is a later expansion.⁹²

f) Moreover, the verb ידע “to know” in Josh 24:31 is changed to ראה “to see” in Judg 2:7. This could be a redactional link back to Josh 23:3.⁹³ But it is

⁸⁴ See RICHTER, *Bearbeitungen*, 47. However, Josh 24:28 seems to be altered to נחלתו in return like the reading Judg 2:6, since Josh 24:28 LXX might have preserved a different and more original *Vorlage* (למקמו). Through this deliberate alteration, Josh 24:28 is converted into a summary of the conquest and is no longer the closure of the covenant ceremony; see KOOPMANS, *Joshua 24*, 368.

⁸⁵ See FREVEL, ‘Wiederkehr’, 40.

⁸⁶ On Josh 24:28 as belonging to Josh 24:1–27 see NENTEL, *Trägerschaft*, 107. Moreover, the theme of the the unconquered land in Judg 2:6 is a refinement of Josh 21:43–44.

⁸⁷ See SOGGIN, *Judges*, 41.

⁸⁸ See RÖSEL, *Von Josua bis Jojachin*, 56.

⁸⁹ See KOOPMANS, *Joshua 24*, 369.

⁹⁰ See BECKER, *Richterzeit*, 66; FREVEL, ‘Wiederkehr’, 39.

⁹¹ See NOORT, ‘Jos 24,28–31’, 113; RÖSEL, *Joshua*, 377. However, BLUM, ‘Knoten’, 182, thinks that the differences are due to the context and cannot be of help regarding textual development.

⁹² According to KOOPMANS, *Joshua 24*, 369 the verse is brought in line with Deut 11:7 by adding הגדול “great”.

⁹³ See RÖSEL, ‘Überleitungen’, 344. Since the verb ידע “to know” is important in Judg 2:10–3:6 (see WEBB, *Judges*, 136), the change to ראה “to see” in Judg 2:7 must be explained somehow.

also possible that the usual word-pair “see”-“know” was deliberately distributed over two verses (Judg 2:7, 10).⁹⁴ Thus, the later change in Judg 2:7 could be explained either redactionally or stylistically. The earlier tradition using ע"ד is clearly preserved in Judg 2:10, where the latter generation did not know about YHWH’s accomplishments. Moreover, Josh 24:31 seems to be more original than Judg 2:7, since Judg 2:7 emphasizes that Joshua’s generation not only knew but also saw YHWH’s deeds. Perhaps Judg 2:7 specifies the verb ע"ד “to know” with the verb ר"ה “to see” being the stronger form of perception.⁹⁵

g) The position of the evaluation of Israel’s obedience in Josh 24:31 after Joshua’s death might be more original, since it refers explicitly to the time after Joshua and must be placed logically after the death notice. Moreover, the evaluation is best situated after the closure of a period, whereas it was put before Joshua’s death in Judg 2:7 to contrast the negative time of the Judges to the ideal time before.⁹⁶ In light of all of this, Josh 24:29–31 with their sequence might be older than Judg 2:6–9.⁹⁷

h) The note that Israel was obedient to YHWH fits better with Josh 24, since the ministry of Israel is a major topic in this chapter. Thus, Josh 24:31 is better integrated in the overall context. Therefore, the original note seems to be placed in Josh 24.⁹⁸

All in all, there are strong reasons for assuming the dependence of Judg 2:6–9 on Josh 24:28–31, since all alterations in Judg 2:6–9 can easily be explained in this direction.

The doublet Josh 24:28–31 || Judg 2:6–9 is sometimes explained by two literary layers: earlier Josh 24:1–Judg 2:5 and later Josh 23 + Judg 2:6–9. Combining both editions resulted in obvious duplication.⁹⁹ There are many indications of a connection between Judg 2:6–9 and Josh 23:

⁹⁴ See KOOPMANS, *Joshua 24*, 368–369. However, according to RICHTER, *Bearbeitungen*, 47, “seeing” is more important than “knowing”, such that Judg 2:7 might have priority over Josh 24:31.

⁹⁵ See BECKER, *Richterzeit*, 66–67, who regards the change from ע"ד “to know” to ר"ה “to see” as a clarification.

⁹⁶ See RÖSEL, ‘Überleitungen’, 344.

⁹⁷ Contrary to NOTH, *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien*, 8–9, who regards Josh 23 as the earlier literary conclusion to Joshua which can be linked to Judg 2:6–10, though the later text in Josh 24 has preserved the older tradition. However, Judg 2:6–10 are clearly based on Josh 24:28–31 and not vice versa. According to RÖSEL, *Von Josua bis Jojachin*, 51 n. 102, Josh 23 was composed as a replacement for an existing conclusion in Josh 24.

⁹⁸ See FREVEL, ‘Wiederkehr’, 40–41.

⁹⁹ See RÖSEL, ‘Überleitungen’, 343; IDEM, *Von Josua bis Jojachin*, 50. However, according to O’DOHERTY, ‘Problem’, 6–7, Josh 24:1–Judg 2:5 were composed by a later dtr editor who used an old tradition and added a theological interpretation in Josh 24:19–24 and Judg 2:1–5.

a) Since Judg 2:6–9 continues Josh 23 with its concept of an incomplete conquest,¹⁰⁰ Judg 2:6–9 might be related to Josh 23.¹⁰¹

b) Furthermore, Joshua's death is anticipated in Josh 23:14 and fulfilled in Judg 2:8–9.¹⁰²

c) The dismissal of the people in Judg 2:6 is the natural sequel to Joshua's speech in Josh 23, since Josh 24 already has a proper closure of the assembly of the Israelites at Shechem.¹⁰³

Some scholars even think that Josh 24:1–Judg 2:5 have a clear logic with the death of Joshua in Josh 24:29 and a reference to it in Judg 1:1.¹⁰⁴ Sometimes Judg 2:6–9 was considered the original sequel of Josh 23 before Josh 24 and Judg 1:1–2:5 were inserted.¹⁰⁵ Hence, the dependence of both parallels was changed with Josh 23 + Judg 2:6–9 being older than Josh 24 (+ Judg 1:1–2:5). This theory seems to be due to the late dating of Josh 24 and Judg 1:1–2:5. Therefore, the late texts Josh 23 and Judg 2:6–9 must be earlier than their counterparts.

However, it is far from certain that Judg 1:1–2:5 is the logical continuation of Josh 24. It might also be linked with Josh 23.¹⁰⁶ Moreover, even if Judg 1 has taken up older traditions, it is still a late composition consisting of different traditions compiled by a Judean redactor, such that the theory of two large blocks (Josh 24:1–Judg 2:5 and Josh 23 + Judg 2:6–9) being arranged secondarily seems implausible. It is more probable that a later redactor corrected the overly positive view of a complete conquest expressed earlier in Josh 24 by adding Judg 1:1–2:5. Hence, the redactor had to point again to Joshua's death and copied the former verses into Judg 2:6–9. Moreover, Judg 2:6–9 was necessary to alleviate the harsh transition to the still unconquered land. Thus, Judg 2:6–9 seem to be later than their doublet in Josh 24.¹⁰⁷

¹⁰⁰ Similarly GROB, *Richter*, 182.

¹⁰¹ See, however, the objections by RICHTER, *Bearbeitungen*, 49–50 n. 147. For a critique see HALBE, *Privilegrecht*, 346, since $\psi^{\prime}\text{ר}$ "to take possession" refers to the legal inheritance of land without possessions. Thus, Judg 2:6 could be linked to either Josh 23 (unconquered land) or Josh 24 (conquered land).

¹⁰² On Josh 23 and Judg 2:6–9 as part of a single literary stratum see already EISSFELDT, *Einleitung*, 340; RÖSEL, 'Redaktion', 187; IDEM, *Joshua*, 375.

¹⁰³ See SMEND, *Erzählung*, 316.

¹⁰⁴ See RÖSEL, *Von Josua bis Jojachin*, 50.

¹⁰⁵ See O'DOHERTY, 'Problem', 4. Judges 2:6 cannot be an independent opening of the book of Judges, as it requires the assembly at Shechem narrated in Josh 23–24; see RICHTER, *Bearbeitungen*, 45.

¹⁰⁶ See JERICKE, 'Josuas Tod', 350; VAN DER MEER, *Formation*, 131.

¹⁰⁷ See RÖSEL, 'Überleitungen', 346–347. However, due to the thematic tension of the "conquered/unconquered land", it is problematic to assign Josh 24 and Judg 1:1–2:5 to a single redactional stratum; see NENTEL, *Trägerschaft*, 103. Furthermore, according to SCHMITT, *Frieden*, 40 n. 57, Judg 2:6–10 cannot be the continuation of Josh 23, since the Israelites have to take possession of their inheritance in Judg 2:6, whereas the conquest

Sometimes Judg 1:1–2:9 is regarded as an appendix to the book of Joshua, since it shares thematic parallels with Joshua. Moreover, Judg 2:6–9 is regarded as a *Wiederaufnahme* of Josh 24:28–31.¹⁰⁸ Hence, the repetition in Judg 2:6–9 was necessary after the interpolation of Judg 1:1–2:5. Moreover, some necessary additions were made.¹⁰⁹ Since Judg 1:1 with its notice of Joshua's death contradicts Judg 2:6, this verse might be an even later gloss,¹¹⁰ probably added in order to separate the two books.

The literary-historical arguments mentioned above are often integrated in redactional systems spanning the books of Joshua, Judges and beyond.¹¹¹ Thus, the different literary strata are explained in the larger context of the DtrH:

a) DtrH and DtrN:¹¹² Sometimes Josh 24:29–31 is regarded as the original ending of the book of Joshua in the form of DtrH, the earliest dtr version. The doubling in Judg 2:6–9 was necessary following the insertion of Judg 1:1–2:5, whereas Judg 2:10 was the former continuation of Josh 24:31, since both verses use the verb *יָדָע* “to know”.¹¹³ This later dtr redaction added Josh 23 and Judg 1:1–2:9 to the first dtr edition of Joshua (DtrH). This nomistic redaction attributes the “unconquered land” and the existence of foreign people in Israel to the disobedience of Israel (DtrN).

b) DtrH and DtrS:¹¹⁴ Due to the addition of the takeover of the “unconquered land”, Judg 2:6 might belong to the later DtrS, whereas the parallel in Josh 24:28 is ascribed to earlier DtrH, with Josh 24:28 being the closure of

happened long ago according to Josh 23. Judg 2:6–10 might be the logical continuation of Josh 24:1–27.

¹⁰⁸ See SMEND, ‘Gesetz’, 506; MAYES, *Story of Israel*, 59; BRETTLE, ‘Jud 1,1–2,10’, 433–435; LUCASSEN, ‘Josua’, 383–385; NENTEL, *Trägerschaft*, 109. See already BERTHEAU, *Richter und Rut*, 56. According to BOLING, *Judges*, 36, Judg 2:6–9 were taken from Josh 24:28–31, expanded in Judg 2:6–10 and prefixed by Judg 2:1–5. The narrator added Judg 1:1–2:5 with the laxity of the generation after Joshua and repeated Josh 24:29–32 in Judg 2:6–9. In this respect, he was able to describe Joshua's period as a golden age which already foreshadowed the dark age of Judges; see ANGEL, ‘One Book’, 170.

¹⁰⁹ See SOGGIN, *Judges*, 41.

¹¹⁰ See LUCASSEN, ‘Josua’, 384.

¹¹¹ For the notion of two dtr versions of the end of Joshua and the beginning of Judges see already SMEND, *Erzählung*, 315–317.

¹¹² See SMEND, ‘Gesetz’, 507–508. LATVUS, *God*, 39–40, regards Josh 24* as belonging to DtrH and Josh 23 to DtrN. However, the chronological problem between Judg 1:1 and Judg 2:6–9 contradicts this redactional hypothesis; see RÖSEL, *Von Josua bis Jojachin*, 53. Moreover, it is far from certain whether Josh 24 is older than Josh 23. Furthermore, Josh 24 is not a conclusive end of the conquest story and is linked to subsequent material such as Judg 6:7–10; see BLUM, ‘Knoten’, 195.

¹¹³ See SMEND, ‘Gesetz’, 506. Similarly FRITZ, *Josua*, 250; RÖSEL, *Von Josua bis Jojachin*, 54.

¹¹⁴ See NENTEL, *Trägerschaft*, 108–109.

the assembly at Shechem. Similarly, the following verses are likewise attributed to DtrH (Josh 24:29–31) and DtrS (Judg 2:7–9), since both units are coherent texts, with Josh 24 having the better and more organic sequence with Judg 2:7 already anticipating Joshua’s death. Furthermore, Josh 24:29 is a perfect transition from Josh 24:28 (DtrH). The verb *יָדָע* “to know” in Josh 24:31, which is typical of DtrH, is changed to *רָאָה* “to see” in Judg 2:7, which is linked to Josh 23:3 (DtrS), whereas “to know” is mentioned again in Judg 2:10 (DtrH).

All in all, the priority of Josh 24:28–31 in relation to Judg 2:6–9 is explained in several different ways. In all of these models, Judg 2:6–9 is interpreted as a later repetition of Josh 24:28–31. This is either due to the insertion of Judg 1:1–2:5 (*Wiederaufnahme*) or to two parallel dtr accounts (Josh 24 [+ Judg 1:1–2:5] and the later version in Josh 23 + Judg 2:6–9) that were combined secondarily.

2. Judg 2:6–9 as the oldest tradition

Some scholars consider Josh 24:28–31 to be dependent on Judg 2:6–9. The following observations might be in favor of Judg 2:6–9 being the older tradition. However, these arguments are in no way unequivocal. As seen above, most of them have been used to argue that Josh 24:29–31 has preserved the older tradition:

a) The arrangement of events in the version of Judg 2:6–9 might be older than Josh 24:29–31 MT.¹¹⁵ In Judg 2:6–9, Israel’s faithfulness during Joshua’s lifetime logically precedes the notice of the leader’s death. This order is intentionally reversed in Josh 24:29–31, since Joshua is the main character in Josh 24 and his fate should be considered first.¹¹⁶ Furthermore, Josh 24 LXX having the same arrangement as Judg 2 might still preserve the original order, which was enhanced by a later MT editor. Due to its better sequence, Judg 2:6–9 could be the continuation of Josh 24:27, serving to build an external connection between the book of Joshua and the actual Judges narratives.¹¹⁷ However, the sequence cannot prove anything (see B).

b) It may be more likely that Josh 24:28 omits the taking possession of the land rather than Judg 2:6–9 adding this notion later. When the redactor of Josh 24 borrowed from Judg 2:6–9, he had to eliminate this information, since it contradicts the context of Josh 24.¹¹⁸

¹¹⁵ According to AULD, ‘Judges I’, 264, the LXX version of Josh 24, having the same arrangement as Judg 2, is to be preferred.

¹¹⁶ See HESS, *Joshua*, 340.

¹¹⁷ See NÖTSCHER, *Richter*, 12.

¹¹⁸ It also contradicts Josh 21:43–45; see LUCASSEN, ‘Josua’, 381 n. 20.

c) Whereas the verb ידע “to know” has to be linked to the obedience to God’s covenant,¹¹⁹ the verb ראה “to see” relates to the historic experience of Joshua’s generation. Therefore, it is not necessary that Judg 2:7 specifies the verb ידע “to know” in Josh 24:9 and that the verb ראה “to see” is the stronger form of perception.¹²⁰

d) Perhaps the addition of the relative pronoun in Josh 24:30 is a clarification of Judg 2:9, indicating the priority of the latter.¹²¹

e) Moreover, Judg 2:6–10 is a perfect transition from the time of Joshua to the following generation of the Judges, unlike Josh 24:28–31, which marks the closure of the book of Joshua and therefore lacks the negative contrast to the following generation. Thus, the linguistic and stylistic differences between Josh 24 and Judg 2 can be explained by their different functions and cannot be exploited for diachronic reconstructions.¹²² Therefore, Judg 2:6–9 need not have been developed from Josh 24:29–31.¹²³

f) Perhaps there is also a link from Judg 2:6–10 back to Exod 1:6–8. Since Exod 1 used similar phraseology and destroyed the perfect sequence of כל הדור ההוא “all that generation” and דור אחר “another generation” due to the different situation, Exod 1 has borrowed from Judg 2 and not vice versa.¹²⁴ Since the parallel in Exod 1 signifies a gap between two generations and a new start, it seems that Joshua’s death notice in Judg 2:8–9 is not a closure, but an opening signal. Therefore, Judg 2:6–10 was written to begin a new narrative. For Josh 24:28–31 being formulated with Judg 2:6–10 as its model, Josh 24 concludes the *Hexateuch*, which combines the traditions of the ancestors and the exodus. Thus, Judg 2:6–10 are older than Josh 24:29–31, which might be the conclusion of the *Hexateuch*.¹²⁵ Hence, Josh 24:28–32 seem to be the end of the *Hexateuch* with the pronounced reference to Joseph’s burial site, whereas Judg 2:1–5, together with Judg 2:6–10, open a new book.¹²⁶

g) Furthermore, Josh 24:29–31 might not be older than Judg 2:7–9, since Judg 2:7–9 cannot be regarded a reasonable *Wiederaufnahme* of Josh 24:29–31 after Judg 1:1–2:5 was inserted. This is due to the obvious observation that

¹¹⁹ According to GRAY, *Joshua, Judges, Ruth*, 182–183, ידע “to know” has covenantal implications, since God’s work is the basis for the covenant.

¹²⁰ See JERICKE, ‘Josuas Tod’, 355.

¹²¹ See BECKER, *Richterzeit*, 67. However, the relative pronoun could be a late addition in MT and cannot prove the direction of dependence; see KOOPMANS, *Joshua 24*, 369. According to FREVEL, ‘Wiederkehr’, 41, the dispensation with the relative pronoun reflects colloquial usage, which usually omits the relative pronoun.

¹²² See BLUM, ‘Knoten’, 184.

¹²³ For the reasoning that Judg 2 is earlier than Josh 24 see AULD, ‘Judges I’, 264.

¹²⁴ See BLUM, ‘Connection’, 104. Similarly VAN SETERS, *Life*, 16–19.

¹²⁵ See BLUM, ‘Connection’, 104–105; GROß, *Richter*, 183.

¹²⁶ See BLUM, ‘Knoten’, 206.

Judg 1:1 already presupposes Joshua's death, which happens again in Judg 2:8–9.¹²⁷

h) The dating of Joshua's death with the idiom *יהי אחרי הדברים האלה* "after these things" in Josh 24:29 suggests that the death happened sometime after the dismissal of the tribes. Thus, Judg 2:1–5* can only be situated properly between the notice of dismissal (Josh 24:28) and the death of Joshua (Judg 2:8–9). The second dismissal is not a rigorous obstacle (Judg 2:6), since the angel of YHWH already presupposes in Judg 2:1–5* the first dismissal of the people of Israel (Josh 24:28).¹²⁸ If one regards Judg 2:1–5* as the first addition between the period of Joshua and Judges, Judg 2:7–9 seem to be earlier than their parallel in Josh 24:29–31. Therefore, Josh 24:29–31 have been borrowed later from Judg 2:7–9. Thus, Josh 24:28 could originally be followed by Judg 2:7–9.¹²⁹ In a last step, Josh 24:29–31 and Judg 1:1* have separated the two books of Joshua and Judges.¹³⁰

According to the aforementioned redactional theory, Josh 24:28–31 were borrowed from Judg 2:6–9 to form a proper conclusion of the book of Joshua.¹³¹ At least the observation that Josh 24:28–31 is a perfect closure of Joshua is valid, but it is far from certain whether it was reshaped secondarily to form the end of Joshua.

This redactional theory is also embedded in the broader context of the DtrH. Both dtr doublets have different theological purposes. Whereas Josh 24:28–31 underscore the topic of "obedience to YHWH", Judg 2:6–9 stress that YHWH's accomplishments have been experienced in history due to the use of *ראה* "to see" and *מעשה יהוה הגדול* "YHWH's great work". Therefore, some scholars think that Judg 2:6–9 belong to the first edition of the DtrH and are linked to Josh 24:1–27, whereas Josh 24:28–31 stem from a later nomistic redaction (DtrN).¹³²

3. Complex redactional processes

Perhaps the final Joshua-Judges text evolved in a complex redactional process, such that a single direction of dependence between Josh 24 and Judg 2 cannot be established. In this regard, neither version of Joshua's death would

¹²⁷ See KRATZ, *Komposition*, 205. This problem can be solved if Judg 1:1 is assumed to have been inserted secondarily in order to distribute the Joshua-Judges material between two books; see BRETTNER, 'Jud 1,1–2,10', 434–435.

¹²⁸ See RAKE, *Juda*, 127.

¹²⁹ The reference to the elders might be a redactional addition (see RAKE, *Juda*, 128 n. 412), since it presupposes the later concept that the elders helped Joshua.

¹³⁰ See RAKE, *Juda*, 131–132.

¹³¹ See NOTH, *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien*, 8–9 n. 3; O'DOHERTY, 'Problem', 4–6.

¹³² See JERICKE, 'Josuas Tod', 355–357. Perhaps Josh 23 is linked to Judg 2:6, 8–9 and Josh 24:1–27 to Josh 24:28–30; see HALBE, *Privilegrecht*, 347.

be more original than the other, such that each verse must be checked separately whether it is older than the parallel verse in the other account. This theory takes seriously the possibility that both units might have evolved by different redactions.

This redactional process can be retraced by following two thematic threads: YHWH's actions in light of the difference between YHWH and other gods (Josh 24 and Judg 2:7, 10) and YHWH's actions against the backdrop of foreign nations¹³³ and the topic of the "unconquered land" (Josh 23 and Judg 2:1–5, 6).¹³⁴ In light of these different topics, several redactional models have been developed:

a) KRATZ (2000): Judg 2:8–9 belonged to the basic text, which was expanded in two steps by Judg 2:7, 10 and Judg 2:6. The section Judg 1:1–2:5 has been inserted as the beginning of a new book¹³⁵ together with Josh 24:29–33, the closure of the book of Joshua.¹³⁶ The two farewell speeches in Josh 23 and Josh 24 do not belong to two separate literary strata that have been combined at later times. Rather, Josh 23:1b, 3 are connected to Josh 24:14a, 15–16, 18b, 22, 28, with Judg 2:7–10 continuing this basic text.¹³⁷

b) BECKER (1990): Josh 24:31 is regarded as more original than Judg 2:7, since מעשה יהוה הגדול "YHWH's great work" and ראה "to see" in Judg 2:7 are intensifications and clarifications of Josh 24:31.¹³⁸ On the other hand, Judg 2:6, 8–9 might be earlier than Josh 24:28–30 due to the deliberate deletion of לרשת את הארץ "to take possession of the land", the calculated addition of the relative pronoun (Josh 24:30) and the dogmatic change of Heres to Serah (Josh 24:30).¹³⁹ Therefore, the earliest dtr edition (DtrH) had the following sequence: Josh 21:43–45 (end of conquest) + Josh 24:31 (obedience of following generation) + Judg 2:8–9 (Joshua's death and burial) + Judg 2:10 (related to ידע "to know" in Josh 24:31). The second dtr edition (DtrN) added Judg 1:21, 27–36; 2:1–7 in front of Judg 2:8–9, and an even later redactor duplicated Judg 2:6, 8–9 in Josh 24:28–30 and added Josh 24:32–33 as well as Judg 1:1–18, 22–26, with Judg 1:1 being a *caesura* signaling the beginning of the book of Judges.¹⁴⁰ Thus, only Judg 2:8–9 were

¹³³ On the topic of the foreign nations and their cult in Josh 23 see SCHMITT, *Frieden*, 148–149.

¹³⁴ See KRATZ, *Komposition*, 206.

¹³⁵ See KRATZ, *Komposition*, 205–206.

¹³⁶ According to KRATZ, 'Hexateuch', 304, Josh 24:29–33 mark the end of the book of Joshua.

¹³⁷ See KRATZ, *Komposition*, 207; IDEM, 'Hexateuch', 306. Similarly RAKE, *Juda*, 137 n. 432. SCHMID, *Erzväter*, 219–220, refers to linguistic associations between Judg 2 and Josh 24 as well.

¹³⁸ See BECKER, *Richterzeit*, 66–67.

¹³⁹ See BECKER, *Richterzeit*, 65–68.

¹⁴⁰ See BECKER, *Richterzeit*, 68–72.

created by DtrH, whereas Judg 2:6–7 were added by DtrN. Afterwards, Josh 24:28–30 were composed by a post-dtr Priestly redactor.¹⁴¹

c) RICHTER (1964): The alleged two dtr layers are reduced to only one dtr edition, which was enlarged by post-dtr additions. This dtr edition goes from Josh 24:28–30* to Judg 2:7, 10. Only later were Judg 2:6 (paralleling Josh 24:28) and Judg 2:8–9 (paralleling Josh 24:29–30) added. In this way, the death and burial notice was doubled and the assembly was dismissed. Thus, the doublet was created by inserting later additions.¹⁴² The unit Judg 2:7, 10 was expanded by the dismissal of Israel and Joshua's death notice from the earlier text Josh 24:28–30. Thus, Judg 2:7, 10 were broken apart by Judg 2:6, 8–9. At that time, the dtr v. 7 might have been added in Josh 24:31.¹⁴³

However, the verse-to-verse comparison is not without problems and leads to an incoherent text in the majority of cases.¹⁴⁴ Moreover, the division of the text into three or more redactional strata is much too complex and hypothetical. The obvious problem of such reconstructions is the lack of coherence within the particular redactional layers.¹⁴⁵

F. Conclusions

The compositional knot between the book of Joshua and Judges has yet to be convincingly untangled. The arguments used are often not decisive and can be used in several ways. Clear and definite linguistic observations are generally lacking, such that different proposals can be developed depending on how one evaluates the evidence.

At least a minimal consensus has emerged: The different sequences in Josh 24:28–31 and Judg 2:6–9 are due to their function within their respective contexts but cannot be used for determining a chronological dating. The LXX plus might not be proof of a divergent Hebrew *Vorlage*, although the relationship of the different versions might be rather complex. The toponym Timnath-Serah instead of Timnath-Heres might be the original name, though this is of little value in defining the original literary core. Moreover, it seems that most of Josh 24:28–31 preserved the original tradition due to linguistic and stylistic reasons. Instead of one or two dtr layers (DtrH and DtrN/DtrS), dtr *Fortschreibung* might be responsible for the current form of Josh 23–Judg 2.

¹⁴¹ See BECKER, *Richterzeit*, 72.

¹⁴² See RICHTER, *Bearbeitungen*, 46–49.

¹⁴³ See already OETTLI, *Deuteronomium*, 204.

¹⁴⁴ See JERICKE, 'Josuas Tod', 351–352; NENTEL, *Trägerschaft*, 104.

¹⁴⁵ See the critique by SPRONK, 'From Joshua to Samuel', 138–140.

