

# Joshua 24 and the So-Called Hexateuch Redaction: A Reassessment

**Johan Wildenboer**

University of Pretoria, South Africa

johan.wildenboer@gmail.com

## Abstract

Joshua 24 is generally assumed to be the concluding chapter of a Hexateuch. Several texts in Genesis and Exodus are indeed taken up in Joshua 24. In recent times, these texts have generally been assigned to a post-Priestly layer of redaction. In this essay, I argue that the direction of influence runs from Joshua 24 to the books of Genesis and Exodus, instead of linearly from Genesis-Exodus to Joshua. I propose that Genesis 34 and 35:1–4 reacts to the assumed pro-Samaritan viewpoint of Joshua 24. Furthermore, I postulate that Genesis 33:18–20, 50:24–26, and Exodus 13:19 aim to explain the unique traditions in Joshua 24. This emphasises the theological importance of Joshua 24 in the debate surrounding the Samaritan identity in post-exilic times, while reassessing the literary question surrounding a Hexateuch redaction.

**Keywords:** Samaritans; post-Priestly Pentateuch; Hexateuch redaction; Shechem

## Introduction

The concept of a Hexateuch was once intertwined with the hypothesis of Source Criticism. It became natural to envision that the proposed Pentateuchal sources stretch into the books of Joshua (in some cases even into the books of Judges or 1 and 2 Samuel). Von Rad (1984, 1–78) took this proposal further with his hypothesis of an old Hexateuch. This means that the sources once reached to the book of Joshua, but it was no longer noticeable, because it was supplanted by the so-called Deuteronomistic History. Von Rad made this assumption on the basis of Martin Noth's *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien* (1943), which suggested that the books of Deuteronomy to 2 Kings constitute a separate literary work as the preceding Tetrteuch. Noth's hypothesis had such a big influence on Old Testament studies that the concept of a Hexateuch waned in the onslaught of the so-called Deuteronomistic History.



Today, in the wake of the decline of the hypothesis of a Deuteronomistic History, we experience a return of the Hexateuch model. Today, the concept of a Hexateuch is widely described as a post-Priestly Hexateuch. This essay aims to engage in this debate, as it focuses on the relation between texts in Genesis-Exodus and Joshua 24. The hypothesis of a pre-Priestly Hexateuch, as well as that of the post-Priestly Hexateuch, implies a linear movement from the books of Genesis and Exodus to the book of Joshua. Put differently, it assumes that Joshua 24 instituted traditions from the books of Genesis and Exodus, or that Joshua 24 belongs to the same redactional layer as these Pentateuchal texts (Römer and Brettler 2000, 410–411; Blum 2006, 98). In this essay I propose that the references to Joshua in the books of Genesis and Exodus were composed in reaction to Joshua 24, and that these traditions found their point of departure in Joshua 24. The purpose of this essay is to stimulate discussion regarding the concept of a Hexateuch redaction. This is not meant as an attack on the notion of a Hexateuch redaction in general. Rather, it is a humble attempt to show that the same arguments that constitute the need for a common redactional layer could in fact be used to prove the opposite, namely that the direction of dependence flows from Joshua 24 to the texts in the books of Genesis and Exodus.

I also draw attention to texts that react theologically to Joshua 24 (Gen 34, 35:1–4) as well as texts that were composed to explain traditions in Joshua 24.

This thesis is based on the assumption that Joshua 24 exhibits a pro-Samaritan position, and that Genesis 34 and 35:1–4 reacts against this position. I discuss these texts in reaction to Joshua 24. I will spend some time discussing the theological positions of Genesis 34 and 35:1–4 in relation to Joshua 24, especially in the case of Genesis 34 as this thesis requires an indirect link between Genesis 34 and Joshua 24. Furthermore, this hypothesis also requires a reassessment of the composition and interpretation of Genesis 34.

## **Theological reactions to Joshua 24**

### **Genesis 34**

#### *Introduction*

The ambiguous literary character of the chapter presents the exegete with many difficulties.<sup>1</sup> The text contains a number of doublets: the request for Dinah (v. 8: Hamor, v. 11: Shechem); the agreement to the conditions set by Jacob's sons (v. 18: Hamor, v. 19: Shechem); and the details of the attack (vv. 25–26: Simeon and Levi, vv. 27–29: all the sons of Jacob). Apart from these apparent doublets, there are also many grammatical inconsistencies. Westermann (1985, 535) points to the fact that the suffixes do not match in some cases, while he considers the style of verses 4–8 to be clumsy and uneven. For

---

1 Volz (1933, 124) describes Gen 34 as possibly the most difficult text in the Hexateuch.

instance, the locale suddenly changes from one verse to the other. Apart from these literary issues, the place of Genesis 34 in the broader narrative of the book of Genesis is also under discussion.<sup>2</sup> These inconsistencies naturally provide an opportunity for proponents of Source Criticism, on the one hand, and supporters of a supplementary hypothesis on the other hand, to propose solutions to these problems.

The documentary solution aims to explain the composition of the text in terms of two or more sources that were blended together by a redactor.<sup>3</sup> Most adherents to this solution propose two sources in Genesis 34, generally described as the Shechem and Hamor sources respectively. Most scholars agree that the Shechem source constitutes the older of two sources. These two originally independent sources tell the story from different perspectives. So, for instance, in the Shechem source the character of Shechem rapes Dinah, while in the Hamor source he only covets Dinah and doesn't engage in sexual relations at all.<sup>4</sup>

Scholars differ in their efforts to align the sources to the various Pentateuchal sources. The Shechem source is generally ascribed to the Jahwist (J),<sup>5</sup> while the Hamor source is assigned to either the Priestly source (P)<sup>6</sup> or the Elohist (E).<sup>7</sup> Westermann (1985, 545) does not identify either source with Pentateuchal sources. Von Rad (1972, 330) identifies the Shechem narrative with J, but leaves the Hamor source undetermined. Wellhausen (1988, 47) assigns the sources to an unknown redactor, in the same manner as Genesis 14. On the other side of the spectrum, some scholars (Speiser 1964, 267; Wenham 1994, 310) attribute only one source (J) to the narrative.<sup>8</sup>

---

2 Mihăilă (2012, 37) describes the chapter as “isolated and eccentric”, while Westermann (1995, 537) concludes that the chapter does not belong to the sequence of events portrayed in the surrounding narrative. Blum (2012, 192) notes that Gen 35:1–7 builds on Gen 34, but he considers Gen 35:1–7 as part of a broader context which includes Joshua 24. Na’aman (2000, 141–60) tentatively traces Genesis 34 and 35:1–5 to the same hand. The relationship of the two chapters will play an important role in this study.

3 Gunkel (1964), Von Rad (1972, 330), Skinner (1930, 418), and Westermann (1985, 536).

4 Driver (1904, 303) and Westermann (1985, 536–8) postulate that verse 2b does not belong to the Hamor source, but rather to the Shechem source. This source tells the story of the revenge of two brothers for the outrage committed against their sister. The Hamor source, on the other hand, tells the story of a peaceful migration or settlement. The third source is based on Deuteronomy 7:1–5 which condemns intermarriage. On the other hand, Gunkel (1964, 358) does include verse 2b in the Hamor source, and therefore Shechem did rape Dinah according to this source. This illustrates the fact that the proponents of source criticism are in no way unanimous in their assignment of the sources.

5 Gunkel (1964, 374). Skinner (1930, 418) does not assign it to J, but he notes that it originated in Yahwist circles.

6 Driver (1904, 302–3); Procksch (1924, 542–9).

7 Skinner (1930, 418) refrains from assigning it to E, but he proposes that it originated in Elohist circles.

8 Levin (2003, 49–59) considers a post-P narrative.

As the influence of Source Criticism wanes,<sup>9</sup> more scholars opt for the supplementary model. Noth (1948, 31) proposes that an original J source was expanded by several successive additions (vv. 4, 6, 8–10, 15–17, 20–23, 27), as well as the additions which refer to Hamor (13a, 18, 24, 26). Noth was followed by du Pury (1969, 5–49), Kevers (1980, 38–86), Vawter (1977), Blum (1984:210–23), and Zakovitch (1985:175–96), who also subscribe to the supplementary hypothesis. Zakovitch’s hypothesis assumes that the original story was expanded by very few additions (2b, 5, 7b, 13b, 17, and fragments of 25–26, 27, and 30–31). This approach is rather controversial, as it eliminates the rape from the original narrative. According to Zakovitch, the element of rape was added later in order to justify the murder committed by Dinah’s brothers. He also suggests that the narrative was expanded to assimilate with the story of the rape of Tamar (2 Sam 13) and the cursing of the sons by Jacob (Gen 47:5–7). Recent studies have shown a tendency to expand the older literary solutions into a more balanced solution which embraced the literary character as well as the sociological aspects of the text. We will turn to two examples, which also support the broader thesis of this essay.

#### *Recent approaches to Genesis 34*

Rofé (2005, 369–75) proposes a solution that puts the narrative thread of Shechem in the context of a post-exilic commentary on mixed marriages, with specific allusion to the relationship between Judeans and Samaritans.<sup>10</sup> This narrative supplants the earlier clan narrative where Hamor plays an important role.<sup>11</sup> According to Rofé (2005, 371), Genesis 34 is not about sexual defilement at all, but rather about the impurity of the

---

9 In a detailed study of Gen 34, Robin Parry (2000, 121–38) carefully dismantles the arguments in favour of Source hypothesis as an approach to Gen 34. While proponents of source criticism argue that vv. 14 and 15–17 belong to different sources, Parry postulates that vv. 15–17 need verse 14 to make sense. He also refutes the claim that vv. 25–26 and vv. 27–29, which form an integral part of the source hypothesis in Gen 34, belong to different sources. According to Parry’s study, these verses form an integral part of the literary character of Gen 34. This approach leads to the concept of a text that has been reworked and revised.

10 There is a relevant discussion regarding the terms “Samaritans” and “Samaritans”. According to Pummer (2012, 3–4) not all Samaritans were Samaritans. This preconceived notion is based on a misreading of 2 Kgs 17, as well as the readings of Josephus, who, according to Pummer (2010, 3), projected his animosity toward the Samaritans during the Roman period in the distant past. Kartveit (2009, 10) avoids the trend of distinguishing between Samaritans and Samaritans by noting that the erection of the temple on mount Gerizim constitutes as the birth of the Samaritans. Furthermore, he calls the distinction between “Samaritans” and “Samaritans” irrelevant, because it is “based on modern, and therefore anachronistic, criteria. Schorch (2013, 135–6) aptly describes how Samaritans became Samaritans once the temple on mount Gerizim was erected and a distinctive version of the Torah has been accepted. In this essay, I will use the term Samaritans as reference to the group who build the temple on Mount Gerizim and saw themselves as the true keepers of the Law.

11 Rofé builds his argument on the work of Kuenen (1894, 255–76) who identifies two layers or phases in the text. Kuenen suggests that the earlier clan narrative was supplanted by a post-exilic narrative which added the element of defilement to the narrative. Rofé expands this argument with his study on Biblical Law regarding mixed marriage. This leads to a fresh and creative approach to Gen 34.

nations. Rofé builds this argument on the fact that sexual defilements of virgins were not considered to be a capital offence according to biblical law. According to Deuteronomy 22:28–29, the man who commits the act of violence should marry the girl and pay the *mohar*.<sup>12</sup> The text states three times that Shechem defiled (טָנַף) Dinah (v. 5, v. 13, v. 27). The punishment on Shechem undergirds the gravity of the situation, which clearly contravenes biblical law on this matter. Rofé explains this inconsistency by interpreting the defilement of Dinah in a broader sociological context, namely the post-exilic question of intermarriage between Jews and Gentiles, and, by definition, the relationship between Judeans and Samaritans. Because Rofé is convinced that the notion of the defilement of Dinah did not originate in biblical law, he attempts to seek its origin in another sphere. Rofé then turns to the idea of the “impurity of the nations of the land” (Ezra 6:21) as the origin of Genesis 34. Furthermore, Rofé suggests that the violence shown by Jacob’s sons toward Shechem symbolises the anger of post-exilic Judea toward the Samaritans. Of course, the Samaritans covet Dinah only to use her.

Rofé (2005, 374) also proposes that Shechem should be regarded as a hidden allusion to the Shechemites in the writer’s time. Therefore, he views the second narrative as a reference to the Samaritans, who courted Dinah (the Law) for impure reasons.

Mihăilă (2012, 31–50) takes Rofé’s suggestion even further by approaching Genesis 34 from a sociological, archaeological, and literary angle. First, he aligns himself with scholars who discard Source Criticism as an approach to Genesis 34. Nevertheless, he leaves room for the possibility of later additions to the base narrative (Mihăilă 2012, 32).<sup>13</sup> Second, he proposes a post-exilic date for the narrative.<sup>14</sup> He takes Rofé’s suggestion of an anti-Samaritan narrative even further by expanding the proposal. According to Mihăilă, the narrative of Genesis 34 should be approached as symbolic.<sup>15</sup> The name Dinah refers to the judgement, or law (דִּינָה). Shechem is personified in the narrative, and therefore the person of Shechem in Genesis 34 refers specifically to the

---

12 Biblical law, however, differentiates between the rape of a virgin and the rape of a married or engaged woman. In the latter case, rape is indeed deemed a capital offence (Deut 22:22, 27; Lev 20:10; Hos 4:14; Prov 6:24–35).

13 For this reason, Mihăilă tentatively uses the term “author”.

14 The hypothesis of a post-exilic date for Gen 34 is built on grammatical and literary considerations. Kuenen (1880, 269–70) notes the influence of the Priestly document (P) on Gen 34, while Rofé stresses the fact that Gen 34 contains a blend of Priestly and Deuteronomistic language, which is indicative of post-exilic literature. Rofé also notes some words and expressions that correspond to Late Biblical Hebrew. He corroborates this with specific reference to the Dead Sea scrolls and rabbinical literature.

15 Mihăilă (2012, 37) notes a link between Gen 34 and the book of Ruth. He points to the fact that the names of the characters in the book of Ruth (which he dates to 5th century B.C.E., like Gen 34) are all symbolic. It is worth mentioning that the issue at hand is also the same, as the book of Ruth comments on intermarriage in the post-exilic period. According to Rofé (1990, 27–39; 1988, 89–104), this issue became a dominant theme in post-exilic times.

temple on Mount Gerezim in a metaphorical way.<sup>16</sup> The rape of Dinah becomes a symbolic act of the raping of justice (hence the title of his essay). In the context of symbolic reading, the narrative reacts against the Samaritans, who claim to love the Law (and therefore the temple in Jerusalem), but rape it for their own perverse needs.

What makes Mihăilă's study even more important is the fact that he discerns several voices in the text. These voices take different positions toward the issue at hand. This helps Mihăilă to explain several inconsistencies in the text, without having to resort to intricate literary reasons. He notes, for instance, the voice of the author, as well as those of Jacob, Simeon, and Levi respectively. He postulates different Priestly groups behind these voices. In short, both Rofé and Mihăilă propose a post-exilic date for Genesis 34. Furthermore, they both interpret the narrative of Genesis 34 as a reaction to the Samaritan question or, as Rofé explains, the issue of intermarriage with other nations. They differ with regard to the literary composition of the text. While Rofé regards the later narrative as an anti-Samaritan text, Mihăilă discerns different voices, and therefore different reactions to the Samaritan question. The role of Shechem forms an integral part of any hypothesis. According to Rofé, Shechem's intentions were impure and erroneous.

Instead of focussing on multiple sources of narratives, Mihăilă aims to explain the inconsistencies in Gen 34 by discerning different voices in the text. According to this hypothesis, these voices, which represent different interested parties in post-exilic Judea, adopt different views on the Samaritan question. The actions of Simeon and Levi correspond to the extremist view of some Priestly groups who felt that the Samaritans' love for the temple in Jerusalem was a veiled attempt to "rape the justice", or to loot and destroy the temple. Jacob's notable silence<sup>17</sup> is to be interpreted as a neutral stance toward the issue, while the author also represents a neutral or a more balanced stance toward the issue at hand. Mihăilă also notes some ambiguity with regard to the respective roles of Shechem and Dinah in the narrative. Shechem, the alleged perpetrator of this crime, is shown to have developed a true love for Dinah,<sup>18</sup> while Dinah is not necessarily portrayed as a victim.<sup>19</sup> In fact, as Mihăilă points out, several

---

16 Mihăilă also interprets the theme of circumcision in Genesis 34 in a metaphorical context. On one hand, it represents a necessary law for including aliens into the community. On the other hand, it represents a path of death for the excluded. Mihăilă also notes that the surgery does not make the body so weak that after three days the person is incapable to fight for his life. This undergirds his view of the metaphorical meaning of the circumcision in Genesis 34.

17 Jacob's silence in Gen 34 stands in sharp contrast to his actions in Gen 49:5–7, where he rebukes Simeon and Levi for their revengeful attitude. Most scholars agree that this refers to their revenge on Shechem.

18 The verbs used in v. 3 (הִבְכָּה "was drawn to", אָהַב "love") and v. 19 ([פָּחַד "have delight"]) allude to real love toward Dinah (Mihăilă 2012, 40).

19 Some scholars (Wenham 1994, 310; Sarna 1989, 233) construe the fact that Dinah "went out" as an allusion to prostitution.

scholars interpret the acts between Shechem and Dinah as consensual.<sup>20</sup> Although the defilement, or at least debasement,<sup>21</sup> of Dinah is described in the strongest language possible, Sternberg (1987, 447) shows that the three negative verbs in verse 2 (וישכב, ויקח, וייענה) are balanced by three verbs of love (וידבר על לב, ויאהב, ותרבק נפשו ב) in verse 3. This almost tender side of Shechem<sup>22</sup> is symbolic of the position of the Samaritans in the narrative. While they originally had evil intentions toward the temple in Jerusalem, they gradually fell in love with it, and should therefore be treated with kindness and forgiveness, according to some of the more tolerant voices in the text.

Of course, the abovementioned approach to Genesis 34 is not above criticism. Several scholars (Hjelm 2000,143) object to an anti-Samaritan reading of Genesis 34, while Amit (2000, 211) supports this interpretation. Both Rofé and Mihăilă admit the tentativeness of their respective proposals. Both, however, trace Genesis 34 to the post-exilic period, where the question regarding intermarriage did indeed play an important role. Mihăilă (2012, 49) narrows his proposal down to several points which he deems as hard evidence. These include circumcision as a condition for admission into the community and the fact that the name of the offender, Shechem, corresponds to the name of the city where the Samaritan temple was erected. Rofé (2005, 374) admits that it seems improbable that a piece of anti-Samaritan ideology would be translated into the Samaritan Pentateuch and their Targum. However, he points to the fact that the attribution of the Pentateuch to the figure of Moses hindered the identification of ancient personalities with present persons. In this sense, Shechem the Hivvite remains a contemporary of Jacob, nothing more or nothing less. Furthermore, the identification of Hivvites of Shechem as Samaritans of the post-exilic period depends on the interpretation of 2 Kgs 17:24–33. The Samaritans, however, denied this tradition and traced their lineage to the Joseph and Levi tribes.

Although Rofé and Mihăilă approach Genesis 34 from different angles, their respective approaches put the narrative in the post-exilic period, where the question of intermarriage indeed played a key part in the bigger question regarding Judean identity.

---

20 Bechtel (1994, 19–36), Frymer-Kensky (1998, 79–96), and Van Wolde (2002, 528–44; 2004, 435–49) represent a list of scholars who interpret Gen 34 as a love story between Shechem and Dinah. Fleishman (2004, 12–32) even postulates a narrative about marriage by abduction, which stresses the consensual aspect of the act. The concept of a love story between Shechem and Dinah found expression in popular literature as well with the publication of Anita Diamant’s novel *The Red Tent*.

21 As Mihăilă (2012, 39) points out, even if ענה doesn’t necessarily mean “rape”, it has at least a meaning of “debase” or “humiliate”.

22 Von Rad (1972, 331) describes it in no uncertain terms: “In any case, the emphasis on the great love for the girl, which brooks no hindrance, receives the benefit of the narrative, and the figure of Shechem is made more human for the reader.”

## Conclusion

There are thus contrasting views regarding the content and message of Genesis 34. On the one hand, Sternberg (1987, 468) aligns himself with Jacob's sons. He finds the actions of Shechem deplorable and therefore he sympathises with the revenge carried out by Jacob's sons. On the other hand, Fewell and Gunn (1991, 197) align with Shechem, because they see true love and affection towards Dinah. At this stage, a comment is in order. It is difficult to construe a positive reading of Genesis 34. However one interprets the semantics of Genesis 34, it seems clear from the narrative that Shechem's actions need to be viewed in a negative light. Even if the verb *ענה* does not denote rape,<sup>23</sup> it at least refers to a humiliation (see footnote 26). The verb *טמא*, which shows some Priestly traits, has definite negative connotations. Furthermore, even if one interprets Shechem's attitude as love towards Dinah, the narrative seems to end with a dark ambience as the reader learns that Dinah was kept in Shechem's house even during the negotiations. Thus, the charge of kidnapping could be added to the charge of rape or humiliation.

The comment above brings us back to Mihăilă's observation that the author (see footnote 20) takes a careful stance toward the situation. In fact, Mihăilă refers to Jacob's silence, which he aligns with the author's position. Although Mihăilă's compelling and thought-provoking essay goes a long way to describe different views regarding intermarriage in the post-exilic era, the interpretation of the author's position does not seem to integrate with the message of the text. Put differently, Mihăilă's description of the conflicting emotions of Jacob and his sons seems to ring true, but Jacob's position should not necessarily be equated with that of the author. In fact, Genesis 34 seems to articulate a negative story of rape or dishonour.

The broader narrative of Genesis 34, as portrayed by Mihăilă and Rofé, seems to comment on the question of intermarriage in post-exilic times. In this case, Rofé seems to be closer to the heart of the narrative when he describes the role of Shechem (and therefore the Shechemites in the post-exilic era) as negative. This viewpoint corroborates that of Na'aman who also reads Genesis 34 in the context of anti-Samaritan polemic. Na'aman goes even further by viewing Genesis 34 and part of Genesis 35:1–5 as an interpolation by a scribe who comments on the pro-Samaritan viewpoint of Joshua 24. This angle represents the aim of this current essay. In previous essays, I have argued that Joshua 24 (MT) exhibits a pro-Samaritan stance, while the LXX version does exactly the opposite (Wildenboer 2015, 484–502; 2016, 483–502). On the basis of the discussion above, I concur with the view that Genesis 34 should be read as a reaction

---

23 Hamilton (1995, 354–55), Matthews (2005, 276), Gravett (2004, 279–99), and Shemesh (2007, 2–21) represent commentators who maintain that Shechem in fact raped Dinah.



against Joshua 24. To explain this in more detail, we will have to turn to Genesis 35:1–5.

## Genesis 35:1–4

### Introduction

The scene in Genesis 35:1–4,<sup>24</sup> aptly described by Albertz (2015, 57) as an “isolated scene”, seems to form a link with Joshua 24. Indeed, we find the rather strange reference to the patriarchs’ idolatry in Joshua 24:2, 14–15. It is generally assumed that Joshua 24 interprets the story of Rachel’s household gods in Genesis 31:19, 34, 35 (Blum 2006, 98). The verb used to describe the removal of the foreign gods (סר) is used in Joshua 24:20 as well as in Genesis 35:2–4.<sup>25</sup> We find several similar cross connections between Joshua 24 and Genesis 35. The expression אלהי הנבר (Gen 35:2, 4) is found elsewhere only in Joshua 24:23 (where Gen 35:2b is almost repeated verbatim). The terebinth tree (האלה) of Genesis 35:4 is also alluded to in Joshua 24:26. Therefore, Blum (2006, 98) describes Genesis 35 in the context of prolepsis, which leads the reader to Joshua 24.<sup>26</sup> This strengthens the idea that Joshua 24 functions as a “Hexateuch in miniature” (Von Rad 1972:16).<sup>27</sup> Put differently, Joshua 24 seems to depend on Genesis 35 and other texts such as Genesis 31 (Blum 2006, 97–100; 2011, 69). This proposal will be challenged in this section, as I propose the opposite: that Genesis 35:1–4 depends on Joshua 24, and furthermore, that it was composed in reaction to Joshua 24.

### Composition of Genesis 35:1–8

Genesis 35:1–8 revolves around the theme of an altar that Jacob built at Bet-el. Whether we can talk about a unified text is debatable, as we shall discover later.<sup>28</sup> Blum (2006, 105) ascribes the text to a late-Deuteronomistic redaction, and later to a Joshua 24

---

24 Blum (2006, 97) treats verses 1–7 as a unit. Albertz (2015, 57), on the other hand, sees verses 1–4 as a unit, and ascribes verses 5a, 6–9 to a later expansion. According to Albertz, verse 5b was introduced after the insertion of Gen 34. I will argue that verses 1–4 form a unit, while verse 5 originally functioned as the end of Gen 34, before Gen 35:1–4 was inserted. I consider verses 6ff. to be part of an independent unit.

25 Perlitt (1969, 257) observes that the term is found only in Deuteronomistic contexts (Josh 24:14, 23; Judg 10:16; 1 Sam 7:3). Of course, one can speculate whether these texts are in fact Deuteronomistic in nature, as Perlitt claims. Here I refer especially to Joshua 24, and specifically to the fact that Sperling (1987, 119–36) does not find any trace of Deuteronomistic thought in Joshua 24.

26 Römer and Brettler (2000, 411) suggest that Genesis 35:2–5 belongs to the same post-Priestly redactional layer as Joshua 24.

27 Of course, Von Rad interpreted Josh 24 as preceding the literary Hexateuch. However, recent scholarship interprets Josh 24 as the conclusion to the literary Hexateuch, as Popovich (2009, 88) notes.

28 Gunkel (1901, 343) refers to the Gen 35:1–8 as, “lose *zusammengehäuftes* ‘Geröll’”.

redaction, which forms a composite framework around the Hexateuch.<sup>29</sup> Some of the scholars representing older source hypothesis ascribed Genesis 1–8 to E,<sup>30</sup> but others proposed J. Westermann (1985, 551) steers away from the J/E debate by ascribing verses 1–7 to a redactor.

As far as the unity of the text is concerned, we can offer a few comments. Verse 1 describes a command from God to build an altar in Bet-el:

ויאמר אלהים אל-יעקב קום עלה בית-אל ושב-שם ועשה-שם מזבח

This command is expanded with the reason for the altar:

מזבח לאל הנראה אליך בברחך מפני עשו אחיך

This is a reference to Genesis 28:1–22,<sup>31</sup> where Jacob built the altar as he fled from Esau. Genesis 28 introduces a Jacob-Bet-el cycle which concludes with the altar in Genesis 35. The cross references between the two chapters is undeniable.

In verse 2a Jacob relays the command to his household:

ויאמר יעקב אל-ביתו ואל כל-אשר עמו

This command is followed by another element, which was in fact not commanded in verse 1, namely that they should remove the foreign gods from their possession:

הסרו את-אלהי הנכר אשר בתככם והטהרו והחליפו שמלתיכם

Verse 3 seems to continue the command of verse 1, namely to build an altar:

ונקומה ונעלה בית-אל ואעשה-שם מזבח לאל הענה אתי ביום צרהי עמדי  
בהרף אשר הלכתי

But in verse 4 we find a reference to the command in 2b which refers to the removal of foreign gods as the people obey Jacob's command to remove the gods from their possession:

---

29 Kratz (2002, 302–3) expresses his concerns as to whether these few scattered motifs in Genesis to Joshua can create a literary unit like the Hexateuch. As Albertz (2015, 55) observes, Kratz does admit that these texts create a redactional bow around the Hexateuch.

30 The term “El” in Bet-el may force many older scholars to link this passage to the Elohist. As Wenham (1994, 323) points out, very few modern older commentators find any reference to E in this passage at all.

31 According to Blum (2012, 197) almost all proponents of source criticism are in agreement as to the conflation of original independent J and E strands in the composition of Gen 28.

ויתנו אל-יעקב את כל-אלהי הנכר אשר בידם ואת-הנזמים אשר באזניהם  
ויטמו אתם יעקב תחת האלה אשר עם-שכם

The structure of verses 1–4 pave the way for scholars to interpret verse 2b and 4 as an interpolation. Westermann (1985, 551) explains why a redactor interpolated these verses. He postulates that the redactor was intent on purity of the nation, and therefore the foreign gods should be removed before the people could claim the land as their possession.<sup>32</sup>

It is important to note that verse 5 seems to belong to the previous narrative (Gen 34). In fact, we can assume that verse 5 was the original ending of Genesis 34:

יסעו ויהי חתת אלהים על-הערים אשר סביבתיהם ולא רדפו אחרי בני יעקב

The term בני יעקב is prevalent in Genesis 34, and the threat from the people of Canaan only makes sense in the context of the revenge on Shechem as portrayed in Genesis 34 (Westermann 1985, 551).

This observation completely changes the assumed hypothesis regarding the redaction-critical history of Genesis 35:1–8. Levin (1993, 261–2) regards the whole of verses 2–4 as a later addition to verse 1, but in the light of verse 5 as the original ending of Genesis 34, I propose that the whole of Genesis 35:1–4 was added to the narrative of Genesis 34 (between Genesis 34:31 and Genesis 35:5).<sup>33</sup> In Genesis 35:6, we find the comment that Jacob arrives in Bet-el, and that he builds an altar because this was the place where God had appeared to him when he fled from Esau (Gen 28:10–22). In other words, verse 6 does not depend on verse 1. This seems to make sense, because nowhere in the stories of the patriarchs do we find that God commanded them to build an altar, as verse 1 suggests. Without exception, it is an act from the patriarch himself (Westermann 1985, 550).

### *Conclusion*

In this hypothesis, Genesis 35:1–5 is an addition to the story of Dinah (Genesis 34). This is an important comment, because we have already discussed the struggle between Judeans and Samaritans as a possible background to Genesis 34. By interpreting Genesis 35:1–4 as an addition to Genesis 34, we may postulate that what these texts share are thematically linked. Here, I build on the tentative insights of Zakovitch (1980, 30–7) and Na'aman (2000:160), who interpret Genesis 35 (especially verses 2b and 4) as a

---

32 Pakkala (2012, 157) observes that the command to purify themselves (והטהרו) after the removal of the foreign gods may point to Priestly influence.

33 This explains the rather abrupt ending of the narrative in Genesis 34. Genesis 35:5 links to Jacob's fear that the people of the land may take revenge on him and his sons (Gen 34:30).

reaction against the covenant at Shechem (Josh 24).<sup>34</sup> Although Mihăilă (2012, 31–50) approaches Genesis 34 as a multi-faceted text, which comments from various angles on the Samaritan question, it would seem that Genesis 34 and 35 both exhibit an anti-Samaritan background, and that Genesis 35:1–5 amplifies the attitude and theological position of Genesis 34.

This suggestion has serious implications for the hypothesis that the worshipping of the gods on the other side of Euphrates (Josh 24:2, 14) refers to Rachel's household gods (Gen 31:30, 32), as Blum (2006, 98) suggests. According to Blum, the reference to the serving of foreign gods beyond the Euphrates in Joshua 24:2, 14 is built on Genesis 31:19, 21. In fact, Joshua 24 functions as a midrash on Genesis 31:19, 21. This hypothesis assumes that the phrase ויקם ויעבר את-נהר (Gen 31:21) is a cross reference to Joshua 24:2,14. However, Blum (2006, 98) admits that the phrase ויקם ויעבר את-נהר (Gen 31:2) could have been added to accommodate such a commentary or Midrash. Blum builds this on the fact that the Euphrates does not make sense in the Jacob narrative. Blum's geographical analysis shows that Laban was an Aramean who lived in Damascus, contrary to the notion that he hailed from Aram Naharaim. The confusion regarding Laban's ancestry could theoretically have caused the addition of Genesis 31:2, where the Euphrates is mentioned. While Blum use this argument to construct a common redactional layer that encompasses these texts, I would like to argue that the opposite is also possible, namely that Joshua 24:2, 14 represents the origin of this tradition. In this case, Genesis 31:19, 21 could have been composed to explain the tradition in Joshua 24. Therefore, the statement in Joshua 24:2, 14 probably refers to an unknown tradition, with no relation to the Jacob narrative at all.

## **Explanatory Reactions to Joshua 24**

### **Genesis 33:18–20**

Genesis 33:18–20 describes the purchasing of the burial place at Shechem by Jacob. This reference is taken up in Joshua 24:32 where Joseph is buried at Shechem.

#### *Composition of Genesis 33:18–20*

Genesis 33:18–20 is often regarded as an independent unit (Westermann 1985, 523; Seebass 1999, 411–7; Ruppert 2005, 408). However, the name Paddan-Aram (v. 18) is associated with Priestly texts (Baden 2009, 265). This is one of many difficulties that confronts the attentive reader. The term שֵׁלֶם (v. 18) is ambiguous, as the divergent readings of the text suggest. Furthermore, there is some confusion regarding the name שִׁכֶם (v. 18), as it can either be translated as a city or as a person. In terms of this essay, there is also a question regarding the unity of verses 18–20. The following discussion is

---

34 Na'aman admittedly mentions this proposal in a footnote, with reference to Zakovitch. In the context of this essay, I propose that this proposal deserves more attention.

relevant to this essay, as it attempts to determine the role of Genesis 33:19 and its relationship to Joshua 24:33.

Although Wenham (1994, 300) argues that שלם should be read as a city<sup>35</sup> (as the LXX implies),<sup>36</sup> the translation of “safely” seems to make sense in the context. This becomes clear if one reads Genesis 33 as the closing of the Jacob-Paddan-Aram cycle which started in Genesis 28. When Jacob flees Canaan in Genesis 28, he wonders if he will ever return safely (Gen 28:21):

ושבתי בשלום אל-בית אבי

This question is answered in Genesis 33:18–20, where Jacob indeed returns safely:

ויבא יעקב שלם

This text also seems to link to Jacob’s promise in Genesis 28:21, where he says that God will be his God if he protects him on his sojourn:

והיה יהוה לי לאלהים

In Genesis 33:20 we read that Jacob does indeed fulfil his promise:

וצצב-שם מזבה ויקרא-לו אל אלהי ישראל

The phrases יעקב ויצא (28:10) and ויבא יעקב (33:18) balance the Jacob-Cycle (Sarna 1989, 231). This reinforces the idea that we are dealing with the closure of a narrative unit in Genesis 33:18–20.

One can also argue that שלם should be translated with “wellness”. In this context, it can refer to the struggle in Genesis 32, where the ensuing battle with the deity leaves him lame. In this sense, שלם can refer to the fact that he is cured. Either way, this translation as an adjective seems to make more sense in the context. In fact, the interpretation of the term is linked with the second difficulty in this unit, namely the translation of the word שכם. Once again, we have different possibilities. Wenham (1994, 287) argues that Genesis 33:18–20 serves as the close of the Paddan-Aram cycle, as well as an introduction to the next chapter, where Shechem is described as a person. If one interprets שלם as an adjective, and not as the name of a city, שכם can easily be translated as a city. Conversely, if one assumes that שלם refers to a city, it becomes natural to read שכם as the name of a person.

---

35 We find a reference to the city Salem in Gen 14:18 and Ps 18:2.

36 The Samaritan Pentateuch renders it as שלום “safe”.

The name “Paddan-Aram” is central to the literary composition of the passage. As mentioned previously, the term is often associated with the Priestly texts. Therefore, most commentators would ascribe verse 18a to the Priestly stratum (P),<sup>37</sup> and therefore the term creates problems. Some scholars (Wellhausen 1899, 48; Kuenen 1894:145; Skinner 1930, 416; Von Rad 1972, 328) solve the problem by interpreting a place name ארם מפדן as a later addition. Baden (2009, 265) tries to solve this by ascribing the unit to P, but he views עיר שכם as a later addition. The issue surrounding the name ארם מפדן can probably be explained in the context of the closure of the Paddan-Aram cycle. In other words, these words do not refer to Genesis 31:17–18, but to the whole unit Genesis 28–33.

We have now established that Genesis 33:18–20 functions as the end of the Paddan-Aram cycle. In terms of the theme of this essay, we still have to determine the role of verse 19 (which forms the link to Joshua 24 with the purchase of Joseph’s burial ground) within this literary unit. Albertz (2015, 56) notes the fact that verse 19 seems to be an interpolation. Verses 18 and 20 are linked with the term in verse 20. In verse 18 Jacob comes to Shechem:

העיר את־פני ויחן ארם מפדן בבאו כנען בארץ אשר שכם עיר שלם יעקב ויבא

Verse 20 follows logically when Jacob pitches his tent there and builds the altar:

ויצב־שם מזבחה ויקרא־לו אל אלהי ישראל

Verse 19 interrupts this logical flow of the narrative and therefore I concur with Albertz that verse 19 is an interpolation. This is confirmed by the term שם (v. 20) which links this verse to verse 18.

### *Conclusion*

Genesis 33:19 seems to serve as a midrash inserted to explain the reference of the purchasing of Joseph’s burial ground in Joshua 24. Once again, the influence seems to flow from Joshua 24 to Genesis. The closure of the Paddan-Aram cycle is, in hindsight, a very logical place to insert this reference.

---

37 Most scholars assign verse 18a to P and 18b to E. Driver (1904, 300) and Dillmann (1892, 291) ascribe the first part of verse 18 to P, but they assign the words יעקב שלם ויבא to E, as part of an independent sentence. They read שלם as the name of a city, and therefore had to assign the words יעקב ויבא to P.

## Genesis 50:24–26

Genesis 50:24–26 follows Joseph’s death-bed scene, and it contains the note that his family put him in a coffin. In Joshua 24:32 the coffin arrives in Shechem, where he is buried in the Promised Land.

### *Composition of Genesis 50:24–26*

Genesis 50:24–26, which concludes Genesis, has generally been ascribed to the Elohist (E) (Von Rad 1972, 430).<sup>38</sup> In recent times, with the demise of the classic source hypothesis, these verses have generally been assigned to a post-Priestly redactor (Blum 2006, 97–106; Gertz 2006, 78–82, Schmid 2012a,15).<sup>39</sup>

A glance at the text reveals why the hypothesis of a post-Priestly redaction in these verses is so prevalent today. Genesis 50:24–26 seems to have been added to an existing narrative. In verses 22–23 we find a death-bed scene where Joseph is surrounded by his descendants. The sudden re-introduction of Joseph in verse 24 does not make sense in the narrative (Albertz 2015, 56). Gertz and Blum, two proponents of the post-Priestly theory, disagree whether verses 24–26 forms a unit. Gertz sees verse 22b as part of the Priestly Joseph story (P) and therefore verse 26 is a continuation of P, where Joseph’s death is reported. He notes that verse 26(P) in its current state, forms an integral part of the post-Priestly unit (24–25), and illustrates it with a reference to a chiasmic structure:<sup>40</sup>

---

38 As Blum (2006, 97) points out, the presence of the term *Elohim* has generally been the reason for this allocation. Of course, proponents of classic source criticism have noted the link between Gen 50:24–26 and Josh 24 (where not only the theme of Joseph’s bones is repeated, but where the ambiguous term **אלהים תורת** also points toward the hand of the Elohist). However, Blum (2006, 97) notes that Gen 50:24, 25 correspond verbatim to Exod 3:16, 17, a text normally assigned to J.

39 Carr (2006, 26) notes a series of texts (Gen 50:24–26; Exod 3:1–4:18; 13:19; 32:14–19; Num 14:11–21; Josh 24:1–32) that share the common themes of conquest, as well as land as oath and an overall orientation towards Deuteronomy. Although he describes these texts as secondary, he assigns them to a non-P Hexateuch, in sharp contrast with most European scholars who tend to date these texts as post-Priestly. In a later essay (2012, 26) he notes that these texts exhibit different themes and emphases, but he does not see this as an insurmountable obstacle to interpreting them as part of a common redactional layer. Van Seters (2006, 151) assigns these verses to J, and refers to the post-Priestly connection between Gen 50:24–26, Exod 13:19, and Josh 24:32 as “circular reasoning”. In this essay, however, I propose that Gen 50:24–26 as well as Exod 13:19, among others, depend on Josh 24. Because I approach Josh 24:1–32 as a post-Priestly text, it is only logical to assign the texts that depend on Josh 24 to a post-Priestly redaction.

40 Carr (2006, 170–1) describes the abovementioned chiasmic structure as “weak” and points to the fact that the chiasmic structure is better identified in verses 24 and 25, where Joseph’s speech (v. 24) and his oath (v. 25) are combined. The addition of verse 26 is explained in terms of confluence toward the end of the Joseph story of various traditions surrounding his death. He also notes that verse 26a (after the chiasm of vv. 24–25) is the most logical place to add a death notice

אנכי מֵת	A 50:24 □□□(non-P)
וּאלֹהִים פִּקֵּד יִפְדֶּךָ אַתְּכֶם וְהֵעֵלָה אַתְּכֶם מִן־הָאָרֶץ הַזֹּאת	B 50:24 □□(non-P)
אֱלֹהֵי־הָאָרֶץ אֲשֶׁר נִשְׁבַּע לְאַבְרָהָם לְיִצְחָק וּלְיַעֲקֹב	C 50:25b □ (non-P)
פִּקֵּד יִפְדֶּךָ אֱלֹהִים וְהֵעֵלְתֶם אֶת־עַצְמֹתַי מִזֶּה	B 50:25b (non-P)
וַיָּמָת יוֹסֵף	A 50:26a □ (P)

Blum initially ascribed verses 24–26 to a late Deuteronomistic redaction. Later, when he explored the relationship between these verses and Joshua 24, he established a “Jos 24 *Bearbeitung*”. Even then, he still ascribed verse 24 to D,<sup>41</sup> while linking verses 25–26 to the aforementioned Josh 24 redaction. Recently, however, he acknowledged that the verses form a unit (as the chiasmic pattern dictates) and he interpreted the whole of verses 24–26 as part of a redaction layer which includes Gen 33:19, 48:21–22, Exod 13:19, and Josh 24. In fact, he goes even further by linking the transition from Genesis to the transition between the books of Joshua and Judges. This further reinforces his hypothesis of Genesis 50:24–26 as a post-Priestly interpolation.

### Conclusion

Without getting tangled up in the intricacies of literary criticism, it is worth mentioning that Blum notices a connection between Genesis 50:24–26, Genesis 48:21–22 (where Shechem as burial place is also mentioned), and Exodus 3:16 (thereby linking the stories of the patriarchs and the Exodus narrative). Most scholars today view the link between Genesis and Exodus as post-Priestly, which of course amplifies the idea of Genesis 50:24–26 as a later addition.<sup>42</sup> Gertz (2006, 80) also refers to the fact that the themes of Joseph’s bones and the burial at Shechem are combined in Genesis 50:24–26. It is therefore easy to assume that later redactor(s) have tried to explain the strange notion of Joseph’s burial ground in Shechem by linking it to the tradition of his bones. In other words: Gertz postulates that the direction of dependence between these texts can easily

41 These texts are linked regarding the theme of the land oath to the patriarchs.

42 This cuts to the heart of the current debate regarding the composition of the Hexateuch. The idea that Genesis and Exodus represent two different accounts of Israel’s origins was first proposed by Galling (1928). This idea was strengthened by Noth’s concept of different separate traditions that were later linked to form a Hexateuch. In recent times, Schmid (1999; 2012c, 187–208) has revived this thesis. In this hypothesis, there must be a redactional link that eventually links Genesis and Exodus. Most modern-day scholars who follow this hypothesis (Römer 2006, 9–27; Gertz 2006, 73–87; Blum 2006, 89–106) agree to an extent that the link between these books is post-Priestly.



flow from Joshua 24 to Genesis 50 and not the other way around, as is generally accepted.

## **Exodus 13:19**

Exodus 13:19 refers to Moses's command to his people to take Joseph's bones to the Promised Land. This refers back to Genesis 50:24–26, and forward to Joshua 24:32, where the command is honoured.

### *Composition of Exodus 13:19*

Gertz (2014:109) aptly describes the non-Priestly texts of Exodus 1–15 as a “highly complex entity”. This statement is indeed relevant to Exodus 13:19. In earlier scholarship, these verses were interpreted as part of the narrative of the sea crossing (Childs 1974:216–39). As noted earlier, many scholars tend to view the theme of the transportation of Joseph's bones in Exodus 13:19 as a late (even post-Priestly) redaction.<sup>43</sup> Albertz (2015, 6) notes the unity of verses 17–19, but postulates that it is interpolated between Exodus 12:40 and 13:20,<sup>44</sup> as it interrupts the narrative flow between these passages. Gertz (2014:109–10), in a detailed study on Exodus 15, asks questions regarding the unity of vv.17–19. He notes the juxtaposition of the two place names in verse 18. The reference to the Sea of Reeds, which connects this passage to Exodus 15:4, 22 is not mentioned again, which reinforces the possibility that it may be found in a later addition. However, this does not affect the assumed unity of verses 17–20. The question regarding the unity of the passage seems to revolve around verses 19 and 20. Gertz (2014, 109) draws attention to the fact that the itinerary in verse 20 seems late, because the people are already on the move in verses 17–19. Furthermore, Succot is not mentioned in the rest of the narrative. This literary seam (*literarische Naht*) between verses 19–20 reinforces the redactional character of verse 19. Of course, Exodus 13:19 does not make sense in isolation. This verse needs Joseph's embalment in Genesis 50:24–26 and his internment (Josh 24:33) in the land purchased by Jacob (Gen 33:18–20). Verse 19 could thus be regarded as an interpolation. According to Blum (1990, 363–365) and Gertz (2000, 208, 209, 364, 365) it could be ascribed to a post-Priestly redaction.

Verses 17–18 are not necessarily part of the same redaction. The above-mentioned juxtaposition of the place names in verse 18 have led Krüger (1996, 524) to propose that verses 17–18 aim to explain the confusion that arose regarding the location of the miracle. According to Krüger, the Priestly narrative (Exod 14:2\*) locates the place of the miracle at the Serbonian Sea, a lagoon of the Mediterranean Sea. However, the non-

---

43 Van Seters (2003, 952) disagrees with this assumption. He notes that verse 19 does not seriously interrupt the sequence of events between verses 18–22.

44 This depends on Albertz's notion that there once existed an older, pre-Priestly Exodus composition (K<sup>EX</sup>).

Priestly narrative, (Exod 12:37a; 13:20) situates the miracle at the northern end of the Gulf of Suez. These locations are 100km apart, and therefore the two traditions are irreconcilable. Kruger’s proposal is confirmed by the studies of Roskop-Erisman (2011, 247–52). She also notes that the sea where Israel crossed was called יַם־סוּף (Exod 15:4, 22). This clashes with other descriptions in the Pentateuch where יַם־סוּף refers to the northern parts of the Red Sea (Exod 23:31; Num 14:25; 21:4; Deut 1:40; 23:1; 1 Kgs 9:26; Jer 49:21). Therefore, Exodus 13:17–19 can be attributed to a redaction which aims to connect the Priestly and non-Priestly geography. This is also corroborated by Albertz (2015, 60).<sup>45</sup> The attempt to reconcile different accounts, coupled with the redactional intent of verse 19, strengthens the hypothesis that verse 17–19 is indeed a later addition. Krüger, however, argues convincingly that verses 17–18 are not from the same hand as verse 19. This is in line with Gertz’s view that verse 19 is an interpolation, which forms part of a broader Hexateuch framework. Of course, Exodus 13:19 does not make sense in isolation. This verse needs Joseph’s embalment in Genesis 50:24–26 and his internment (Josh 24:33) in the land purchased by Jacob (Gen 33:18–20). According to Blum (1990, 363–5) and Gertz (2000, 208, 209, 364, 365) Exodus 13:19 could be ascribed to a post-Priestly redaction. I argue that Exodus 13:19 aims to explain the reference to Joseph’s bones in Joshua 24, and that the order of influence runs from Joshua 24 to Exodus 13:19.

### *Conclusion*

In Joshua 24:33, the journey with Joseph’s bones is completed when the story of his bones and the history behind the burial place are eventually connected. Fritz’s (1994, 251) hypothesis that Joshua 24:33 should be ascribed to a Priestly redaction, and that it depends on Genesis 23 (Abraham purchasing the cave of Machpela), Genesis 25:9 (the burial tradition of Abraham), and Genesis 50:13 (the burial tradition of Joseph) has generally been accepted. The result of Fritz’s hypothesis is that Joshua 24:33 is often described in the context of a Priestly addition (Blum 1997, 210–11; Van Seters 2003, 952).<sup>46</sup> I suggest that the order of influence runs from Joshua 24 to Exodus 13:19 and that these traditions have their point of departure in Joshua 24.<sup>47</sup> The reference to Shechem as Joseph’s burial place in Joshua 24 has certainly caused some reflection for the scribes. Therefore, we find another tradition in Genesis 48, where the burial ground

---

45 According to Albertz (2015, 60), Exod 13:17–19 forms part of a Hexateuch redaction (HexR) which, in this case, contradicts the Priestly redactor who located the miracle closer to Egypt, for theological reasons.

46 Nentel (2000, 107–8), in contrast, views it as part of a late Deuteronomistic redaction.

47 “Exodus 13:19 treats the secondary technical problem of how the death of Joseph, which is certainly not original, is connected to the burial tradition in Shechem. Genesis 50:25–26 (and probably also 33:19) is thus formulated with Josh 24:32 in view. ... Indeed, on the basis of their close conceptual and literary ties, these passages can be assigned to one and the same literary layer, or Gen 33:19; 50:25–26; and Exod 13:19 may be dated *after* Josh 24:32” (Gertz 2006, 80; emphasis mine).

in Shechem is not purchased, but inherited by Jacob's family. This seems like another attempt to make sense of Joshua 24:32.

## Conclusion

The concept of a Hexateuch redaction is generally assumed today. This means that several texts in the Pentateuch are taken up in Joshua 24. In this essay, I suggest that the direction of dependence stretches from Joshua 24 to the Pentateuch. Furthermore, I postulate that texts in the Pentateuch (Gen 34; 35:1–4) react to the theological viewpoint in Joshua 24, or serve to explain the rather strange traditions found in Joshua 24 (Gen 33:18–20; 50:24–26; Exod 13:18). This proposal asks some tentative questions regarding the concept of a redactional layer of Hexateuch redaction in Joshua 24. Of course, Joshua 24:2–14 provides a summary of Israel's *Heilsgeschichte*, which forms some sort of Hexateuch, but this essay reacts specifically to the idea of a Hexateuch redaction.

## References

- Achenbach, R. 2002. *Die Vollendung der Tora. Studien zur Redaktionsgeschichte des Numeribuches im Kontext von Hexateuch und Pentateuch*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für Altorientalische und Biblische Rechtsgeschichte 3. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Albertz, R. 2015. "The Formative Impact of the Hexateuch Redaction: An Interim Result." In *The Post-Priestly Pentateuch: New Perspectives on its Redactional Development Profiles and Theological Profiles*, edited by F. Giuntoli and K. Schmid, 53–74. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Amit, Y. 2000. *Hidden Polemics in Biblical Narrative*. Transl. J. Chipman. Leiden, Boston, Köln: Brill.
- Baden, J.S. 2009. *J, E and the Redaction of the Pentateuch*. FAT 68. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Bechtel, L.M. 1994. "What If Dinah is not Raped?" *JSOT* 62: 19–36.
- Blum, E. 1984. *Die Komposition der Vätergeschichte*. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener.
- Blum, E. 1990. *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*. BZAW 189. Berlin/ New York: de Gruyter.
- Blum, E. 1997. "Der kompositionelle Knoten am Übergang von Josua zu Richter: Ein Entflechtungsvorschlag." In *Deuteronomy and Deuteronomical literature. Festschrift C H W Brekelmans*, edited by M. Vervenne and J. Lust, 181–212. Leuven: Peeters.

- Blum, E. 2006. "The Literary Connection between the Books of Genesis and Exodus and the End of the Book of Joshua." In *A Farewell to the Yahwist? The Composition of the Pentateuch in Recent European Interpretation*, edited by T.B. Dozeman and K. Schmid, 80–106. SBL Symposium Series 34. Atlanta: SBL.
- Blum, E. 2011. "Pentateuch-Hexateuch-Enneateuch." In *Pentateuch, Hexateuch, or Enneateuch. Identifying Literary works in Genesis through Kings*, edited by T.B. Dozeman, T.C. Römer, and K. Schmid, 43–71. SBL 8. Atlanta: SBL.
- Blum, E. 2012. "The Jacob Tradition." In *The Book of Genesis. Composition, Reception, and Interpretation*, edited by C.A. Evans, J.N. Lohr, and D.L. Petersen, 181–211. VTSup 152. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- Carr, D.M. 2006. "What is Required to Identify Pre-Priestly Narrative Connections between Genesis and Exodus? Some General Reflections and Specific Cases." In *A Farewell to the Yahwist? The Composition of the Pentateuch in Recent European Interpretation*, edited by T.B. Dozeman and K. Schmid, 159–180. SBL Symposium Series 34. Atlanta: SBL.
- Carr, D.M. 2012. "The Moses Story: Literary-Historical Reflections." *HEBAI* 2012 (1), 7–36.
- Childs, B.S. 1974. *Exodus: A Commentary*. OTL. London: SCM.
- Diamant, A. 1997. *The Red Tent*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Dillmann, A. 1892.<sup>6</sup> *Die Genesis. Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch*. Leipzig: Hirzel.
- Driver, S.R. 1904. *The Book of Genesis*. London: Methuen/New York: E.S. Gorham.
- de Pury, A. 1969. "Gen 34 et l'histoire." *Revue Biblique* 76:5–49.
- Fewell, D.N. and Gunn, D.M. 1991. "Tipping the Balance: Sternberg's Reader and the Rape of Dinah." *JBL* 110, 463–88. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3267082>
- Fleishman, J. 2004. "Shechem and Dinah in the Light of Biblical and Non-Biblical Sources." *ZAW* 116: 12–32. <https://doi.org/10.1515/zatw.2004.001>
- Fritz, V. 1994. *Das Buch Josua*. HAT 1/7. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Frymer-Kensky, T. 1998. "Virginity in The Bible." In *Gender and Law in the Hebrew Bible and in the Ancient Near East*, edited by V.H. Matthews, B.M. Levinson, and T. Frymer-Kensky, 79–96. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Galling, K. 1928. *Die Erwählungstraditionen Israels*. Giessen: Alfred Töppelmann.
- Carr, D.M. 2000. *Tradition und Redaktion in der Exoduserzählung. Untersuchungen zur Endredaktion des Pentateuch*. FRLANT 186. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

- Carr, D.M. 2006. "The Transition between the Books of Genesis and Exodus." In *A Farewell to the Yahwist? The Composition of the Pentateuch in Recent European Interpretation*, edited by T.B. Dozeman and K. Schmid, 173–187. SBL Symposium Series 34. Atlanta: SBL.
- Carr, D.M. 2014. "The Miracle at the Sea: Remarks on the Recent Discussion about the Origin and Composition of the Exodus Narrative" In *The Book of Exodus: Composition, Reception, and Interpretation*, edited by T.B. Dozeman, C.A. Evans and J.N. Lore, 91–120. VTSup 164. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- Gravett, S. 2004. "Reading 'Rape' in the Hebrew Bible. A Consideration of Language." *JSOT* 28: 279–299. <https://doi.org/10.1177/030908920402800303>.
- Carr, D.M. 1901. *Genesis*. HAT. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Carr, D.M. 1964.<sup>6</sup> *Genesis*. HAT 1.1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Hamilton, V.P. 1995. *The Books of Genesis. Chapters 18–50*. NICOT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Hölscher, G. 1952. *Geschichtsschreibung in Israel: Untersuchungen zum Jahvisten und Elohisten*. Lund: Gleerup.
- Hjelm, I. 2000. *The Samaritans and Early Judaism: A Literary Analysis*. JSOT Supplement Series 303. Copenhagen International Seminar. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Kartveit, M. 2009. *The Origin of the Samaritans*. VTSup 128. Leiden: Brill. <https://doi.org/10.1163/ej.9789004178199.i-406>.
- Roskop-Erisman, A. 2011. *The Wilderness Itineraries: Genre, Geography and the growth of the Torah*. History, Archaeology, and Culture of the Levant 3. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.
- Kevers, P. 1980. "Etude littéraire de Gen 34." *Revue Biblique* 87: 38–86.
- Knauf E.A. 2000. "Does Deuteronomistic Historiography (DH) exist?" In *Israel Constructs its History. Deuteronomistic Historiography in Recent Research*, edited by A. du Pury, T.C. Römer and J.P. Macchi, 388–398. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Kratz, R.G. 2002. "Der vor- und der nachpriesterliche Hexateuch." In *Abschied vom Jahwisten: die Komposition des Hexateuch in der jüngsten Diskussion*, edited by J.C. Gertz, K. Schmid and M. Witte, 295–323. BZAW 315. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter.
- Krüger, T. 1996. "Erwägungen zur Redaktion der Meerwunder-erzählung (Exodus 13,17–14,31)." *ZAW* 108, 519–33

- Kuenen, A. 1880. "Beitraege zur Hexateuchkritik: VI. Dinah und Sichem (Gen 34)." In *Gesammelte Abhandlungen zur Biblischen Wissenschaft*, edited by A. Kuenen. Freiburg i.B: Leipzig, 1894.
- Le Roux, J.H. 2009. "Searching for a Question and an Answer." In *Gerechtigkeit und Recht zu üben (Gen 18,19). Studien zur altorientalischen und biblischen Rechtsgeschichte, zur Religionsgeschichte Israels und zur Religionssoziologie. Festschrift für Eckart Otto*, edited by R. Achenbach and M. Arneth, 508–518. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für Altorientalische und Biblische Rechtsgeschichte 13. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Carr, D.M. 1993. *Der Jahwist*. FRLANT 157. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Carr, D.M. 2003. *Fortschreibungen: Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament*. BZAW 316. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter.
- Matthews, K.A. 2005. *Genesis 11:27–50:26*. NAC 1B. Nashville: Broadman & Holman.
- Mihăilă, A. 2012. "Raping the 'Justice': Another Reading of Genesis 34." *StTeol* 3: 31–50.
- Na'aman, N. 2000. "The Law of the Altar in Deuteronomy and the Cultic Site near Shechem." In *Rethinking the Foundations: Historiography in the Ancient World and the Bible. Essays in Honour of John Van Seters*, edited by S.L. McKenzie and T.C. Römer, 141–161. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter.
- Nentel, J. 2000. *Trägerschaft und Intentionen des deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerks: Untersuchungen zu Reflexionsreden: Jos 1; 23; 24; 1 Sam 12 und 1 Kön 8*. BZAW 297. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Nihan, C. 2007. "The Torah between Samaria and Judah: Shechem and Gerizim in Deuteronomy and Joshua." In *The Pentateuch as Torah: New Models for Understanding Its Promulgation and its Acceptance*, edited by B.M. Levinson and G.M. Knoppers, 187–223. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.
- Carr, D.M. 1943. *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.
- Carr, D.M. 1948. *Überlieferungsgeschichte des Pentateuchs*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.
- Otto, E. 2000. *Das Deuteronomium im Pentateuch und Hexateuch*. FAT 30. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Pakkala, J. 2012. "Deuteronomy and 1–2 Kings in the Redaction of the Pentateuch and Former Prophets." In *Deuteronomy in the Pentateuch, Hexateuch and Deuteronomistic History*, edited by K. Schmid and R. Person 133–162. FAT II 56. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Parry, R. 2000. "Source Criticism and Genesis 34." *Tyndale Bulletin* 51 (1): 121–138.

- Perlitt, L. 1969. *Bundestheologie im Alten Testament*. WMANT 36. Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag.
- Popovich, M. 2009. "Conquest of the Land, Loss of the Land. Where does Joshua 24 Belong?" In *The Land of Israel in Bible, History and Theology: Studies in Honour of Ed Noort*, edited by J. Von Ruiten and C. De Vos, 87–98. VTSup 124. Leiden: Brill.
- Procksch, O 1924.<sup>2</sup> *Die Genesis übersetzt und erklärt*. Leipzig: Deichertsche Verlagsbuchshandlung.
- Pummer, R. 2010. "Samaritanism – A Jewish Sect or an Independent Form of Yahwism?" In *Samaritans: Past and Present: Current Studies*, edited by M. Mor and F. Reiterer, 1–24. *Studia Samaritana* 5. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Rofé, A. 1988. "The Vineyard of Naboth: The Origin and Message of the Story." *VT* 38: 89–104.
- Rofé, A. 1990. "An Enquiry into the Betrothal or Rebekah." In *Die Hebräische Bibel und ihre zweifache Nachgeschichte: Festschrift für Rolf Rendtorff zum 65 Geburtstag*, edited by E. Blum, C. Macholz, and E.W. Stegemann, 27–39. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener verlag.
- Rofé, A. 2005. "Defilement of Virgins in Biblical Law and the Case of Dinah (Gen 34)." *Biblica* 86: 369–375.
- Römer, T.C. and Brettler, M.Z. 2000. "Deuteronomy 34 and the Case for a Persian Hexateuch." *JBL* 119 (3): 401–419. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3268406>.
- Roskop-Erisman, A. 2011. *The Wilderness Itineraries: Genre, Geography, and the Growth of the Torah*. History, Archaeology, and Culture of the Levant 3. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.
- Ruppert, L. 2005. *Gen 25:19–36, 43. Volume 3 of Genesis*. Forschung zur Bibel. Würzburg: Echter.
- Sarna, N.M. 1989. *Genesis=Be-reshit: The Traditional Hebrew Text with New JPS Translation*. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society.
- Schmid, K. 1999. *Erzväter und Exodus*. WMANT 81. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neu-kirchner.
- Schmid, K. 2012a. "Genesis in the Pentateuch." In *The Book of Genesis. Composition, Reception, and Interpretation*, edited by C.A. Evans, J.N. Lohr, and D.L. Petersen, 27–50. VTSup 152. Leiden/Boston: Brill.

- Schmid, K. 2012b. "Die Sameritaner und die Judaer. Die biblische Diskussion um ihr Verhältnis in Josua 24." In *Die Sameritaner und die Bibel: Historische und literarische Wechselwirkungen zwischen biblischen und Sameritanischen Traditionen*, edited by J. Frey, U. Schattner-Rieser and K. Schmid, 21–49. *Studia Judaica/Studia Samaritana* 7. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter.
- Scmid, K. 2012c. "Genesis and Exodus as Two Formerly Independent Traditions of Origins for Ancient Israel." *Biblica* 93 (2): 187–208.
- Schorch, S. 2013. "The Construction of Samari(t)an Identity from the Inside and the Outside." In *Between Cooperation and Hostility: Multiple Identities in Ancient Judaism*, edited by R. Albertz and J. Wöhrle, 135–149. *Journal of Ancient Judaism Supplements* 11. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Seebass, H. 1999. *Vätergeschichte I*. Volume 2.1 of Genesis. Neukircher-Vluyn: Neukirchner.
- Shemesh, Y. 2007. "Rape is Rape: The Story of Dinah and Shechem." *ZAW* 119: 2–21.
- Skinner, J. 1930.<sup>2</sup> *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Genesis*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.
- Speiser, E.A. 1964. *Genesis*. New York: Doubleday.
- Sperling, S.D. 1987. "Joshua 24 Re-examined." *HUCA* 58: 119–136.
- Sternberg, M. 1987. *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative: Ideological Literature and the Drama of Reading*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Van Seters, J. 2003. "Deuteronomy Between Pentateuch and Deuteronomistic History." *HTS* 59 (3): 947–956.
- Van Seters, J. 2006. "The Report of the Yahwist's Death Has Been Greatly Exaggerated!" In *A Farewell to the Yahwist? The Composition of the Pentateuch in Recent European Interpretation*, edited by T.B. Dozeman and K. Schmid, 143–157. *SBL Symposium Series* 34. Atlanta: SBL. <https://doi.org/10.4102/hts.v59i3.681>.
- Van Wolde, E. 2002. "Does 'innâ Denote Rape? A Semantic Analysis of a Controversial Word." *VT* 52: 528–544.
- Van Wolde, E. 2004. "Love and Hatred in a Multiracial Society: The Dinah and Shechem Story in Genesis 34 in the Context of Genesis 28–35." In *Reading from Right to Left. Essays on the Hebrew Bible in Honour of David J.A Clines*, edited by J.C. Exum and H.G.M. Williamson, 435–449. *JSOT Sup* 373. Edinburgh: T & T Clark.
- Vawter, B. 1977. *On Genesis: A New Reading*. Garden City: Doubleday.
- Von Rad, G. 1972. *Genesis: A Commentary*. Transl. J. Bowden. OTL. London: SCM.



- Von Rad, G. 1984. *The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays*. Transl. E.W. Trueman Dickens. London: SCM Press.
- Wellhausen, J. 1899. *Die Composition des Hexateuchs und der historischer Bücher des Alten Testaments*. Berlin: Georg Reimer.
- Wenham, G.J. 1994. *Genesis 16–50*. WBC. Dallas, Texas: Word Books.
- Westermann, C. 1985. *Genesis 12–36*. Volume 12 of a Continental Commentary (trans. John. J Scullion). Minneapolis: Augsburg.
- Westermann, C. 1994. *Die Geschichtsbücher des Alten Testaments: Gab es ein deuteronomistisches Geschichtswerk?* TB Altes Testament 87. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlag.
- Wildenboer, J. 2015. “Joshua 24: Some Literary and Theological Remarks.” *JSEM* 24 (2): 484–502. <https://doi.org/10.25159/1013-8471/3465>.
- Wildenboer, J. 2016. “Joshua 24 in the LXX: Some Literary and Theological Remarks.” *JSEM* 25 (2): 483–502. <https://doi.org/10.25159/1013-8471/2522>.
- Würthwein, E. 1994. “Erwägungen zum sog. Deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerk: eine Skizze.” In *Studien zum deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerk*, edited by E. Würthwein, 1–11. BZAW227. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Zakovitch, Y. 1980. “The Object of the Narrative of the Burial of the Foreign Gods at Shechem.” *BeTM* 25: 300–337.
- Zakovitch, Y. 1985. “Assimilation in Biblical Narratives.” In *Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism*, edited by J.H. Tigay, 175–196. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.