

Introduction

Konrad Schmid

Both redaction-critical and source-critical approaches usually accept that the Pentateuch is composed of sources.¹ But are the sources, however scholars may determine and label them, reworked in the Pentateuch limited to the literary horizon of Genesis–Deuteronomy? Or do at least some of them extend into the Former Prophets? In nineteenth- and early twentieth-century scholarship, it was not uncommon to assume that the pentateuchal sources J, E, and P extended into Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and even Kings.² For example, Carl Cornill, Karl

¹ Cf. K. SCHMID, “Has European Scholarship Abandoned the Documentary Hypothesis? Some Reminders on Its History and Remarks on Its Current Status,” in *The Pentateuch: International Perspectives on Current Research* (ed. T. B. DOZEMAN et al.; FAT 78; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 17–30.

² See C. H. CORNILL, “Ein elohistischer Bericht über die Entstehung des israelitischen Königthums in I Samuelis 1–15 aufgezeigt,” *Zeitschrift für kirchliche Wissenschaft und kirchliches Leben* 6 (1885), 113–141; IDEM, “Noch einmal Sauls Königswahl und Verwerfung,” *ZAW* 10 (1890): 96–109; IDEM, “Zur Quellenkritik der Bücher Samuelis,” *Königsberger Studien* 1 (1887), 25–89; K. BUDDÉ, *Das Buch der Richter* (KHC 7; Freiburg: Mohr, 1897), xii–xv; IDEM, *Die Bücher Richter und Samuel: Ihre Quellen und ihr Aufbau* (Gießen: Ricker, 1890), 165–166, 268–269; IDEM, *Die Bücher Samuel* (KHC 8; Tübingen: Mohr, 1902), xii–xxi; IDEM, *Geschichte der althebräischen Litteratur: Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen von Alfred Bertholet* (Leipzig: Amelangs, 1909), 57–59; I. BENZINGER, *Jahvist und Elohist in den Königsbüchern* (BWAT 2; Berlin: Kohlhammer, 1921); IDEM, *Die Bücher der Könige* (KHC 9; Freiburg: Mohr, 1899); W. STAERK, *Die Entstehung des Alten Testaments* (SG 272; Berlin, 1918), 11–16; R. SMEND, “JE in den geschichtlichen Büchern des AT,” *ZAW* 39 (1921), 181–217; G. HÖLSCHER, “Das Buch der Könige, seine Quellen und seine Redaktion,” in *Eucharistérion, Studien zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments* (ed. H. Schmidt; FRLANT 19; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1923) 158–213; IDEM, *Geschichtsschreibung in Israel: Untersuchungen zum Jahvisten und Elohisten* (Lund: Gleerup, 1952); IDEM, *Geschichte der israelitischen und jüdischen Religion* (Gießen: Töpelmann, 1922), 135, n. 1; O. EISSFELDT, *Die Quellen des Richterbuches in synoptischer Anordnung ins Deutsche übertragen samt einer in Einleitung und Noten gegebenen Begründung* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1925); IDEM, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament unter Einschluß der Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen sowie der apokryphen und pseudepigraphenartigen Qumran-Schriften: Entstehungsgeschichte des Alten Testaments* (3rd ed.; NTG; Tübingen: Mohr, 1964), 178–179, 771; C. A. SIMPSON, *Composition of the Book of Judges* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1957); see the overviews provided by HÖLSCHER, *Geschichtsschreibung*, 7–19; E. JENNI, “Zwei Jahrzehnte Forschung an den Büchern Josua bis

Budde, Immanuel Benzinger, Willy Staerk, Rudolf Smend Sr., and Cuthbert A. Simpson all reached this conclusion. J, E, and P were also clearly present at several points in the book of Joshua according to Julius Wellhausen.³ It was only with Martin Noth's 1938 commentary on Joshua that it became popular to interpret the book of Joshua (and accordingly the following books) without relying on the Documentary Hypothesis and thus no longer to seek and find J, E, and P in the book of Joshua.⁴ Together with Gerhard von Rad's study from the same year,⁵ Noth established an influential theory that the Pentateuch and Former Prophets are to be held apart in terms of their compositional history.

In current scholarship, however, the separation between the Pentateuch and the Former Prophets has started to soften up, at times even to disappear. Evidence of the problems in the Noth-von Rad separation model began to appear in the 1970s. First were the books by John Van Seters,⁶ Hans Heinrich Schmid,⁷ and Rolf Rendtorff,⁸ all from the mid-seventies, which in various ways suggested a much closer relationship between the Deuteronomistic History and the Pentateuch than the one proposed by the Noth-von Rad compromise. Van Seters and Schmid dated the Yahwist very close to the Deuteronomist and also detected theological affinities between the two.⁹ Differing somewhat

Könige," *ThR* 27 (1961), 1–32, 97–146; G. FOHRER, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (10th ed.; Heidelberg: Quelle u. Meyer, 1965), 212–257. An early critical assessment of this assumption is provided by R. KITTEL, "Die pentateuchischen Urkunden in den Büchern Richter und Samuel," *TSK* 65 (1892), 44–71. See in more detail K. SCHMID, "The Emergence and Disappearance of the Separation between the Pentateuch and the Deuteronomistic History in Biblical Studies," in *Pentateuch, Hexateuch, or Enneateuch: Identifying Literary Works in Genesis through Kings* (ed. T.B. Dozeman et al.; SBL Ancient Israel and Its Literature 8; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011), 11–24.

³ J. WELLHAUSEN, *Die Composition des Hexateuch und der historischen Bücher des Alten Testaments* (3rd ed.; Berlin: Reimer, 1899), 116–134.

⁴ M. NOTH, *Das Buch Josua* (HAT 1/7; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1938), vii–viii. Noth refers to A. ALT, "Josua," in *Werden und Wesen des Alten Testaments* (ed. P. Volz et al.; BZAW 66; Berlin: Töpelmann, 1936), 13–29, for that approach.

⁵ G. VON RAD, "Das formgeschichtliche Problem des Hexateuchs (1938)," in *Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament* (TB 8; München: Kaiser, 1958), 9–86; English translation, "The Form-Critical Problem of the Hexateuch," in *The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays* (trans. E.W. Trueman Dickens; London: SCM Press, 1984 [1st ed., 1966]), 1–78.

⁶ J. VAN SETERS, *Abraham in History and Tradition* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1975).

⁷ H.H. SCHMID, *Der sogenannte Jahwist: Beobachtungen und Fragen zur Pentateuchforschung* (Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1976).

⁸ R. RENDTORFF, *The Problem of the Process of Transmission in the Pentateuch* (trans. J.J. Scullion; JSOTSup 89; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1990); German original, *Das überlieferungsgeschichtliche Problem des Pentateuch* (BZAW 147; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1977).

⁹ To a certain extent, this was a return to Wellhausen, who had already found the Yehowist (that is, the combined JE) and the Deuteronomist to be kindred spirits (*Geistesverwandschaft*; see WELLHAUSEN, *Composition* [see n. 3], 94, n. 1).

from Van Seters and Schmid, Rendtorff argued for a compositional model of the Pentateuch similar to that for the Deuteronomistic History proposed by Martin Noth. Rendtorff theorized that there were major text blocks not only in Deuteronomy–Kings but also in Genesis–Deuteronomy that were subsequently linked together by a Deuteronomistic redaction layer. Erhard Blum provided a significant breakthrough in 1984, with his book on the composition of the ancestors' story in Gen 12–50, and again in his 1990 companion volume on Exodus–Deuteronomy.¹⁰ He extended and elaborated on Rendtorff's view that the Pentateuch is basically shaped by Deuteronomistic and Priestly composition layers. With regard to the Deuteronomistic texts in the Pentateuch, he developed the notion that they were composed within a literary horizon that overarches both the Pentateuch and the Deuteronomistic History.¹¹ The influence of Blum's position, especially in its extended version from 1990, can be seen by the fact that many English-speaking introductions on the Old Testament assume D and P layers throughout the Pentateuch.¹²

In the wake of this overarching D perspective in Genesis–Kings, it has become customary to speak either of the so-called Primary History (as opposed to the Chronicler's work as the Secondary History)¹³ or of the

¹⁰ E. BLUM, *Die Komposition der Vätergeschichte* (WMANT 57; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1984); IDEM, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch* (BZAW 189; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1990).

¹¹ BLUM, *Studien* (see n. 10), 109. See his self-correction in IDEM, "Die literarische Verbindung von Erzvätern und Exodus: Ein Gespräch mit neueren Endredaktionshypothesen," in *Abschied vom Jahwisten: Die Komposition des Hexateuch in der jüngsten Diskussion* (ed. J.C. Gertz et al.; BZAW 315; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2002), 119–156.

¹² Cf., e.g., J. BLENKINSOPP, *The Pentateuch: An Introduction to the First Five Books of the Bible* (New York: Doubleday, 2000).

¹³ E.g., D.N. FREEDMAN, "The Law and the Prophets," in *Congress Volume: Bonn, 1962* (ed. G.W. Anderson et al.; VTSup 9; Leiden: Brill, 1963), 250–265, esp. 251, 254, 257; S. MANDELL and D.N. FREEDMAN, *The Relationship between Herodotus' History and Primary History* (SFSHJ 60; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993), ix (see also 85); P.J. KISSLING, *Reliable Characters in the Primary History: Profiles of Moses, Joshua, Elijah and Elisha* (JSOTSup 224; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996); E. BEN ZVI, "Looking at the Primary (Hi)story and the Prophetic Books as Literary/Theological Units within the Frame of the Early Second Temple: Some Considerations," *SJOT* 12 (1998), 26–43 (see p. 26: "Primary Historical Narrative"); S. MANDELL, "Primary History as a Social Construct of a Privileged Class," in *Concepts of Class in Ancient Israel* (ed. M.R. Sneed; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1999), 21–35; A. ABELA, "Is Genesis the Introduction of the Primary History?," in *Studies in the Book of Genesis: Literature, Redaction and History* (ed. A. Wénin; BETL 155; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2001), 397–406; A.G. AULD, "Counting Sheep, Sins and Sour Grapes: The Primacy of the Primary History?," in *Sense and Sensitivity: Essays on Reading the Bible in Memory of Robert Carroll* (ed. A. Hunter and P.R. Davies; JSOTSup 348; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002), 63–72; D.N. FREEDMAN and B. KELLY, "Who Redacted the Primary History?," in *Sefer Moshe: The Moshe Weinfeld Jubilee Volume; Studies in the Bible and the Ancient Near East, Qumran, and Post-Biblical Judaism* (ed.

Enneateuch.¹⁴ At any rate, it is this very literary horizon that research on the Pentateuch needs to take into account as well when dealing with its alleged sources and redactions.¹⁵ There is a significant and important caesura between Deuteronomy and Joshua, but it is not an absolute one in terms of the compositional and redactional history of Genesis–Kings. The contributions in this part will therefore discuss and evaluate the question of possible extensions of literary sources within the Pentateuch into the realm of the Former Prophets.

C. Cohen et al.; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2004), 39–47; J.-W. WESSELIUS, “The Functions of Lists in Primary History,” in *“Basel und Bibel”*: *Collected Communications to the XVIIth Congress of the International Organization for the Study of the Old Testament, 2001* (ed. M. Augustin and H.M. Niemann; BEAT 51; Frankfurt: Lang, 2004), 83–89.

¹⁴ Cf., e.g., E. AURELIUS, *Zukunft jenseits des Gerichts: Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Studie zum Enneateuch* (BZAW 319; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2003); the contributions in M. WITTE et al. (eds.), *Die deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerke: Redaktions- und religionsgeschichtliche Perspektiven zur “Deuteronomismus”-Diskussion in Tora und Vorderen Propheten* (BZAW 365, Berlin: de Gruyter, 2006); H.-C. SCHMITT, *Theologie in Prophetie und Pentateuch: Gesammelte Schriften* (BZAW 310, Berlin: de Gruyter, 2001), 255–276, 277–294, 295–308, 311–325; IDEM, “Das sogenannte jahwistische Privilegrecht in Ex 34,10–28 als Komposition der spätdeuteronomistischen Endredaktion des Pentateuch,” in *Abschied vom Jahwisten: Die Komposition des Hexateuch in der jüngsten Diskussion* (ed. J.C. Gertz et al.; BZAW 315; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2002), 157–171; IDEM, “Dtn 34 als Verbindungsstück zwischen Tetrateuch und Deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerk,” in *Das Deuteronomium zwischen Pentateuch und Deuteronomistischem Geschichtswerk* (ed. E. Otto and R. Achenbach; FRLANT 206; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004), 180–192; IDEM, *Arbeitsbuch zum Alten Testament: Grundzüge der Geschichte Israels und der alttestamentlichen Schriften* (UTB 2146; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2005), 242–248; R. ACHENBACH, “Pentateuch, Hexateuch, und Enneateuch: Eine Verhältnisbestimmung,” *ZABR* 11 (2005), 122–154; T.B. DOZEMAN, “The Composition of Ex 32 within the Context of the Enneateuch,” in *Auf dem Weg zur Endgestalt von Genesis bis II Regum: Festschrift Hans-Christoph Schmitt zum 65. Geburtstag* (ed. M. Beck and U. Schorn; BZAW 370; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2006), 175–189; E. BLUM, “Pentateuch – Hexateuch – Enneateuch? Oder: Woran erkennt man ein literarisches Werk in der hebräischen Bibel?” in *Les dernières rédactions du Pentateuque, de l’Hexateuque et de l’Ennéateuque* (ed. T. Römer and K. Schmid; BETL 203; Leuven: Peeters, 2007), 67–97; C. LEVIN, *Re-Reading the Scriptures: Essays on the Literary History of the Old Testament* (FAT 87; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), 115–141.

¹⁵ Cf. K. SCHMID, “Buchtechnische und sachliche Prolegomena zur Enneateuchfrage,” in *Auf dem Weg zur Endgestalt von Genesis bis II Regum: Festschrift Hans Christoph Schmitt* (ed. M. Beck and U. Schorn; BZAW 370; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2006), 1–14.