

On Untying Tangles and Tying Knots in Joshua 23–Judges 3:6

A Response to Erhard Blum, Reinhard G. Kratz
and Sarah Schulz

Christian Frevel

Responding to three excellent papers that deal with one of the most often “solved” narrative conundrums does not make one happy at the end of the day. Although they all aim at unraveling the obvious narrative, conceptual and literary problems of the textual sequence in Josh 23–Judg 3:6, the three papers of Erhard Blum, Reinhard G. Kratz and Sarah Schulz could not be more diverse. The common ground is the acknowledgment of the crucial obstacles in the final chapters of Joshua and the first chapters of Judges that shape the book-seam on a synchronic level and at the same time call for a diachronic explanation: the various endings of the book of Joshua starting with Josh 11:23 and including the two farewell speeches of Joshua in Josh 23–24; the narratively “superfluous” repetition of Josh 24:28–31 with minor alterations in Judg 2:8–11, which becomes even more troubling by the stunning remark of Judg 1:1 between the repetitions; the repeated and disparate degrees of conclusion of the conquest in Josh 11:23; 21:43–45; 18:1 and 19:51 and the issue of the remaining unconquered land in Josh 23; Judg 1; 2:21–23 and 3:1–5; and finally the disruptive role of the scene in Bochim in Judg 2:1–5. Many minor frictions molding the transition zone, as well as a complex textual history, could be added. All this makes it one of the densest transitions between two books in the Hebrew Bible. The concept of a “book-seam” becomes blurred, since the issue also concerns the seam between literary works, which accentuates or dissolves the boundaries of the “books” concerned.

In addition to the literary problems on the textual surface and within the textual history, larger compositional theories are also tested here: the question of a Hexateuch, the existence of a Deuteronomistic History and the lines which form an Enneateuch. Although all three papers share the challenge of diachrony and are aware that almost every possible explanation has been proposed so far in the history of research, they all present more or less new solutions. Chapeaux! Part of the problem, however, is that the three solutions differ greatly from each other. They are all highly sophisticated, so that it is

advisable to study them in their own characteristic style instead of reproducing their arguments in detail here.¹ However, some remarks may ease the reading.

To begin with, they all focus on different aspects of the problem: Reinhard G. Kratz takes the possible literary junctions of the various parts of the transition area Josh 23–Judg 2 as his starting point and argues (albeit in *his* view) in favor of a most logical chain of transmission. He roughly evaluates Josh 11:23 followed by the death and burial of Joshua in Judg 2:8–9 as the oldest transition between Joshua and Judges. The repetition of this passage was necessitated by the insertion of a reflection on religious behavior in Josh 24* and Judg 2:7, 10 in a first stage and the integration of Josh 23 and Judg 2:1–6 in a second stage. The resumption was intensified by the integration of Judg 1, requiring Josh 24:29–31 as a prolepsis of Judg 2:7–9. In this respect, Kratz focuses not so much on the composition and the synchronic understanding of the passage, but all the more on a redaction-critical model for the growth of the text. On the surface of his argument, he is not concerned with the specific context (Hexateuch, Deuteronomistic History or Enneateuch), although the result cannot easily be reconciled with other hypotheses than his own.²

Much more conceptual is the argument of Erhard Blum, who consciously expands upon, clarifies and corrects his original contributions on the “compositional knot” between Joshua and Judges.³ In his paper, he mainly focuses on two points: 1) the question of whether Judg 2:6–10 can be understood as a *Wiederaufnahme* and whether this can shed light on the literary history, and 2) the role of Judg 2:1–5 and its connection to the basic layer of Josh 23. His starting point is Noth’s demonstration of an original transition between Joshua and Judges which was part of an Deuteronomistic History, but he goes beyond Noth in attributing the theme of the remaining peoples in the land after Joshua as a secondary layer in Josh 23. However, in remarkable contrast to Kratz, he considers the basic layer of Josh 23* together with Judg 2:6–10 as the starting point of the transition and as part of an exilic concept of a Deuteronomistic History. This was amended by the conception of the remaining people in Josh 23* as well as by Judg 2:20–21, 23; 3:1aa, 3. The *mal’ak* episode Judg 2:1–5 relates directly to the concept in Josh 23 on the next level of textual growth. Through the addition of Josh 24 as a unifying *hexateuchal* perspective, the former sequence in Judges was temporarily uncoupled, so that Judg 1 was included as the opening of a now separate book of Judges.

¹ For my own position, which is not presented here in detail, see FREVEL, ‘Wiederkehr’; IDEM, ‘Josua-Palimpsest’.

² See KRATZ, *Composition*, 197–200.

³ See BLUM, ‘Knoten’, 181–212; IDEM, *Textgestalt*.

While Blum and Kratz follow a supplementary and redactional approach, Sarah Schulz favors a combination of a source critical model with redaction criticism. Her approach has a broader interest in finding links between the book of Joshua and the *Enneateuch*, particularly to solve the riddle of the transition in Josh 23–Judg 3:6. Schulz argues in favor of *two originally independent* bridges between the Hexateuch and an original Samuel-Kings composition: Josh 13–21; 23; 24:28–33; Judg 1:1–2:5; 17–21 on the one hand, and Josh 11:23b; 24:1–27; Judg 2:6–16:31 on the other. The presupposition of this hypothesis is that there were parallel editions of the enneateuchal context, a suggestion which can hardly be substantiated by the available external evidence⁴ or by the internal literary evidence. The suggestion has its background in Schulz’ dissertation on Judg 17–21 and the argument that these stories are an unlikely continuation of the original savior narratives.⁵

With the paper on Joshua this new and extraordinary hypothesis is now extended to the whole transition area from Josh 11–1 Sam. However, Schulz is aware that her solution of two parallel versions does not explain the doublet in the current text. Following Schulz, the repetition of Judg 2:6–10 is due to “the extended redactional work in the first chapters of Judges, which stress the death of Joshua as a turning point in the history of Israel in both versions.”⁶ In the one version, Judg 2:7, 10 mark a historical turning point related to the lifetime of Joshua, and in the other version Josh 24:28 is said to be essential before Judg 1:1. While Josh 24:30 was redactionally transferred to Judg 2:9, Judg 2:7 was *vice versa* copied in Josh 24:31. Why this alignment took place and why in contrast the heavy tension between Judg 1:1 and Judg 2:8 was *not* balanced in the newly created *book* of Judges, is given just as little explanation as the redactors’ logic to combine the two versions in Josh 11:23. Schulz’ approach is a new and thought-provoking one when compared to the current discussion on Judges and Joshua, and it would deserve a more detailed discussion. It is based on general observations on the distinct role of Judg 17–21, which again demonstrates that “solutions” to the conundrum of the book-seam between Joshua and Judges are never free from general models on the literary history of the *Enneateuch*. This makes the evaluation of the current suggestions much more difficult.

In sum: All three papers make considerable progress, but in very different respects. Although all three share various observations on textual problems, their arguments are almost incommensurable, and all lead to different conclusions.

⁴ See part II, section 1 of this volume.

⁵ See SCHULZ, *Anhänge*, and EADEM, p. 268–270 above.

⁶ SCHULZ, p. 274 above.

A. The Analysis of Josh 23

The difference between the three approaches cannot be more obvious than in the literary analysis of Josh 23. While Kratz sees the chapter (notwithstanding the possible original introduction of the basic layer in Josh 24 in Josh 23:1–3*) as a literary unity, Blum and Schulz argue for at least two stages of growth, the basic layer of which for Schulz comprises vv. 2, 4a, 5b, 14 and, in absolute contrast to this, for Blum consists of vv. 1–3, 6, 11, 14–16a. Schulz sees a first reworking of the chapter in vv. 5a, 6, 12–13 and a second reworking focused on the first commandment in vv. 3, 7–11, 15–16. Here, the methodological underpinnings lead to different positions, which should be discussed in close proximity of the textual level. Irrespective of the question of the alleged connection to Josh 11:23a; 13:1, 6b; 14:1–19:51*, I cannot follow the suggestion that within the farewell speech of Joshua the basic layer only comprises this thin narrative thread: Israel is only summoned to conquer (v. 5b) the remaining peoples (הַגּוֹיִם הַנּוֹשְׂאֲרִים, v. 4a), and this basic layer should have been linked *originally* to the detailed chapter Judg 1 with Josh 24:28–29 as a bridge. Are there any reasons to make a hard break between v. 14b and vv. 15–16a?

In the same way, I would be reluctant to separate Josh 23:1 and 3 from a basic form of Josh 23:2, although Schulz is right in relating Josh 23:1 to Josh 21:43–45. However, in taking up Josh 11:23, Josh 21:43–45 is not the latest part of the transition zone, as is argued by Schulz. In a footnote, she sees the possibility of connecting Josh 13:1a; 23:1b and 23:3 and attributing these verses to the same layer, but she retains her redactional separation of Josh 23:1a. In my view, there is no hard rupture in vv. 4–13, not even in the deuteronomistic diction of v. 11.⁷ Verse 14a may be a non-verbatim, redactional *Wiederaufnahme* of vv. 1–3*, and if this is correct, vv. 4–14a as a whole may be part of the secondary layer. Hence, with Reinhard Müller and Uwe Becker,⁸ I see no reason to separate the reference to the first commandment in vv. 7–11 from the surrounding context, although in principle it remains *possible* to cut off v. 11 and to attribute it to the basic layer.

For me, it thus makes sense to see the basic layer in vv. 1, 2*, 3, [9, 11,] 14b–16a. Although Josh 13–21 were integrated later, Josh 13:1 relates to Josh 23*, which establishes a strong link to the book of Deuteronomy in a hexateuchal perspective. Neither the basic layer of Josh 23* nor that of Josh 24* is strongly linked conceptually or linguistically to the material presented in Judg 1–3; thus, it is plausible to see the deuteronomistic scheme in

⁷ For the analysis and my understanding of Josh 23 see FREVEL, 'Josua-Palimpsest', 59–66.

⁸ MÜLLER, *Königtum*, 233; BECKER, 'Kontextvernetzungen', 150; for discussion of Josh 23 see also RÖMER, 'Book-Endings'.

Judg 2 as a secondary stage. Following Walter Groß, the first deuteronomic layer in Judg 2:11–12*, 14–16, 18–19*; 3:7⁹ was created to link the Deut-Josh hexateuchal narrative of Joshua, which included the earlier conquest narrative, Josh 11:23b; 23:1, 2*, 3, 14b–16a, the older parts of Josh 24:1–17* and the notice of the death of Joshua in Josh 24:28, 29–31 with the earlier composition of Samuel-Kings by integrating the older savior narratives.

B. The Role of Judg 2:1–5 and the Question of Exogamy in Josh 23

While for Blum Judg 2:1–5 are a unity, Schulz questions the originality of v. 3 because of the “unnecessary introduction of speech”. Whereas v. 2 introduces a divine quote in the messenger’s speech, v. 3 adds *גַּם אִמְרַתִּי*, which is indeed striking.¹⁰ However, the content of v. 3 alludes to *מוֹקֵשׁ* in Exod 23:33 and the forbidden covenantal relations in Exod 34:12; Deut 7:16 and finally Josh 23:13. Without v. 3, the people’s reaction in v. 4b cannot be understood. The topic of the nations that were not expelled fits very well with the context. This is quite compelling within the text’s broader line of argumentation, even if v. 2 refers to Josh 9, as Blum has convincingly argued. Thus, the second quotation may indeed be read as *performative speech*, which is perhaps the reason for the emphatic *גַּם* (which is thus not an indication of a secondary insertion!).¹¹ If anything, it is the angel’s first statement that may be suspicious. The idea that the covenant will never be broken by God goes far beyond the topic of forbidden mixing in vv. 2–3 and the connection to Josh 9. In light of such a promise by God, there is no need for crying (vv. 4b, 5).

Walter Groß sees a quite *deliberate* tension in the text:

Die Weigerung JHWHs, die Einwohner des Landes vor den Israeliten zu vertreiben 3b, tritt in Spannung zu seiner Versicherung, er werde niemals seinen Bund, der seine Selbstverpflichtung, sie zu vertreiben, beinhaltet, brechen 1f. Diese Spannung teilt Ri 2,1–3 mit Jos 23: JHWH wird die übrig gebliebenen Völker vor Israel vernichten 23,5 – JHWH wird sie im Fall des Konnubiums nicht weiterhin vernichten Jos 23,12–13. Diese Spannung ist somit beabsichtigt.¹²

It is true that there is an insurmountable tension in Josh 23 (which led to the suggestion of redactional reworking above), but in my view the case in Judg 2:1 is different, since the promise is much more far-reaching and solemn:

⁹ See GROß, *Richter*, 185–189.

¹⁰ On the history of research and a proposed literary development of the passage in three stages (I: vv. 1a*ba, 2a, II: vv. 1bβ, 2b, 4b; III: vv. 3, 4a, 5) see RAKE, *Juda*, 102–124 (with the chart on p. 157).

¹¹ See GROß, *Richter*, 159, followed by Erhard Blum.

¹² GROß, *Richter*, 177.

“I will never break my covenant with you.” This can be read as a lens on the whole book of Judges with all of its cyclical ups and downs: God will never let Israel fall down, irrespective of the breach of the covenant from their side.

Another crucial issue is the rhetorical aim of the *מלאך* passage in Judg 2:1–5 and the question of forbidden alliances with the foreign nations in this text and in Josh 23. Erhard Blum takes the location of the scene in *Bochim*, or more precisely the move of the angel from Gilgal to *Bochim* (v. 1), as an indication that Josh 24:1, which is located in Shechem, was not yet present. Thus, he argues that there is a close and almost natural relationship between Judg 2:1–5 and Josh 23. Without the connection to Josh 23, Judg 2 lacks the assembly which is presupposed in Judg 2:4. At first glance this is compelling.¹³ It implicitly presumes that the assembly in Josh 23:1 takes place in Gilgal, which is not stated in the text but can be assumed in light of Josh 4:19–20; 5:10; 9:6; 10:43. Thus, it seems quite obvious that the passage in Judg 2:3 refers back to Josh 23:13. Yet how strong is the assembly and localization argument actually? If Josh 23 and Judg 2:1–5 are not on the same literary level, it is also possible that the insertion of Judg 2:1–5 links the angel to Gilgal because the assembly in Josh 24 was already dissolved. Also Judg 1:1 presupposes a combined acting of “Israel” without mentioning a deliberate assembly. So, yes, it is an argument, but no, it is not decisive for the date of Josh 24 as a whole.

More problematic in this case is the view of Kratz, who regards Josh 23 and Judg 2:1–5 as part of the same compositional level. The topic underlying the covenant parenthesis differs in both texts: In Josh 23 it is exogamy, while in Judg 2:1–5 it is the story of Josh 9. A second glance reveals the differences, which become apparent if one compares the implicit and explicit substantiations¹⁴ of Josh 23:7–8, 12–13 with Judg 2:1–5 and 3:5–6. In Judg 3:5–6, the justification for the prohibition of exogamous relations is that any covenant with foreigners leads Israel astray from YHWH. The repercussion of the breach of covenant is thus the violation of the first commandment.

The same background can be seen in Josh 23:7 (ובשם אלהיהם לא תזכירו) which has a link to the frame of the Covenant Code in Exod 23:13. In contrast to this, the prohibition against making a covenant with the inhabitants of the land in Judg 2:2 is absolute (לא תכרתו ברית ליושבי הארץ הזאת) and is followed by the commandment to tear down their altars. This is an abbreviated allusion to Exod 34:13–16; Deut 12:2–3; 7:3–5 and Num 33:51–52. The wording ברית כרית may include exogamous relationships, but they are notably not mentioned explicitly. In Josh 23:7–8, 12–13, the link between the demand for exclusivity on the one hand and the warning against exogamous marriages on the other becomes apparent through the link to v. 11 and v. 7.

¹³ In addition to Blum, see also RAKE, *Juda*, 126.

¹⁴ On this see FREVEL/CONCZOROWSKI, ‘Deepening the Water’.

Obviously, the argument forms a sophisticated ABAB-scheme. Judg 2:1–5 and the reworked level of Josh 23 do not belong to the same literary stratum (*pace* Kratz).

That Judg 2:1–5 are related to the Gibeon story in Josh 9 seems obvious: “Der Autor von Ri 2,1–5 sieht im Verhalten der Israeliten in Jos 9 einen typischen Vorgang und stilisiert ihn hoch zum grundsätzlichen Vergehen gegen JHWHs Gebot.”¹⁵ Strikingly, the forbidden marital ties are not included, and the prohibition of exogamy v. 12 was not disregarded. Only the relationship to Josh 9 indicates that the commandment of YHWH was ignored.

Within the overall argument of Josh 23–Judg 3:6, the passage in Judg 2:1–5 plays a crucial but also a special role. Be that as it may, the breach of covenant mentioned in Judg 2:1–5 cannot follow the statement of observance in Josh 24:31. Indeed, this may be another point in favor of Blum’s assumption that Josh 24:31 postdates Judg 2:1–5. However, as many studies have pointed out, there is no easy explanation for the tension between Judg 2:6–7 and Judg 2:1–5, even if one sees in Judg 2:6–10 the oldest transition layer. The tension is not solved if Judg 2:1–5 is attributed to a redactional layer that serves to connect Josh 23* and Judg 2:1–5 (Blum).

A possible explanation may be that the content of Judg 2:6–8 already existed and was copied for certain reasons to this position (see below). If this is accepted, the insertion of Judg 2:1–5 before Judg 2:11–3:6* requires an explanation. The insertion was not possible at any other place in the book of Judges but as an introductory passage and hermeneutical key to the book.

Der kurze Text Ri 2,1–5 spielt für das Richterbuch in seiner Endgestalt eine wichtige Rolle, da er mit vielen Themensträngen innerhalb und außerhalb dieses Buches vernetzt ist und so ganz am Beginn wichtige Interpretationsanweisungen für das Buch als Ganzes gibt.¹⁶

The passage introduces the basic conditions of the book of Judges: Fulfillment of God’s promise by relating the speech of the angel to Exod 23 and 32; and justification for the unconquered land by relating the passage to a covenant breach in Josh 9. Hence, to relate the passage compositionally to Josh 23 as Blum does is one, but not the only, possibility.

If our suggestion about the compositional function of Judg 2:1–5 (simultaneously disjunctive and conjunctive) is correct, it becomes clear why Judg 2:6–10 had to repeat the death of Joshua, which accentuated the epochal transition from the era of Joshua to the time of the saviors. In sum: Judg 2:1–5 is a late compositional and theological hinge that contributes to the separation of the book of Judges as a discrete unit.

¹⁵ GROB, *Richter*, 176.

¹⁶ GROB, *Richter*, 159.

C. Twice Dead: The Repetition of Judg 2:6–10

The question of a separate book of Judges leads to the most puzzling question of the repetition of Josh 24:28–31 in Judg 2:6–10. This is a crucial issue dealt with in all studies for centuries.¹⁷ However, great differences exist in regard to the methodological implications of a comparison of both passages. Schulz favors a combination of a source-critical explanation in Josh 24:28–29 || Judg 2:6, 8 and mutual influences in the other verses. She attributes the Judges version to the composition Josh 11:23b; 24:1–27; Judg 2:6–16:31, since Judg 2:7, 9 have links to the savior narratives and are thus echoed in Josh 24. In her argument, Schulz emphasizes the function of the two passages within their present context to explain why the doublet was not deleted. Kratz, in contrast, sees merits in the in-depth textual comparison between the doublets and also takes the complex textual transmission into account, but for him the priority of Judg 2:6–10 is indicated by the order of the text. However, this order may be due to the redactional process and not original. Blum is critical of an in-depth comparison,¹⁸ since the potential fallacies are too serious. In his view, all differences are due to the different positions of the doublets and their compositional function as a closure or an opening.

Although one has to admit possible fallacies and although each passage has a distinct compositional function, even the minor differences between the two versions cannot be neglected methodologically. To attribute them *only* to arbitrary stylistic variance is much too simple. This holds particularly true because the other arguments are often dependent on larger models and cannot decide the issue. Yes, it is true that some of the differences point to the priority of Judg 2 and others to Josh 24. But this does not make the comparison a futile exercise. In my view, it is the tendency of the sum of observations, which has to be taken seriously into account. I will not go into too much detail here, but point to few crucial aspects:

a) The comparison of Josh 24:31 and Judg 2:7 reveals four significant differences: 1) the variation of the subject ישראל vs. העם, 2) the syndesis vs. asyndesis of the second relative clause, 3) the variation of רא"ה vs. יד"ע (*vice versa* in LXX) and 4) the additional הגדול. To bring these differences to an argument, one has to compare both verses with Deut 11:7:

¹⁷ While for instance Rudolf Smend, Hartmut Rösel and Ernst Axel Knauf favor the priority of Josh 24:28–31, Martin Noth, Detlef Jericke, Thomas Römer and Walter Groß take the other direction. See FREVEL, 'Wiederkehr', 37–40.

¹⁸ See BLUM, 'Knoten', 184; see also RÖMER, 'Ende', 534; IDEM, *The So-Called Deuteronomistic History*, 118; IDEM, 'Book-Endings', 94–95.

Josh 24:31	Deut 11:7	Judg 2:7
ויעבד ישראל את יהוה כל ימי יהושע וכל ימי הזקנים אשר האריכו ימים אחרי יהושע ואשר ידעו את כל מעשה יהוה אשר עשה לישראל:	כי עיניכם הראת את כל מעשה יהוה הגדל אשר עשה	ויעבדו העם את יהוה כל ימי יהושע וכל ימי הזקנים אשר האריכו ימים אחרי יהושע אשר ראו את כל מעשה יהוה הגדול אשר עשה לישראל:

Judg 2:7 is obviously closer to Deut 11:7 than Josh 24:31 is to Deut 11:7. Usually Josh 24 is said to have stronger links into the Pentateuch than Judg 2. Is it thus compelling to assume that the links were reduced in Josh 24:31 instead of increased in Judg 2:7? It is much more likely that Judg 2:7 was adjusted in the process. In addition, the generational scheme fits much better in Joshua 24, which may also give evidence of the original context of this verse. The use of ראה in Judg 2:7 is taken as an argument for the original connection between Josh 23:3. This argument, however, is blurred by the LXX, which has ὄσοι ἔγνωνσαν in Judg 2:7 and ὄσοι εἰδοσαν in Josh 24:31 (Josh 24:29 LXX). Yet even if one assumes that ראה is original in Judg 2:7, the reason for this seems to be the relationship to Deut 11:7 (see above). It is striking that all other comparable instances introduced by אשר ראה combine ראה with עינים (even Deut 11:7). The wording of Judg 2:7 is slightly altered due to alignment rather than being original.

b) The reference to the זקנים in Judg 2:7 is odd, since the elders do not play any role in the book of Judges or in Josh 23. Mentioning the elders makes sense with regard to זקני ישראל in Josh 24:1. If Judg 2:6 originally connected to Josh 23, the use of עם (which differs from Josh 24:31) would be quite strange, since עם does not appear at all in Josh 23. In contrast, עם is used in Josh 24:2, 16, 19, 21, 22, 24, 25, 27. One may downplay this difference, but in my view it makes more sense that עם was used in Judg 2 in light of the use of עם in Josh 24. Again, one could argue that this alignment was made later. In any case, the connection of Judg 2:7 to Josh 23 is not so “evident” as is often argued. In contrast, nothing in Josh 24:29–31 stands against an original connection with Josh 24 in the present context.

c) Compared to Judg 2:6, the phrase לרשת את הארץ is missing in Josh 24:28, which is difficult to explain. If Judg 2:6 was the original continuation of Josh 11:23, as is often assumed, this phrase produces a tension. Only a connection to Josh 23:5 makes sense, but Josh 23 is not part of the earliest transition (see above). However, even if one assumes that Judg 2:6 was the original continuation of Josh 11:23, the phrase is odd here. There is no immediate conquest of the unconquered land *after* Judg 2:10 to match Josh 23:5, so “to conquer the land” is more or less a placeholder in the text. Only Judg 3:13 (Eglon conquers the התמרים); Judg 11:21–22 (taking possession of all the territory of the Amorites) and Judg 18:9 speak of a future process of occupa-

tion. All of these cases are temporally far removed from the death of Joshua. In contrast, in Judg 1:1–31 *יִרְשׁוּ* is used 12 times as a keyword (Judg 1:19*bis*, 20, 21, 27, 28*bis*, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33). Hence, the phrase in Judg 2:6 makes more sense if it is read as an analepsis. At least Judg 2:6 presupposes Judg 1:1–31. Of course, one can also interpret the phrase in Judg 2:6 as a later alignment, so this case is not decisive. However, if one argues that Judg 2:6 can only link to Josh 23:16 (which does not hold water in my view), one has to struggle with the aforementioned problem. Another obstacle in Judg 2:6 is that *נָחֳלָה* does not play any role in Judges (apart from the late additions in 18:1; 20:6; 21:23–24). Rather, it fits much better as a back-reference to Josh 11:23; 19:49 etc. and as a *closure* to the book of Joshua than into the reference system of Judges.

d) Let me finally mention a quite sophisticated case, which is insignificant at first sight. It is the specification of the burial place of Joshua in the hill country of Ephraim. The place is named *תְּמַנַּת חֶרֶס* in Judg 2:9 and *תְּמַנַּת סָרַח* in Josh 24:30 (cf. Josh 19:50), but this is not decisive. The localization is introduced with a relative particle in Josh 24:30 (*אֲשֶׁר בְּהַר אֶפְרַיִם*), which is lacking in Judg 2:9. Strikingly, no other reference to the hills of Ephraim uses the relative particle (Josh 19:50; 20:7; 21:21; Judg 4:5; 10:1 and *passim*). Even the reconstructed LXX *Vorlage* does not have it;¹⁹ thus, it may be asked when it came into the text of Josh 24:30. It is indeed difficult to explain against the background of the other passages. Be that as it may, it cannot be deduced from Judg 2:9, while it is quite conceivable that Judg 2:9 and the LXX aligned the phrase to the normal usage.

In sum, none of these arguments can decide the issue alone, and the various textual phenomena can be explained in multiple ways. And it is true that the significant differences have to be explained against the background of the contextual function of the two passages. However, on the whole, the evidence does not rule out the priority of Josh 24:28–31. Be that as it may, the doublet must have something to do with the separation of the two books. Erhard Blum is correct in emphasizing that there are no grammatical or syntactic grounds for understanding the verbs in Judg 2:6–9 in a pluperfect sense. Reading pluperfect would require a different syntax with inverted word order (*w^e-x-qatal*: *וַיְהִי־שָׁעַ מָת*). The juxtaposition of two notices of the death of a protagonist in a narrative tense does not make sense in one literary work; it disturbs the narrative coherence. The separating function of the repetition cannot be overemphasized. On the one hand, the repetition of Judg 2:6–10 separates the book of Judges from the book of Joshua; on the other hand, it creates a link to the book of Joshua by the almost verbatim wording.

This dialectic phenomenon makes sense if the repetition is understood as redactionally resumptive. In his argument, Blum emphasizes the fact that

¹⁹ See part II, section 1 of this volume.

irrespective of the demarcation in Josh 24:28–31, the repetition of these verses in Judg 2:6–10 *cannot* be understood as a resumptive repetition (*Wiederaufnahme*). By this he defines this phenomenon as “a stylistic device by which primary authors/narrators or later redactors/*Bearbeiter* can design complex constellations of plot and/or discourse sequence in the linear presentation of texts”. He understands resumptive repetition from a narratological perspective and assumes that it always aims at shaping “a complex narrative coherence”. Because the continuation of the narrative is distorted in Judg 2:6, the passage “was not intended to function as resumptive repetition”. The only possibility for Blum is that this repetition “can only be the *accidental* by-product of some literary-historical process”. He thus understands Judg 2:6, 10 as “a textual *fragment*, enclosed within the final text of Judges”.²⁰

However, while the narratological function of a *Wiederaufnahme* is one thing, the diachronic argument is another. Irrespective of its narrative function, a resumptive repetition can at least in some cases formally be defined as a *redactional technique*: An expansion is inserted into an existing text by repeating the phrase before the insertion. An easy definition is given by Bernhard Lang: “Into a text AB an expansion X is inserted according to the pattern AXAB.”²¹ Various variations have been described so far. For instance, the position of the insertion says nothing about the literary priority of the preceding or the following element, even if the repetition is often secondary. Sometimes more than one element is repeated by framing the insertion with formulae etc.²² Although many resumptive repetitions have a rhetorical function and may establish a complex narrative coherence, this is by no means always the case.

With regard to biblical literature, one should not pit the narrative technique against the redactional technique as Blum does. Judg 2:6–10 does not make sense as a resumptive repetition in a narrative respect but does in redactional respect, and that makes a difference. The passage placed between the repetitions is secondary to the repetition; it goes beyond the context and establishes a *new context*. This is precisely the function of Judg 1:1–2:5. However, Judg 1 and Judg 2:1–5 do not belong to the same compositional level but do have the same function: to open a new context. It is possible to explain this redactionally *or* narratologically *or* even both. If the narrative is the focus, the death of Joshua becomes a flashback even if it is grammatically *not* expressed in the pluperfect. Judg 1:1 forces the reader to understand the text in this way. With the death of Joshua the “new start” is irrevocably emphasized.

Der Zweck der Wiederholung (kann) darin bestehen, mit dem Bericht von Josuas Tod die Ausgangssituation der beginnenden Richterzeit ins Gedächtnis der Leser und Hörer des dtr.

²⁰ All quotes from BLUM, pp. 223–224 above.

²¹ LANG, ‘Method’, 43; for further literature see SKA, *Introduction*, 77–78.

²² See WONNEBERGER, *Redaktion*, 117–123.

Richterbuchs zurückzurufen. Eine *Erinnerung* an Josuas Tod, die nicht als Rückblick gekennzeichnet ist, erscheint vor allem dann als sinnvoll, wenn Josuas Tod nicht schon einmal im unmittelbar vorausgehenden Kontext geschildert wird. Dies ist – unter der Voraussetzung, dass Ri 1,1-2,5 jünger als DtrR sind – wiederum dann der Fall, wenn beide Texte auf verschiedenen Schriftrollen gestanden haben.²³

It is probably true that Judg 1:1 was not inserted at the same time that the repetition of Josh 24:28–31 in Judg 2:6–10 came into being. Without Judg 1:1, Judg 2:6–10 can only be understood as a resumptive repetition, or it cannot be understood. And this points strongly to a diachronic explanation in which the text *between* (in whichever extent) was inserted. Read literally, the repeated death is implausible for the reader, who will thus naturally disconnect the two “books” – or better: literary contexts – in the reading process.

D. The Role of Judg 1:1 in the Process of Separation

Sometimes one gets the impression that the doublet of Joshua’s death and the question of literary dependency make exegetes lose sight of the surrounding issues. The opening verse of Judg 1:1 does not play a further role in the argument. It is only the insurmountable tension between Judg 1:1 and Judg 2:8 which is considered. It is not possible that Judg 2:8 was modeled on Judg 1:1.²⁴ As we already noted above, the repetition of Judg 2:6–10 (together with Judg 2:1–5) forces the reader to regard the text that follows as belonging to its own separate context. This was intensified by putting Judg 1 before Judg 2:1–5. However, there is one possibility that has not been thoroughly discussed so far. Usually Judg 1:1a α is seen in connection with the insertion of Judg 1:1a β –36. This makes much sense, but it is also possible that Judg 1:1a α (וַיְהִי אַחֲרֵי מוֹת יְהוֹשֻׁעַ) was originally followed by וַיַּעַל מִלְאֲךָ יְהוָה מִן הַגִּלְגָּל in Judg 2:1a and that this redactional connection was broken apart by the insertion of Judg 1:1a β –36*.

The role of Judg 1:1a β –36 should receive more attention in the discussion. The text cannot simply be read as a continuation of the concept of unconquered land in Josh 23. Within the transition from Joshua to Judges, the report of the unconquered land (“Negatives Besitzverzeichnis”, Albrecht Alt)²⁵ has an important function: 1) It is presumed that the land is still unconquered, 2) only Judah initiates the conquest and only Judah takes land into possession, 3) the divination links loosely to Num 27:21 but at the same time separates Judg 1 from the former conquest, 4) Reuben and Gad are not mentioned, so that perhaps only the book of Joshua is superseded. The setting is

²³ FOCKEN, *Landnahme*, 70.

²⁴ Pace RAKE, *Juda*, 126–128.

²⁵ On the history of this term see RAKE, *Juda*, 21–24.

totally different compared to Josh 23–24. Neither the worship of YHWH (Josh 24; Judg 2:6–10, 11–19) nor the peril of the religion(s) of the foreign nations (Josh 23; Judg 2:1–5; 2:20–3:6) plays any role. Judg 1 is an exposition on its own, and it is highly unlikely that it would have been read as a continuation of the book of Joshua, although – as Ernst Axel Knauf has rightly pointed out – the authors knew the book of Joshua very well. The literary horizon of Judg 1 is the *book* of Judges:

Das Kapitel bringt den Widerspruch zwischen Josua und Richter auf den Punkt: Die in Jos wiederholt gefeierte ‘Eroberung des ganzen Landes’ wird nun als überaus unvollständig dargestellt, um den Verhältnissen in Ri 3–19 gerecht zu werden. ... Die Landverteilung Jos 13–21* wird vorausgesetzt, die Eroberung Jos 1–12 stillschweigend durch eine ‘Inbesitznahme’ Ri 1 mehr ersetzt als ergänzt.²⁶

With Judg 1:1aβ–36, the separation of the two books *is already complete*.

Be that as it may, Judg 1:1aα is designed as the beginning of a scroll. The parallel with Josh 1:1 is striking and most probably deliberate. Through this similar phrase (which is attested further only in 2 Sam 1:1 and Gen 25:11), the books of Joshua and Judges are paralleled and indicated as separate units. As in the transition from Deuteronomy to Joshua, the death of the protagonist which was narrated in the final chapter with similar wording is introduced as past and as a new beginning:

Deut 34:5–7aα; Josh 1:1aα	Josh 24:29aβ–30; Judg 1:1aα
וַיִּמָּט מֹשֶׁה עַבְדַּי יְהוָה בְּאֶרֶץ מִדְבָּר עַל פִּי יְהוָה:	וַיִּמָּט יְהוֹשֻׁעַ בֶּן נֹון עַבְדַּי יְהוָה בְּיַמֵּי יְהוֹשֻׁעַ שְׁנַיִם:
וַיִּקְבְּרוּ אֹתוֹ בְּגֹבֹל נַחֲלָתוֹ בְּתִמְנַת־סֶרֶחַ אֲשֶׁר יָדַע אִישׁ אֶת קִבְרָתוֹ עַד הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה: וּמֹשֶׁה בְּיַמֵּי יְהוֹשֻׁעַ שָׁנָה	וַיִּקְבְּרוּ אֹתוֹ בְּגֹבֹל נַחֲלָתוֹ בְּתִמְנַת־סֶרֶחַ אֲשֶׁר בְּהַר־אֶפְרַיִם מִצְפּוֹן לְהַר־גֵּזַע:
וַיְהִי אַחֲרַי מוֹת מֹשֶׁה עַבְדַּי יְהוָה	וַיְהִי אַחֲרַי מוֹת יְהוֹשֻׁעַ

Obviously the two beginnings (or better: the two transitional divisions) were deliberately paralleled, and the reader is prompted to compare them. This may be the only reason why the redactor accepted the harsh tension between Judg 1:1aα and Judg 2:8. On a synchronic level, the reader *now* can only take the account of Judg 2:6–10 as a flashback or *analepsis*.

E. Conclusion

Investigating the book-seam between Joshua and Judges reveals more problems than solutions, even if several opinions are taken together. Methodologically, it is necessary to differentiate between the synchronic and diachronic level, the narrative aspect and the reconstruction of textual growth. The con-

²⁶ KNAUF, *Richter*, 41.

sensus regarding the latter is less than that regarding the former. There is considerable consensus that the transition between these two books mirrors literary growth and that the separation between the two books has been intensified during the process of redaction. The textual transition zone evinces a dense textual network in which the textual relations are neither linear nor unambiguous. The textual relations comprise at least the whole Enneateuch, which compounds the difficulties. However, on the surface level of the text, the function of Josh 23–24 as a conclusion and the function of Judg 1:1–3:6 as an exposition is obvious.

The consensus ends in the detailed reconstruction of the literary growth of the text. However, there is a consensus that the death of Joshua in whichever version can be reckoned as part of the oldest conclusion. It was striking that the same observations led to totally different reconstructions. Here, as in other areas of diachronic discussion, the understanding of coherence, textual relations, compositions, literary works etc. are disputed. In particular, the issue of a persistent Hexateuch ending with Josh 24 and alternatively the existence of a separate composition consisting of Deuteronomy-Joshua (DtrL) or the Deuteronomistic History comprising the books of Deuteronomy-Kings informs the different solutions. This is not the end of the world, but has to be discussed with the highest possible transparency.

Based on a complex argument developed in several papers, my own position goes beyond the classic Deuteronomistic History of Martin Noth. I rather see clusters in Sam-Kings and Deut-Josh which were perhaps at some point linked by parts of the book of Judges. I agree upon links between the material in Joshua and Judges, but these links were neither the first nor the final level of literary growth. The basic layer in Josh 23:1, 2*, 3, 14b–16a was originally not part of a larger history from Deut 1–2 Kgs 25, but rather a second step which intensified the closure of the book of Joshua. The earliest conclusion was formed by Josh 11:23 together with Josh 24:28–31*. This suggestion includes a foregoing pre-Priestly assembly comprising parts of Josh 24 (particularly the alternative between YHWH and the other gods) that have been overwritten by later literary strata. This assumption is often criticized but remains a possible solution within the dense literary transition. Judges 2:1–5; 2:6–10; Josh 23:4–14a; and Judg 1:1a β –36* were added in a sequenced process with some mutual influences. The separation between Joshua and Judges was sealed by the repetition of Josh 2:6–10 and was finally executed by the scroll-separating introduction in Judg 1:1a α . Whether Judg 1:1a α was written before or after Judg 1:1a β –36* cannot be decided with certainty.