A NARRATIVE AND TEXTLINGUISTIC APPROACH TO THE TRANSITION
FROM THE BOOK OF JOSHUA TO THE BOOK OF JUDGES

by

Ron Bell, BA, MA

A dissertation submitted to
the Faculty of McMaster Divinity College
in partial fulfilment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy (Christian Theology)

McMaster Divinity College
Hamilton, Ontario
2025

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY McMaster Divinity College
(Christian Theology) Hamilton, Ontario

TITLE: A Narrative and Textlinguistic Approach to the Transition
from the Book of Joshua to the Book of Judges

AUTHOR: Ron Bell

SUPERVISORS: Dr. August H. Konkel
Dr. Mark J. Boda

NUMBER OF PAGES: xi + 289

McMASTER DIVINITY COLLEGE

Upon the recommendation of an oral examining committee,
this dissertation by

Ron Bell

is hereby accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY (CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY)

Primary Supervisor, August H. Konkel, PhD _August Konkel_

Digitally signed by August Konkel
Date: 2025.04.16 15:44:45 -04'00'

Secondary Supervisor, Mark J. Boda, PhD _Mark J. Boda_

Digitally signed by Mark Boda
Date: 2025.04.16 22:00:00 -04'00'

External Examiner, Roy Heller, PhD _Roy L. Heller_

Digitally signed by Roy L. Heller
Date: 2025.04.16 12:36:27 -05'00'

Examination Committee Chair, Ambrose Thomson, PhD _A. Thomson_

Digitally signed by Ambrose Thomson
Date: 2025.04.17 08:24:38 -04'00'

Date Approved: April 16, 2025

ABSTRACT

A Narrative and Textlinguistic Approach to the Transition from the Book of Joshua to the Book of Judges

Ron Bell
McMaster Divinity College
Hamilton, Ontario
Doctor of Philosophy (Christian Theology), 2025

The narrative features of plot, characterization, and temporal and spatial markers, as elicited through the application of textlinguistic discourse analysis, provide evidence for the distinct theological and ideological perspectives of the MT books of Joshua and Judges, particularly at the book-seam and in the synoptic passages. This study will demonstrate distinct presentations between Joshua and Judges, the former having a more permissive and ambiguous view of Israel's obedience and the latter a more severe outlook on the speed and depth of Israel's apostasy, through a narrative approach guided by the application of discourse analysis to the overlapping and transitional material. This study will clarify some unresolved issues concerning the transition from Joshua to Judges and contribute a useful methodology to constrain the inherent subjectivity of narrative approaches.

The juxtaposition of these two books, and the duplication of various traditions in new settings, draw our attention to the continuities and discontinuities that come into view at the book-seam. So, a precise textlinguistically-informed narrative description will be made of the *overlap* (*or not*) of material at the book-seam of Josh 23–24 and Judg 1:1—3:11, and in the introductory material of Judges with the conquest and other

material of the book of Joshua—specifically, comparison of Josh 8:10–23; 12:9, 16 with

Judg 1:22–26 (the sacking of Ai/Bethel), Josh 10:1–5, 22–27; 12:10 with Judg 1:1–8

(Adoni Zedek/Bezek), Josh 14:6–15; 15:13–19 with Judg 1:9–16, 20 (allotment to

Caleb), Josh 15:63 with Judg 1:8, 21 (Jebusites persist in Jerusalem), Josh 16:10 with

Judg 1:29 (allotment to Josephites [Ephraim]), Josh 17:11–31 with Judg 1:27–28

(allotment to Josephites [Manasseh]), Josh 17:14–18 with Judg 1:19 (Josephites complain

about their allotment), *and especially* Josh 24:28–33 with Judg 1:1; 2:6–10 (the death of

Joshua). The procedure to be used in this study will be the careful articulation of some

specific narrative features (plot, foregrounding and backgrounding, perspective and point

of view, characterization, and spatio-temporal structuring considerations as commonly

found in narrative approaches to Biblical Hebrew literature) of the texts noted above

using the textlinguistic data.

Dedicated to the memory of
Professor Jerry Sheppard,
Father Brian Peckham,
Father Bill Irwin,
and Professor Al Pietersma
—mentors all of
immense stature,
intellect, and kindness

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I daily thank God for the gifts of life, family and friends, the church, scholarship, and the freedom we have in Christ.

I am grateful this day for the prompting, guidance, direction, and encouragement of numerous instructors, but in particular, my friends and doctoral supervisors at McMaster Divinity College, Gus Konkel and Mark Boda. Also instrumental in giving shape to this project throughout the years were Glen Taylor, Stan Porter, Claude Cox, and Mary Conway. I wish to send out a special thanks to my examining committee, Gus, Mark, Roy Heller, and Ambrose Thomson, for their generosity of spirit and charitable approach to an encounter that I will continue to cherish. I would be remiss if I did not mention the substantial financial support provided by Veterans Affairs Canada, without which this journey would have been significantly more difficult.

Finally, it is with much affection that I especially acknowledge the steadfast support of my wife Donna, and our three children, Sarah, Rachel, and Matthew. It has been a long road and I am happy to have travelled it with you. The most important thing I have learned about our conversations is that it is better to be kind than right.

Soli Deo gloria, Good Friday 2025

CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

BDB   Brown, Francis, S. R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs. *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*

BHK   *Biblia Hebraica*. Edited by Rudolph Kittel. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1905–1906

BHQ   *Biblia Hebraica Quinta*. Edited by Adrian Schenker et al. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2004–

BHS   *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*. Edited by Karl Elliger and Wilhelm Rudolph. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1983

Dtr   Deuteronomist

GKC   *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*. Edited by Emil Kautzsch. Translated by Arther E. Cowley. 2nd ed. Oxford: Clarendon, 1910

IBHS   *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*. Bruce K. Waltke and Michael O'Connor. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1990

KJV   King James Version

LXX   Septuagint

MT   Masoretic Text

NASB   New American Standard Version

NETS   New English Translation of the Septuagint

NRSV   New Revised Standard Version

OT   Old Testament

SIL   Summer Institute of Linguistics

TDOT   *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*. Edited by G. Johannes Botterweck and Helmer Ringgren. Translated by John T. Willis et al. 8 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974–2006

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

1.1 A Description of the Topic and Its Importance

There is continuing uncertainty concerning the history and origins of the traditions and

compositional layers (sources and redaction) of Joshua and Judges, particularly in the

context of historical-critical theories of a Deuteronomistic History, or somewhat

conversely a Hexateuch, and how different elements of the books relate to one another

viewed within this historical process.[1] Layers of editing are evident, particularly where

individual narratives are joined to each other and in the overall framing of the books, and

those added layers contribute to the meaning of the texts. It is also interesting and

important to note, as Thomas Römer did that

> Seit der Antike bis heutzutage wird dem Ende eines Buches oder einer Buchrolle
> eine besondere Aufmerksamkeit verliehen, enthalten diese doch oft wertvolle
> Lese- und Verstehenshilfen. Der Leser wird abschließend über den Sinn (oder
> Unsinn) des Vorhergehenden orientiert; oft wird auch klargestellt ob eine
> Fortsetzung oder nicht zu erwarten ist.[2]

> There are also two distinct written traditions that have come down to us—the MT

and the LXX. Of particular interest with respect to those two textual histories are the

connections between the end of Joshua, and Judg 2:12–13 and 3:12–14. Judges 2:6–9 is,

in many of its parts, close to a verbatim replication of Josh 24:28–31 in both the MT and

---

[1] Webb, *Judges*, 20–32; Butler, *Joshua 1–12*, 51–75, 84–94.
[2] Römer, "Doppelte Ende des Josuabuches," 523. (From ancient times to the present-day, special attention has been paid to the end of a book or a scroll as it often contains valuable aids to reading and understanding. The reader is finally informed about the meaning [or nonsense] of what has gone before; it is often also made clear whether a sequel is to be expected or not).

the LXX. The order of the verses in the MT of Joshua is unique, nevertheless, as the LXX of Joshua has those verses in the same order as the MT and LXX of Judges. There are also significant differences between the MT and the LXX of Joshua insofar as the LXX has Josh 24:31a, 33a–b, which is not found at the end of the MT of Joshua. However, Josh 24:33b (LXX) not only repeats the action of Israel departing to their own places from v. 28 (cf. Judg 2:6), but it also includes notice of the worship of, for example, Astarte and other gods from the surrounding nations that is also found at Judg 2:12–13. Joshua 24:33b (LXX) ends the book with the notice that παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς κύριος εἰς χεῖρας Εγλωμ τῷ βασιλεῖ Μωαβ, καὶ ἐκυρίευσεν αὐτῶν ἔτη δέκα ὀκτώ (the Lord gave them over into the hands of Eglom the king of Moab and he ruled over them eighteen years), which connects this ending directly with Judg 3:12–14. Alexander Rofé pointed out that Joshua "LXX here is not dependent on (Judges) LXX of these verses,"[3] that fact implying that the translator of Joshua could have had a Hebrew *Vorlage* that differed from the tradition retained in the MT at that point in the text. That the LXX, at certain places (including there), likely represents an *older* Hebrew text than that represented by the MT, indicates some later editorial and literary development of the text of Joshua, especially at its ending.[4] The observation of divergent text traditions serves to underscore the complexity of the diachronic evaluation of the transition between these two books that has been the subject of some recent studies.[5]

---

[3] Rofé, "End of the Book of Joshua," 28. The following of other gods from among the people surrounding them, the Ashtaroth and Baalim, and the deliverance by the LORD into the hand of Eglon the king of Moab are the converging elements.

[4] Tov, "Literary Development," 144–47. See also De Troyer, *Ultimate and Penultimate*, 16–20 for a succinct evaluation of that conclusion against the notion that the differences ought to be explained by a free translation technique.

[5] Berner and Samuel, *Book-Seams in the Hexateuch 1*, Part 2 (187–380).

The overall literary structure of the book of Judges also remains unclear, or is at least contested,[6] particularly with respect to the introductory material and ending.[7] From a literary standpoint there are tensions—theological, historical/geographical (place, time, and manner of occupation), and narrative-wise—within and between the two books of Joshua and Judges that a reader should want to resolve. Perhaps one of the most significant divergences is how, on the one hand, the book of Joshua presents the conquest as relatively complete—however, not absolutely—and the people of Israel as relatively faithful followers of the LORD—again, not wholly so—whereas, on the other hand, the book of Judges presents a decidedly incomplete conquest of the land (as well as pressure from outside the land) alongside a rapid and continual—but not continuous—tendency toward apostasy. *The focus of this study will be on describing and explaining some of those divergences*. My aim is to concentrate on the synchronic narrative features of the book-seam to elicit meaning, and to do so primarily with the MT, without ignoring its complex history of composition and that history's influence on meaning.

Theology is tightly wrapped up in the narrative presentation of the composition(s) so that the rightness or wrongness of the actions of Israelites—especially vis-à-vis their leaders—is often only implicit, or even ambiguous, compared with the stated notices of the narrator(s). If we think of a deuteronomistic historian (e.g., the Deuteronomist) as an *author* responsible for a considerable portion of the Former Prophets (after the manner of Martin Noth's grand hypothesis),[8] *that* historian's perspective is clearest in the summary speeches (retrospective and anticipatory) by historiographical personages (e.g., Joshua,

---

[6] Butler, *Judges*, li–lxiv.
[7] See, e.g., Boling, *Judges*, 34–38; Klein, *Triumph of Irony*, 12–15; Soggin, *Judges*, 4–5; Lindars, *Judges 1–5*, 3–7; Polzin, *Moses and the Deuteronomist*, 147–55; Beldman, *Completion of Judges*, 1–51.
[8] Noth, *Deuteronomistic History*.

Samuel, and Solomon) or "summarizing reflections upon history"[9] (e.g., Josh 12 and

Judg 2:11–19), which structure the continuing narrative.[10] In Josh 1 the LORD speaks

first to Joshua and then Joshua commands the people concerning the possession of the

land. In Josh 23, following the occupation of the land, Joshua again addresses the

collected people and provides them with instruction. These mark transition points in the

history, the beginning and the end of the conquest, and the theological impress of the

speech at Josh 23 is hard to miss—*"If you transgress the covenant of the LORD your*

God, which he enjoined on you, and go and serve other gods and bow down to them, then

the anger of the LORD will be kindled against you, and you shall perish quickly from the

good land that he has given to you" (Josh 23:16, NRSV). The threat is made explicit

early in the recounting of the history, and its eventual fulfilment would be the

"predictable future"[11] of Israel.

According to Noth, the Deuteronomistic History moved directly from there to the

period of the judges that begins at Judg 2:6 (i.e., right after the angelic pronouncement at

Bochim with the reproach of Israel for its failure) and ends with the speech by Samuel in

---

[9] Noth, *Deuteronomistic History*, 18–19.

[10] This starting point for the discussion does not preclude later revisions to Noth's thesis such as the two distinct versions of the Deuteronomistic History described by Frank Moore Cross in "Themes of the Book of Kings" (274–89), other redactional layers often described as prophetic or nomistic (see O'Brien, *Deuteronomistic History Hypothesis*, 1–12 for a brief evaluation of the main outlines of scholarly thought on those matters), or even outright rejection of a unified history in favour of a Hexateuch. Brian Peckham provides a fairly radical revision to Noth's theory by denying *authorship* to the Deuteronomist, assigning a mere editorial function instead.

> The Deuteronomistic History, touted as new and original, was just the last significant stage in the transmission of tradition, and all but irrelevant to the interpretation of that tradition. . . . It seemed to have the support of critical literary method, and it acquired credibility in the historical synthesis that Noth created. But it undermined the theory that it was supposed to prove and turned Dtr, whom the literary analysis had revealed as an editor, into a mute or very marginal purveyor of curiosities from the distant past ("Significance of the Book of Joshua," 221).

Each redactional layer has the potential, indeed likelihood, of adjusting the theological perspective, and an account of this will need to be made in some instances.

[11] Polzin, *Moses and the Deuteronomist*, 141.

1 Sam 12 that marked the transition to the era of the kings.[12] Noth also saw another

decisive juncture that reinforced the theological impetus of the Deuteronomistic History.

> Finally, after the completion of the temple in Jerusalem—an event that was of
> fundamental importance to Dtr's theological interpretation of history—King
> Solomon makes a detailed speech in the form of a prayer to God, which
> thoroughly expounds the significance of the new sanctuary for the present, and
> especially for the future (1 Kgs 8:14 ff.). Elsewhere the summarizing reflections
> upon history which sum up the action are presented by Dtr himself as part of the
> narrative.[13]

With the installation of the Ark of the Covenant of the LORD in the newly built temple,

and with the dedication of that temple, there is a continuation of the familiar refrain—

"that they may fear you all the days that they live in the land" (1 Kgs 8:40, NRSV). At

the end of the quotation above from Noth, we observed that the summary notices do not

always come in the form of speeches but may also come as narrations such as those at

Josh 12, Judg 2:11–19, and 2 Kgs 17:7–20.[14] *So, the broad theological perspective of

Josh 23:16 is a major controlling factor in the books of Joshua and Judges*.

In general, the literary structure of the book of Joshua offers the conquest

narratives (Josh 1–12) and tribal-geographic lists (Josh 13:1—21:42),[15] with the

traditions in Josh 22–24 affixed as appendices.[16] Judges may be organized, again in

general, around a pragmatic collection (Judg 2:6—15:20) that includes an epic prologue

(Judg 2:6—3:6), with a Deuteronomic framework (Judg 2:1–5; 6:7–10; 10:6–16; 16:1—

18:31), and a later Deuteronomistic framework (Judg 1:1–36; 19:1—21:25).[17] These

simplified constructs from a past generation are useful, but insufficient for our purposes.

---

[12] Noth, *Deuteronomistic History*, 19. Cf. 1 Sam 12:24–25, "fear the LORD, and serve him. . . .
But if you still do wickedly, you shall be swept away, both you and your king" (NRSV).

[13] Noth, *Deuteronomistic History*, 19.

[14] Noth, *Deuteronomistic History*, 19–20.

[15] Boling, *Joshua*, 60.

[16] Soggin, *Joshua*, 3.

[17] Boling, *Judges*, 30.

The increased interest in biblical narrative as literature in the past few decades as an academic activity[18] generated several studies that deal specifically with the book of Judges.[19] Recognition of the literary artistry and coherence of the broader book-length narrative is generally the defining feature of those studies. That approach is less straightforward for Joshua, likely due to its considerable portion of non-narrative, list-like writing in Josh 12–21, even though most of it is within a narrative framework. *This study is based on an appreciation of the literary artistry and relative coherence of the narratives under consideration*.

It is worth noting that the two books of Joshua and Judges have lain beside each other—in that order—in the codices from at least early Christian times.[20] The focus of this study reflects the notion that this observation concerning their linkage in that way is meaningful. So then, a textlinguistic narrative approach to the transition between the MT of the two books need not completely ignore the historical nature of the writing. The state of recent scholarship on the matter of the transition as discussed in *Book-Seams in the Hexateuch 1*[21] was succinctly posited by Christian Frevel as follows.

> 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; 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

---

[18] Especially since the 1981 publication of Alter, *Art of Biblical Narrative*.

[19] E.g., Bal, *Death and Dissymmetry*; Gros Louis, "Book of Judges"; Klein, *Triumph of Irony*; Webb, *Integrated Reading*.

[20] Samuel, "Attestation of the Book-Seam," 187; Dozeman, *Joshua 1–12*, 34–43; Smith and Bloch-Smith, *Judges 1*, 7n40.

[21] Berner and Samuel, *Book-Seams in the Hexateuch 1*, 187–380.

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 (if one were to accept a Hexateuch), which accentuates or dissolves the boundaries of the "books" concerned.[22]

In view of the quite divergent proposals now available with respect to diachronic analysis of the so-called book-seam between Joshua and Judges in that compilation of essays—in effect a significant stalemate between *yes* and *no* answers to the question of a genuine book-seam—the application of a textlinguistic discourse analysis methodology as a narrative approach has potential to clarify the meaning and purpose of specific elements of the overlapping and juxtaposed presentations. In particular, and for example, *the near-duplicate notice of the events surrounding the death of Joshua can be seen, by means of subtle changes in the discourse, to emphasize the speed and depth of the apostasy of the people of Israel following the death of Joshua in the book of Judges as compared to the book of Joshua.*

The juxtaposition of these two books, and the duplication of various traditions in new settings, draw our attention to continuities and discontinuities that come into view at the book-seam of Joshua and Judges. So first, the historical and literary evidence will be examined to determine if Judges (or for that matter Joshua also) ought to be considered an independent book—perhaps fitted in toward the end of the compositional history of the larger corpus—or as essentially just part of a larger single composition (Deuteronomistic History or Enneateuch) not necessarily delineated by significant literary markers or boundaries at the places where the book-seams currently sit.[23] That the character (Joshua) and temporal (*wayəhî* [usually translated something like "and it so

---

[22] Frevel, "Untying Tangles," 281.
[23] Cf., e.g., Amit, "Who Was Interested?" 103; Frolov, "Rethinking Judges," 25–28.

happened," or simply left untranslated]) connection between Josh 24:29 and Judg 1:1

"forges a link between the two texts"[24] across the canonical boundary is seen by some as

a sign of a unique narrative beginning,[25] or conversely, a resumption or continuation.[26]

Second, a precise textlinguistically-informed narrative description needs to be made of

the *overlap* (*or not*) of material at the book-seam of Josh 23–24 and Judg 1:1—3:11, and

in the introductory material of Judges with the conquest and other material of the book of

Joshua—specifically, for example, comparison of Josh 8:10–23; 12:9, 16 with Judg 1:22–

26 (the sacking of Ai/Bethel), Josh 10:1–5, 22–27; 12:10 with Judg 1:1–8 (Adoni

Zedek/Bezek), Josh 14:6–15; 15:13–19 with Judg 1:9–16, 20 (allotment to Caleb), Josh

15:63 with Judg 1:8, 21 (Jebusites persist in Jerusalem), Josh 16:10 with Judg 1:29

(allotment to Josephites [Ephraim]), Josh 17:11–31 with Judg 1:27–28 (allotment to

Josephites [Manasseh]), Josh 17:14–18 with Judg 1:19 (Josephites complain about their

allotment), *and especially* Josh 24:28–33 with Judg 1:1; 2:6–10 (the death of Joshua).[27]

To be sure, some of the ideological distinctives between the two books are already

well-known. For example, the pre-eminence of Judah in Judg 1,[28] the anti-Benjaminite

stance of Judg 19–21,[29] and the generally Ephraimite-friendly stance of the book of

Joshua,[30] were recognized through previous historical-critical approaches. Some of those

---

[24] Frolov, "Rethinking Judges," 33.

[25] E.g., Moore, *Judges*, 10; Sasson, *Judges 1–12*, 123–24; Smith and Bloch-Smith, *Judges 1*, 58; Soggin, *Judges*, 20. Boda and Conway understood *wayəhî* temporal clauses as "An initial marker of a new paragraph in the narrative backbone that establishes a past tense narrative" (*Judges*, 66).

[26] Frolov, "Rethinking Judges," 33, who wrote "As far as syntax is concerned, Judg1:1–26 properly belongs, in defiance of the canonical division, with Joshua rather than the balance of Judges." Similarly, for Tammi Schneider, "According to the conventions of Hebrew narrative, the first word, *wayəhî*, signals the resumption or continuation of an ongoing narrative" (*Judges*, 2). Lindars took a moderating view (*Judges 1–5*, 3).

[27] Dozeman, *Joshua 1–12*, 25. See also Soggin, *Joshua*, 101–4 on Josh 7–8 and Judg 1:22–26.

[28] Lindars, *Judges 1–5*, 5–7.

[29] Amit, *Book of Judges*, 341–50.

[30] Nelson, *Joshua*, 8. Nonetheless, he notes that the story mostly takes place "in Benjaminite territory (and) the editorial outlook is distinctly Judahite."

theological and narrative differences are already advanced above. *What will be new in this study is the textlinguistically-controlled narrative approach that elicits both the continuities and discontinuities evident especially at the transition/overlap between the books.*

Because I have indicated that *textlinguistics* will be the essence of the methodological approach of this study, the term deserves a brief introduction at this point even though I will describe the method in detail in the following chapter. I will generally follow Robert E. Longacre's understanding of it as a disciplinary subset of the broader study area of *text theory* in which "the intersection of the morphosyntax and the discourse/pragmatic structure" is examined.[31] Traditional grammar is usually focused on describing relationships within the bounds of the clause and sentence, and often struggles to provide useful guidance on deixis, anaphoric and cataphoric participant reference, nuances of verb usage, and spatio-temporal relationships between sentences and within a paragraph.[32] The main concern of textlinguistics is to describe how plot or logical progression, dialogue relations, role relations, and spatio-temporal relations are formulated in a discourse.[33] The textlinguistic foundation of Longacre's discourse analysis shall be used as a control on inconsistent and incompatible narrative readings of the *overlap* (i.e., overall perspectives, synoptic passages, and the book-seam) of the books of Joshua and Judges. This approach has the benefit of providing more adequate assessments of the narratives based on observations of features in the text (e.g., typical verb forms that carry the main line of a discourse) that can often be explained better by

---

[31] Longacre, *Grammar of Discourse* (1996), 5.
[32] Longacre, *Grammar of Discourse* (1996), 1.
[33] Longacre, *Grammar of Discourse* (1996), 2.

quantitatively demonstrated textlinguistic data than they can by traditional sentence grammar approaches. This, in turn, ought to generate better understandings and interpretations of the stories and their places in the books.

I have already implied above a certain dissatisfaction with narrative approaches *in general*. This is primarily due to the subjectivity of their overarching evaluations. A comparison of main findings of a few will suffice as an example. Concerning the book of Judges, Barry G. Webb indicated "that the fundamental issue which the book as a whole addresses is the non-fulfilment of Yahweh's oath sworn to the patriarchs (to give Israel the whole land)."[34] For Lillian R. Klein, the basic point of the book was the deteriorating relationship between the LORD and the people of Israel.[35] Mieke Bal deliberately pursued a marginal reading of Judges that put the focus on "the institutional violence of the social order."[36] For Kenneth R. R. Gros Louis, the narrative of Judges is designed "to illustrate a theory of history, to underline God's abiding love for his people."[37]

The key question, nonetheless, remains. How can the books of Joshua and Judges be capably described as a continuous narrative in the MT as we now have it?

1.2 Thesis Statement

The narrative features of plot, characterization, and temporal and spatial markers, as elicited through the application of textlinguistic discourse analysis, provide evidence for the distinct theological and ideological perspectives of the books of Joshua and Judges, particularly at the book-seam and in the synoptic passages. This study will demonstrate

---

[34] Webb, *Integrated Reading*, 208.
[35] Klein, *Triumph of Irony*, 18–20.
[36] Bal, *Death and Dissymmetry*, 231.
[37] Gros Louis, "Book of Judges," 162.

distinct presentations between Joshua and Judges, the former having a more permissive and ambiguous view of Israel's obedience and the latter a more severe outlook on the speed and depth of Israel's apostasy, through a narrative approach constituted by the application of textlinguistic discourse analysis to the overlapping and transitional material. This study will clarify interpretive issues concerning the transition from Joshua to Judges created by the apparent juxtaposition of separate and compositionally complex works into a continuing narrative, and contribute a useful methodology to constrain the inherent subjectivity of narrative approaches in general.

1.3 Structure of the Dissertation

This introductory chapter includes the rationale for the study (diachronic analysis is at something of a stalemate), the basic reasons for using the particular methodology it does (potential for breaking the logjam with new, text-based observations, as opposed to typically subjective narrative approaches), an outline of the main points of the thesis, and a prospective indication of the main conclusions. The pertinent texts are identified (in the main, Josh 23–24 and Judg 1:1—3:11, as well as other synoptic passages in the book of Joshua) as part of the rationale.

Investigation specifically into the transition between Joshua and Judges (and the comparison with the transition from Genesis to Exodus!) has received increased interest recently[38]—however niche it may be considered in the mainstream of scholarship—but it has been almost exclusively of a diachronic nature. The additional questions posed above concerning this examination of the book-seam between Joshua and Judges, and the

---

[38] Berner and Samuel, *Book-Seams in the Hexateuch 1*.

treatment they have received in a selected share of scholarly literature since the time of Noth, will be discussed in some detail within the context of the larger discussion surrounding the composition of the Deuteronomistic History and/or the Hexateuch.

The following chapter will focus on the textlinguistic discourse analysis method used to evaluate the Joshua–Judges book-seam, and the reasons for choosing it. Key catalysts in the development of rhetorical and narrative approaches to biblical material, and the development of the textlinguistic approach of Pike and Longacre will be reviewed. Narrative approaches to the Primary History (Enneateuch) proliferated in the last quarter of the last century, so the utility of some key elements of literary theory as they have been applied to the biblical narratives will be noted, especially with respect to Judges. The essence of the methodology will be the application of the most important elements of narrative approaches (foregrounding and backgrounding, spatio-temporal aspects, characterization, and perspective and point of view as they pertain to plot development) as practiced through the use of Summer Institute of Linguistics (SIL) discourse analysis, which functions as a control mechanism on the inherent subjectivity of narrative approaches in general. *The textlinguistic features of discourse analysis as proposed by Longacre and further developed by others will be the primary method of analysis of the pertinent texts and will be explained in some detail*.

In Chs. 3 and 4 the relevant texts in Joshua and Judges will be analyzed with a focus on the narratives and the embedded direct speech of Josh 23–24 and Judg 1:1—3:11. The synoptic portions of Josh 8–17, including embedded expository discourse, will also be of some importance as they relate to the opening of Judges. Narrative interpretation will be presented as deductions from the analyses.

The concluding chapter will be a comparison of analyses and summary of findings. The fundamental supposition of this study is that the books of Joshua and Judges present distinct ideologies or theologies—sometimes subtle but present nonetheless—and that those distinctives are notable at the transition and repetitions from one book to the other. The question of how those corresponding portions of the two books function in each of the books will be the aim of the comparison. The application of discourse analysis as a control mechanism on the subjectivity of narrative approaches to biblical narrative is a crucial outcome of this study and its exploration will be summarized. The summary of findings from the synchronic analysis will also be brought into conversation with diachronic approaches to the problem of the book-seam to determine what mutual benefit can be shared between the diachronic and synchronic methodological outcomes.

The remainder of this present chapter consists of a survey of important elements relating to the compositional issues surrounding the transition from Joshua to Judges within the context of the larger discussion of a Hexateuch, the Deuteronomistic History, and an Enneateuch.

1.4 Key Research Judgments of the Past Concerning the Joshua–Judges Book-seam

1.4.1 Introduction to the Research Trajectory that Begins with
the Deuteronomistic History Hypothesis of Martin Noth

Scholarly investigation into the transition between Joshua and Judges has previously been overwhelmingly diachronic in character. This emphasis is important to an examination of the transition in a narrative sense—as the historical approaches tended to deal primarily with the literary issues of composition and editing—even if the purposes of those

traditional studies were *more* focused on understanding the historical processes involved in the creation of the text than they were on understanding the meaning of the existing text. At the forefront, the movement from the book of Joshua to the book of Judges is of singular importance to the Deuteronomistic History hypothesis of Martin Noth; an examination of the second chapter to his 1943 wartime publication *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien*, on the "Merkmale der planvollen Geschlossenheit,"[39] will reveal that he chose to concentrate some effort on that relatively small segment of the History (i.e., Josh 23:1–Judg 3:6) because of the sharp contrast in outlook between the conclusion to Joshua and the introduction to Judges.[40] Whereas his hypothesis has as its basis that the "retrospective and anticipatory reflections at certain important points in the history (are) a characteristic which strongly supports the thesis that Dtr was conceived as a unified and self-contained whole,"[41] he has also been correctly understood to have judged "dass die deuteronomistischen Zusatze sich nicht in der Kommentierung der Uberlieferung erschopfen, sondern Klammern sind, die den ubergreifenden literarischen Zusammenhang allererst herstellen."[42] Additionally, by 1938 Noth had already published the prewar first edition of his commentary on Joshua in which he had challenged the general scholarly consensus of the time that the pentateuchal Documentary Hypothesis extended in its applicability through the book of Joshua, putting in jeopardy the then current notion of a Hexateuch. He stated that "die vor allem an der Genesis erprobten literarkritischen Thesen am Josua-Buche sich nicht in derselben

---

[39] Noth, *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien* (Studies on the History of Tradition, "Evidence that the Work is a Self-contained Whole"), 3–12. The first part of that collection of studies is translated into English as *The Deuteronomistic History*.

[40] Noth, *Deuteronomistic History*, 20.

[41] Noth, *Deuteronomistic History*, 20.

[42] Levin, "Nach siebzig Jahren," 76 (that the deuteronomistic additions are not limited to commenting on the tradition, but are frames that create the overarching literary context in the first place).

einleuchtenden Weise bewähren wie dort, vor allem deswegen, weil es nicht recht

gelingen will, für die angenommenen durchlaufenden Erzählungsfäden je in sich

geschlossene Zusammenhänge zu gewinnen."[43] In the 1953 revision of his commentary

on Joshua he added that "Auf das Buch Josua sind also die an der Pentateuch-Erzählung

bewährten literarkritischen Ergebnisse nicht ohne weiteres zu übertragen."[44] There is,

nonetheless, the recognition in Noth's assessment of the scholarly consensus of the time

that Joshua quite naturally *appears* to be the continuation, and even a conclusion of sorts,

to the story depicted in the Pentateuch—that being the possession of the land by the

descendants of those ancestors to whom it was promised. The idea of a Hexateuch was,

therefore, comprehensible to him even though he rejected it based on his analysis of

Joshua. Thus, the substance of his rejection of that model was first, the apparent lack of

coherent primary linkages between the presentation of the pentateuchal sources in

whatever form they might be thought to take (e.g., Rudolf Smend with J^1 and J^{2},[45] Otto

Eissfeldt with L and J,[46] Gerhard von Rad with P^A and P^{B},[47] and Wilhelm Rudolph with E

as an independent narrator[48]),[49] second, the lack of any kind of consistent literary thread

of any of these sources in the book of Joshua, and third, the stories in Joshua that he

viewed as different in kind, in that they decisively reflect a perspective of being settled in

---

[43] Noth, *Josua* (1938), viii. (The literary-critical theses that have been tested primarily on Genesis do not prove to be as convincing in the book of Joshua as they do [in Genesis], mainly because it is not really possible to gain a coherent connection for the assumed continuous narrative threads [in Joshua].)

[44] Noth, *Josua* (1953), 8. (The literary-critical results proven for the pentateuchal narrative cannot simply be transferred to the book of Joshua.)

[45] Smend, *Erzählung des Hexateuch*, 279–352.

[46] Eissfeldt, *Hexateuch-synopse*, 66–88.

[47] Von Rad, *Priesterschrift im Hexateuch*, 148–66.

[48] Rudolph, *Elohist*.

[49] Noth, *Josua* (1953), 8.

the land *after* the facts being articulated.[50] For these reasons Noth rejected the possibility

of productively applying the pentateuchal source-critical methods to Joshua.

Noth was motivated to explain the transition between Joshua and Judges because,

of all the transitions between eras in the Deuteronomistic History, it was the only one that

was seriously problematic on a literary basis.[51] He was particularly critical of Rudolph's

idea that two parallel deuteronomistic *threads* could be discerned there,[52] and would

spend some effort arguing specifically against Rudolph's attempts to explain the

conflicting perspectives of the text.[53] It is useful to understand some of the details of

Rudolph's and Noth's approaches—*within the wider context of the two books*—to the

movement from Joshua to Judges, in order to lay a foundation for some later

examinations of the book-seam.

1.4.2 Wilhelm Rudolf's Position on Joshua 23–24 and Judges 1:1—3:6

Rudolph's presentation of the issue in his 1938 publication of *Der* "*Elohist*" *von Exodus*

bis Josua (obviously just prior to Noth's commentary as Noth makes numerous

references to this work of Rudolph in the commentary)[54] is reasonably typical of the

general scholarly consensus of his time in many respects. Rudolph did, however, differ

from most others in his view that Joshua's narrative source was based primarily on J

(with some P, particularly in the lists of Josh 13–22), rather than in combination with E

(which he did not view as a continuous source like J, and which he did not find at all in

---

[50] Noth, *Josua* (1953), 8.
[51] Noth, *Deuteronomistic History*, 24.
[52] Noth, *Deuteronomistic History*, 22. Cf. Rudolph, *Elohist*, 243.
[53] Noth, *Deuteronomistic History*, 20–24.
[54] Noth, *Josua* (1938), xv.

Joshua). He thought that there was a later deuteronomic shaping, then deuteronomistic

adaptation, and finally, numerous additions and glosses.[55] That he generally viewed the

deuteronomistic Josh 13:1–6 and ch. 23—with many conquests remaining to be

accomplished—as *not* being at odds with the deuteronomic Josh 1–12, which clearly

indicates a complete conquest of the land, he attributed to the general misunderstanding

by later editors that the *remaining nations* are considered the original inhabitants of

Canaan, rather than others on the periphery![56] This idea, of course, anticipated the fact

that in Judges many of the oppressions come from Israel's external enemies. He thought

possession of the *additional* surrounding land remained conditional to *future* generations

on continued obedience. The inability or unwillingness to drive out inhabitants (Josh

13:13; 15:63; 16:10; 17:12–13) were, according to Rudolph, later deuteronomistic

insertions and glosses, based on editors not understanding the differentiation between the

former inhabitants of the land that had been driven out (cf. Josh 23:8–9) and those

peoples that continued to surround the promised land.

Rudolph's interpretation of Josh 13 in its context, however, remains problematic.

He rightly understood that "faßt man ירשׁ als 'erobern,' so widerspricht die Aussage der

Meinung von Kap. 11, wonach die Eroberung abgeschlossen ist; faßt man ירשׁ als 'in

Besitz nehmen,' so steht dieser Auffassung von v. 1bβ entgegen, daß bisher von einer

Inbesitznahme von Teilen des Landes noch gar nicht die Rede war."[57] His solution,

---

[55] Rudolph, *Elohist*, 164–253. He was generally in conversation with the works of Karl Budde (*Richter und Samuel* and *Richter*), Otto Eissfeldt (*Hexateuch-synopse* and *Quellen des Richterbuches*), Rudolf Smend (*Erzählung des Hexateuch*), Martin Noth (*System der zwölf Stämme Israels*), Otto Procksch (*Elohimquelle*), and Heinrich Holzinger (in the "Josua" section of Kautzsch and Bertholet [*Heilige Schrift des AT*[4]]).

[56] Rudolph, *Elohist*, 240–41.

[57] Rudolph, *Elohist*, 211. (If one takes ירשׁ to mean "conquer," then the statement contradicts the opinion of ch. 11, according to which the conquest is complete; if one takes ירשׁ to mean "take possession,"

however, was to understand Josh 13:1bβ, וְהָאָרֶץ נִשְׁאֲרָה הַרְבֵּה־מְאֹד לְרִשְׁתָּהּ "and very much land remains to possess," as meaning only that the land that had already been conquered needed then to be *settled* (conveniently removing הַרְבֵּה־מְאֹד "very much" as a gloss in order to dampen down the harshness of the appraisal), and then jumping to v. 7 where Joshua is ordered by the LORD to apportion the land as inheritances.[58] Verses 2–6 and 9–12 he considered glosses (based on the aforementioned misunderstanding between the heartland and the periphery) inserted into the J story, and accentuated by the deuteronomistic v. 13 that was a necessary corrective based on the outlook of Josh 23 that assumed that former inhabitants of the land had remained among the Israelites.[59] A problem remaining for Rudolph's compositional history scheme, nevertheless, is how to account for the *retention/reinsertion* of all the J (and any other pre-existing) material of Josh 13:8—19:50, which clearly interrupts the deuteronomistic shaping of the narrative that moved relatively smoothly from Josh 13:7 to 23:2 (at least in a previous iteration that had Joshua actually allotting territories) with, *perhaps*, a route through Josh 22:1–6 where Joshua sends the two and one-half Transjordanian tribes home. A related issue then must also be how to cogently account for the even later integration of P, which he saw *restricted* to that same section of the book—Josh 13–22.[60] Rudolph cannot be faulted for ignorance of Noth's theory of a Deuteronomistic History—which would only be published later—and the revolutionary perspective it would instigate, but the general

---

then this interpretation of v. 1bβ contradicts the fact that up to now there has been no mention of taking possession of parts of the land.)

[58] Rudolph, *Elohist*, 211.

[59] Rudolph, *Elohist*, 212–13.

[60] Rudolph, *Elohist*, 241, 281. The integration of Josh 13:8—19:50 interrupts the command-obedient execution response from Josh 13:7 (through 14:1–5; 18:1–10; 19:51?) to 23:2 that is characteristic of Joshua (though the actual narrator's note of Joshua's obedient execution may have been left out at some point in the expansion of the narrative, or finds itself pre-emptively at Josh 11:23).

questions still remain: why, and how, did Josh 13:8—22:35, complete with all of its

deuteronomistic (and priestly) flourishes, find its way into the finished product? Rudolph

really did not answer these questions in a satisfactory way.

Rudolph agreed with Rudolf Smend[61] that the deuteronomistic Josh 23 was a

replacement for Josh 24 (which was mostly J for Rudolph [against Smend,[62] Eissfeldt,[63]

and Noth[64] at the time]) because the Deuteronomist found mention of Shechem and the

stone that was set up there offensive.[65] He wrote that only Josh 24:28–30 // Judg 2:6, 8–9

was kept, with Judg 2:6 being the dismissal of the assembly of Josh 23, which it directly

continues; the Deuteronomist would then have inserted Judg 2:7, 10 about the good

generation of Joshua's time and the one afterward that did not know the LORD.[66]

Rudolph believed that Judg 2:13 is redundant based on vv. 11–12, that the testing notices

(Judg 2:22; 3:4) are directly dependent on Josh 23:13, and that Judg 3:3 is a summary of

Josh 13:2b–6a; "ist Jos 23; Jdc 2:6–10, 13, 20–22; 3:1a, 3, 4, 6 der einheitliche

deuteronomische Abschluß des Josuabuchs, der zugleich auf die Richterperiode

überleitet."[67] He was of the opinion that a later Deuteronomist added Judg 1:1—2:5, and

altered the previous outlook of obedience to the LORD to one of disobedience and

potential punishment.[68] This second Deuteronomist repudiated the former view of the

---

[61] Rudolph, *Elohist*, 241; Smend, *Erzählung des Hexateuch*, 315.
[62] Smend thought Josh 24 was a conclusion to the E story (*Erzählung des Hexateuch*, 334).
[63] Eissfeldt broke Josh 24 down into mostly E with some L source material, and the mention of Shechem and vv. 26b, 27b as J (*Hexateuch-synopse*, 248–50).
[64] Noth would publish the first edition of his *Josua* commentary later this same year in which he would repudiate the use of JE in Josh 24, positing instead that it contained other old traditional material adapted by a later Deuteronomist who affixed it as an appendix to the book (*Josua* [1938], 107–8).
[65] Rudolph, *Elohist*, 241, 279–81.
[66] Rudolph, *Elohist*, 241.
[67] Rudolph, *Elohist*, 242. (Josh 23; Judg 2:6–10, 13, 20–22; 3:1a, 3, 4, 6 is the coherent deuteronomic conclusion of the book of Joshua, which at the same time leads into the time of the judges.)
[68] Rudolph, *Elohist*, 242.

book of Joshua that seduction to apostasy only came from the periphery and made it come from the inhabitants of the land (cf. Judg 1:1—2:5, 23; and especially 3:5).[69] Judges 2:11–12, (13), 14–19 (though v. 17 is a later gloss)[70] "geben . . . eine Überschau über die verheerenden Auswirkungen dieses Zustands in der Folgezeit."[71] Rudolph disavowed the leading position of the day that Josh 23 + Judg 2:6–9, and Josh 24 + Judg 1:1—2:5, constitute a double ending to Joshua and a double beginning to Judges.[72] It was his opinion that the earlier Deuteronomist concluded Joshua with ch. 23, and the later one began a separate book of Judges with 1:1—2:5 (+ 2:11–12, 14–16, 18–19, 23; 3:5), *thus bracketing an already existing Josh 24*, with the later Deuteronomist of Judges distinguished by the more severe outlook on the generation of Joshua,[73] but only explicitly so *perhaps* in Judg 2:1–5; the censure of Judg 2:11—3:1 is explicitly for the following generation(s) in Rudolph's scheme. This also discounts the temporal notice of Judg 1:1aα that Joshua has already died, as *editorial*.[74] This view raises the question even more forcefully: why then would a later Deuteronomist or editor even bother to keep Josh 24?

Rudolph considered Josh 24 to be uniformly J (i.e., not composed from multiple sources, and he argues strongly against any E on both linguistic and content grounds) though containing a number of additions and corrections.[75] However, he thought the text still remains confused as evidenced in part in Josh 24:5–7 by alternating "you" and "your

---

[69] Rudolph, *Elohist*, 242–43.
[70] Rudolph, *Elohist*, 243n2.
[71] Rudolph, *Elohist*, 243. (Provide . . . an overview of the devastating effects of this situation in the period that followed.)
[72] Rudolph, *Elohist*, 243, 243n2, 249.
[73] Rudolph, *Elohist*, 243.
[74] Rudolph, *Elohist*, 243n1.
[75] Rudolph, *Elohist*, 244, 248–49.

fathers" nomenclature, the third person reference to the LORD by the LORD in direct speech at v. 7, the addition of the seven nations at v. 11 in the context of the battle with Jericho, and the mention of "the two kings of the Amorites" in v. 12 which would be better connected with v. 8.[76] Rudolph did note however, that there are problems that remain in that Josh 24 presents a situation that goes against the combined tradition of J and E that puts the inauguration of the people's worship of the LORD at Sinai in Exod 19 and 24 (however, there is the apparent recognition by the people that they *already* worshiped the LORD in Josh 24:16).[77] The solution provided by Rudolph is that the Shechem covenant is to be understood as the incorporation of tribes that had come from the east and that had not been in Egypt.[78] The J strand would then have moved directly from Josh 19:50 to Josh 24.[79] Joshua 24, nevertheless, does not have the sense of a farewell speech coming at the end of Joshua's life like Josh 23 does (see especially Josh 24:15b where Joshua expects to go on serving), so its placement between Josh 23 and Judg 1 as part of a narrative that continues into the book of Judges remains awkward.

The ending of Joshua in 24:29–33 was, likewise, for Rudolph a continuation of J except for the deuteronomistic v. 31 (incorporated from Judg 2:7)—he mentions its transposition to before Joshua's death in the LXX as well as the other additions found there as supporting evidence for its secondary nature.[80]

---

[76] Rudolph wrote that glosses in Josh 24:1–15 include vv. 1bα, 2aδ, 5aα, 6aα,b, 7a, 10a, mention of the seven nations in v. 11, and the two kings in vv. 12a, 12b (*Elohist*, 246–47); and glosses in Josh 24:16–28 include וְאֶת־אֲבוֹתֵינוּ "and our fathers" in v. 17a, 17bα, וְ אֶת־כָּל־הָעַמִּים "all the peoples and" in v. 18a, and vv. 19–21, 22b, 26a, 27b (*Elohist*, 249).

[77] Rudolph, *Elohist*, 250.

[78] Rudolph, *Elohist*, 251.

[79] Rudolph, *Elohist*, 281.

[80] Rudolph, *Elohist*, 252–53.

According to Rudolph, the deuteronomistic Judg 2:1–5 provides comment on Judg 1:1–20 and 1:21–36, that being that the Israelites had been disobedient in making alliances with the inhabitants of the land.[81] He recognized that much of Judg 1 did not support the Deuteronomist's conclusion with respect to their disobedience at Judg 2:2b— indeed, Judg 1:1–20 has no negative judgement until vv. 18–19 (if one follows LXX; if one follows MT, only v. 19b is negative).[82] The second half of Judg 1 is divided into a positive section (vv. 22–26 about the House of Joseph and the taking of Bethel) and a negative part (vv. 21, 27–36 about Benjamin, Manasseh, Ephraim and the others).[83] Rudolph also recognized that the lack of a negative view in the text concerning the agreements between the Israelites with Rahab (Josh 2), the Gibeonites (Josh 9) and the man from Luz/Bethel (Judg 1:23–26) do not fit with the deuteronomic outlook of Judg 2:2, and that there is a difference between the "could not" and "would not drive out" notices of the negative second half of Judg 1, which he saw as evidence of a pro-Judean compiler.[84]

Rudolph's contention that the book of Joshua (and Judg 1) contains older written traditions that were later shaped by a deuteronomic writer, and even later adapted by deuteronomistic editors, is supported somewhat by the literary evidence. Much less certain are his theories that the older traditions are a continuation of the pentateuchal J source, or that significant blocks of P material were inserted into the book in the final stages of composition; the P-like character of stretches of the text of Josh 13–22 is more likely a result of redactional activity and the incorporation of administrative

---

[81] Rudolph, *Elohist*, 263.
[82] Rudolph, *Elohist*, 264, 267n2.
[83] Rudolph, *Elohist*, 264.
[84] Rudolph, *Elohist*, 264–65.

documentation. Whereas Rudolph was not particularly clear, at times, in differentiating between the deuteronomic disposition of the original shaping, and the later deuteronomistic adaptation, Noth was correct in his characterization of Rudolph as principally advancing two distinct Deuteronomists, one that wrote Judges and one that later shaped Joshua with the ch. 23 ending (with an even later editor joining the two books).[85] Where Rudolph was particularly unclear is in attributing Judg 1:1—2:5 overall to a certain Deuteronomist when, on the other hand, he was quite clear that he understood that Judg 1 is all pre-Yahwistic (with the exception of v. 20 that he considered J).[86] His scheme of two distinct, yet intertwined, Deuteronomists working in tandem is unnecessarily complicated. Nevertheless, where Rudolph was particularly insightful for our purpose is in his view of the *narrative* relationship between Judg 2:7 and 2:10. "Aus Eigenem fügt der Deuteronomiker Jdc 2:7 ein, um nachher in 2:10 die grundsätzliche Änderung berichten zu können, die mit dem Tode Josuas und seiner Generation im religiösen Verhalten Israels eintrat."[87] Even though it may no longer be possible to determine definitively the original placement of the notice concerning the Israelites serving the LORD throughout Joshua's life—i.e., before Joshua's death as here in Judg 2:7,[88] or after his death as in Josh 24:31[89]—arguments for *both* positions support a *literary* reason for its specific placement at Judg 2:7.

---

[85] Noth, *Deuteronomistic History*, 20. Cf. especially Rudolph, *Elohist*, 240–44.

[86] Rudolph, *Elohist*, 242.

[87] Rudolph, *Elohist*, 241. (The Deuteronomist inserted Judg 2:7 on his own initiative in order to be able to report later in 2:10 the fundamental change that occurred in the religious behavior of Israel with the death of Joshua and his generation.)

[88] Rudolph, *Elohist*, 241n6.

[89] Budde sees its position in Judg 2:7 as being influenced by v. 10 (*Richter*, 21).

1.4.3 Martin Noth's *Josua* Commentaries and *The Deuteronomistic History*

Noth's initial foray into the book of Joshua for the Handbuch zum Alten Testament series

led him to contemplate the notion of the Deuteronomistic History and alter his

understanding of the book's relationship to the Pentateuch. Between the first[90] and

second editions[91] he produced his important work in this respect,

Überlieferungsgeschichtlichen Studien.[92] He considered the position of the book of

Joshua to be critical in the investigation of these matters,[93] and so he dealt extensively

with the tradition history and literary problems of Joshua in both editions of the

commentary. The situation with regard to general literary-critical issues around problems

related to the Pentateuch/Hexateuch evolved considerably within the academy between

the first and second editions of the commentary,[94] and some of this is reflected in the

development of his own positions throughout the period.

The one perspective that Noth was certain of by its presence in the book of Joshua

is the substantial editorial-authorial hand of a Deuteronomist or Deuteronomists. This did

not, however, discount for him the idea that use was made of older independent written

traditions. The central portion of the book—the distribution of the land in Josh 13:1—

21:42—appeared to him to have its own literary history distinct from the conquest

narrative that precedes it, the instructions for life in the settled land that follow it, and the

pentateuchal narrative in general.[95] He also saw disconnects between the stories in Joshua

and those in the Pentateuch that should only be evaluated after the book of Joshua is

---

[90] Noth, *Josua* (1938). Noth also edited the book of "Josuae" (1936) in *BHK*.
[91] Noth, *Josua* (1953).
[92] Noth, *Überlieferungsgeschichtlichen Studien*.
[93] Noth, *Josua* (1953), 6.
[94] Noth, *Josua* (1953), 6.
[95] Noth, *Josua* (1953), 8.

considered on its own terms.[96] Admittedly, the details on the structure of the entire book

of Joshua, and the relationships Noth envisioned between its parts, which follow in this

section, stray from a more modest focus on the seam/synoptics between Joshua and

Judges—but an understanding of some of the foundations upon which Noth's

Deuteronomistic History hypothesis rests is crucial to grasping important compositional

matters.

Noth divided up the literary history of the book into pre-deuteronomistic,

deuteronomistic, and post-deuteronomistic periods, and in fact saw primary and

secondary deuteronomistic hands. Two major deuteronomistic sections—1:1–18 and

21:43—22:6 + 23:1–16—frame the book, in his opinion, providing an introduction that

voices the transition of leadership from Moses to Joshua and moves conquest-wise from

Transjordan to Cisjordan (to include the assistance of those already settled in the

Transjordan area), as well as a conclusion that marks the attainment of the Cisjordan

lands and the return of the Transjordanians to their territories. He also considered as

deuteronomistic the list of defeated kings at 12:1–24, Joshua building the altar at Mount

Ebal at 8:30–35 (cf. Deut 27), Caleb's demand for land at 14:6–15 (cf. Deut 1:22–46) that

closes off that storyline, other assorted notices about the Jordan crossing at 3:2–4, 6–10;

4:6, 7, 10aβ, 12, 14, 21, 22, 24, the conquest of Jericho at 6:4aαb, 5aβ, 8aβb, 12b, 13a,

26, scattered remarks at 2:9b, 10b, 11b; 5:4–7; 8:1aαb, 2aγ, 9bβ, 10, 24, 27bβ; 10:1aβb,

2b, 25; 11:12aβb, 15, and 11:21–23 as an introduction to 14:6aβb–15 that would result in

a deuteronomistic section 11:21–23a + 14:6aβb–15 + 11:28b (= 14:15b). From these

findings he determined that a deuteronomistically edited *book of Joshua* was once part of

_____

[96] Noth, *Josua* (1953), 9.

a great deuteronomistic work of history that spanned the time from Moses onward (through its linkage of Josh 24:31 with Judg 2:7), and which was an independent entity alongside the Pentateuch.[97]

The present form of Joshua however demonstrated for him a second stage of deuteronomistic redaction, in particular, for the central section of 13:1—21:42 that deals with the geographic layout of the tribes. He disputed the assertions of von Rad[98] and Rudolph[99] who, based on its formulaic nature, contended that this section contains a large proportion of P source material. He posited that the many lists derive from this section's own unique prehistory. In his view it was a description of the tribal land holdings that was transformed into a narrative about the distribution of the land and included the person of Joshua in the process. He saw Josh 13:1 and the following account of Moses giving the landholdings to the two and one-half tribes east of the Jordan in ch. 13 as characteristically deuteronomistic, as he did the expansion at ch. 20 on the cities of asylum. The main reason for which he saw this section as secondarily added is the duplication of 13:1a at 23:1b (וִיהוֹשֻׁעַ זָקֵן בָּא בַּיָּמִים "and Joshua had grown old, advanced in days"); he did not believe that they would be so widely separated otherwise, so they actually introduce the last words of the character Joshua at Josh 23:1 and are reused to introduce the distribution of the land at Josh 13:1.[100] A supporting reason he held for a second stage of deuteronomistic editing was what he thought were the clear deuteronomistic comments in ch. 24 at vv. 4bα, 8b, 9b, 10abα, 12a, 13aβb, 17aβbα, 19–24. Now Noth did not believe that this chapter was part of the original deuteronomistic

[97] Noth, *Josua* (1953), 9.
[98] Von Rad, *Priesterschrift im Hexateuch*, 148–66.
[99] Rudolph, *Elohist*, 214–38.
[100] Noth, *Josua* (1953), 10.

work because it conflicts with the picture of a solemn national assembly in which Joshua

gives his farewell speech, but he did concede that in its original form it served as a model

for ch. 23 and was only later incorporated as part of the second stage of deuteronomistic

editing along with the central section on the distribution of the tribal lands.[101]

Noth recognized some post-deuteronomistic expansion of the book of Joshua that

is P-like in form and content.[102] He did not allow that there is a P layer of redaction

present, but only that there are some scattered and non-interrelated additions based on the

later portions of the pentateuchal narrative (e.g., Josh 13:21b–22 // Num 31:8; and Josh

17:2aβb–6 // Num 26:29–34; 27:1–7 [however, in Numbers it is Moses rather than

Eleazar that mediates the judgement regarding Zelophehad's daughters]). The extended

narrative of Josh 22:9–34 concerning the building of the witness on the west bank of the

Jordan by the Transjordanian tribes upon their retreat he considered a revamped

aetiological tradition related to P. These kinds of expansions were to be expected in his

opinion.[103]

He detected other expansions in ch. 13 concerning the tribal lands of Reuben,

Issachar, Asher, and Naphtali based on ch. 21. He thought various geographic place

names throughout the central section derived from the Josianic period and its regional

structure. Notices of lands not occupied in Josh 15:63; 16:10; 17:10b–13; 19:15a, 29bβ,

30a, 38aβ he considered to come from Judg 1:21, 27–36.[104]

---

[101] Noth, *Josua* (1953), 10. In his earlier commentary Noth was of the opinion that the Josh 24 traditions were more directly connected to the traditions of Josh 1–12, and is more ambiguous about its removal by Dtr and later reintroduction in a secondary deuteronomistic stage (*Josua* [1938], 109). In 1943 Noth had repudiated the idea that Josh 24 was a model for Josh 23 (*Deuteronomistic History*, 23n1). Hartmut Rösel would later repeatedly draw attention to Noth's ambivalence on this issue (see e.g., "Nomistische Redaktion," 187n8).
[102] Noth, *Josua* (1953), 10.
[103] Noth, *Josua* (1953), 11.
[104] Noth, *Josua* (1953), 11.

As noted above, Noth recognized older written collections of traditions available to the original deuteronomistic compiler. He dealt with the conquest story (chs. 1–12), the distribution of the land (chs. 13–21), and the appendix (ch. 24) as containing different components of older written tradition complexes. He thought chs. 2–9 were formed into a continuous narrative from a series of aetiological sagas attached primarily to a Gilgal sanctuary (therefore being a special Benjaminite tradition), and that chs. 10 and 11:1–9 were based on battle accounts. In his opinion the Benjaminite tradition may have become expanded to all-Israel during the kingship of Saul. In this manner Noth thought that the name of Joshua may have become attached to the idea of an all-Israel conquest by the hand of the collector of this material and that the connection to Joshua was initially missing from the series of aetiologies at the disposal of that collector. Similarly, the two war stories of chs. 10–11 also could have been elevated to pan-Israelite significance from their originally merely local importance. Based on that collector's lack of knowledge of an Israelite settled Ai (i.e., until the 10th century) in Josh 8:28, and the experience of a united kingdom at the time of the collection (see 11:16), Noth gave a date for that collection of 900 B.C.E. and thought it exhibited a Judean perspective based on the geographical place names used.[105] Most of the land eventually settled was in the central highland area and the traditions attached to those locales knew of a crossing of the Jordan River from east to west. This is the narrative framework into which he considered the traditions were fitted.

The central section of the book where Joshua presides over the distribution of the land was based on two main documentary sources according to Albrecht Alt[106] and

---

[105] Noth, *Josua* (1953), 11–13.
[106] Alt, "System der Stammesgrenzen," 13–24; "Judas Gaue unter Josia," 100–17.

agreed to by Noth. One is very old, dating to pre-monarchic times, which was a *system of tribal borders* composed of a list of fixed points defining the actual and ideal extent of the land holdings. Reuben, Simeon, and Levi are missing from this. The second document was a list of places in the kingdom of Judah according to its division into twelve districts. This regional arrangement is post-Solomonic and the *terminus a quo* for the creation of the document, therefore, must have been the reign of King Josiah of Judah (639–609 BC). The combination of these two documents was necessary due to the incomplete or irrelevant (e.g., Dan being in its northern territory) nature of some of their features. A literary editor would have turned the lists into a single connected narrative. The list of Levitical cities in ch. 21 may have also been incorporated at this time.[107] Noth categorically rejected Sigmund Mowinckel's assumption of a lengthy oral transmission period for these lists extending to post-exilic times.[108] In giving these lists narrative shape the literary editor turned them into a story about the occupation of the land under Joshua according to Noth. The narrative portions include elements of conquest traditions from individual tribes, and the tribes of Judah and Joseph are given pre-eminence as the driving force of the occupation. The reference to Deut 1 in the list of asylum cities at Josh 20 again was seen to provide a *terminus a quo* during the Josianic kingship, and with the complex literary development envisioned by Noth for this central section of the book, he suggested an exilic period provenance for it.[109]

For the final portion of the book Noth indicated that Josh 21:43—23:16—the final exhortations of Joshua—are only deuteronomistic and post-deuteronomistic.[110] Joshua

---

[107] Noth, *Josua* (1953), 13–15.
[108] Noth, *Josua* (1953), 15. Cf. Mowinckel, *Quellen in Josua 13–19*.
[109] Noth, *Josua* (1953), 15.
[110] Noth, *Josua* (1953), 15.

21:43—22:6 and all of ch. 23 are deuteronomistic; Josh 21:43–45 completes the taking of

the land and introduces 22:1–6, which connects back to 1:12–18 concerning the

Transjordanian tribes, and which anticipates elements of Joshua's closing speech at 23:9b

and 14b. Joshua's speech in ch. 23 highlights that Israel had now found *rest* (possession

and security) through the help of the LORD (see Deut 3:20; Josh 1:13, 15; 21:44; 22:4).

The people are admonished to remain separate from the people around them, whose

presence is conspicuous and somewhat incongruous with the later addition of the

enigmatic v. 4.[111] The P-like narrative of Josh 22:9–34 concerns itself with the single

place of worship as a requirement (Shiloh in this case) and has as its main character

Phinehas rather than Joshua. Noth noted in respect to this narrative the secondary

connection of the half-tribe of Manasseh compared with the Reubenites and Gadites

alone as found in vv. 25, 32–34. Whatever old aetiological tradition lay behind this

narrative has been obscured by its reshaping into a warning against foreign cults.[112] Noth

did not believe that Kurt Möhlenbrink's thesis[113] of a rivalry between amphictyonic

sanctuaries at Shiloh and on the Jordan River can be sustained, but was intrigued by the

notion that an Elide priest from Shiloh named Phinehas is also mentioned at 1 Sam 1:3;

4:4, etc., which suggested to him that these traditions are old.[114]

In Josh 24:1–33 there is a preserved foundation of pre-deuteronomistic tradition

in the events recounted that is connected with the traditions underlying chs. 1–12, but

---

[111] Noth, *Josua* (1953), 133. רְאוּ הִפַּלְתִּי לָכֶם אֶת־הַגּוֹיִם הַנִּשְׁאָרִים הָאֵלֶּה בְּנַחֲלָה לְשִׁבְטֵיכֶם מִן־הַיַּרְדֵּן וְכָל־הַגּוֹיִם אֲשֶׁר הִכְרַתִּי וְהַיָּם הַגָּדוֹל מְבוֹא הַשָּׁמֶשׁ "Consider, I have allotted to you these remaining nations as an inheritance to your tribes, from the Jordan—and/now all the nations that I had cut down—(to) the Great Sea at the setting of the sun."

[112] Noth, *Josua* (1953), 133–34.

[113] Möhlenbrink, "Landnahmesagen," 246–50.

[114] Noth, *Josua* (1953), 135.

which are not connected literarily in the book as it stands, according to Noth.[115] He considered the account of the assembly of the leadership at Shechem a special tradition passed on but supplanted in favour of the account of ch. 23 by the primary Deuteronomist and only adapted as a duplicate account in the secondary deuteronomistic revision.[116] The deuteronomistic comments in Josh 24:4bα, 8b, 9b, 10abα, 12a, 13aβb, 17aβbα, 19–24 were already noted above and Noth made extensive comparisons with their connections to, and disconnections from, for example, the story in Num 22–24 (Balaam),[117] the "hornet" driving out the two Amorite kings (cf. Exod 23:28; Deut 7:20),[118] and the prediction the LORD made to Moses at Deut 31:16 emerging as a variant in the mouth of Joshua at 24:20–23. He considered it likely that the language of Josh 24:19–24 is deuteronomistic and gave some specific examples—אלהים "(holy) God" (plural *construct*) and קנוא "jealous" (v. 19), and אלהי (ה)נכר "foreign gods" (vv. 20, 23).[119] Like Rudolph, he drew attention to instances of confusion between the generation of the exodus (their "fathers") and the generation of the conquest and the alternation between second (you/your) and third person (they/them) references (vv. 5–7, 17, 25–27). This led him to differentiate speech that views the different generations as a unity and speech that carefully distinguishes the different generations.[120] He also noted the incongruous third person reference to the LORD in v. 7 of the so-called Yahweh-speech as a textual issue, panning the LXX's adjustment of reference to the LORD in the third person throughout as a secondary imposition of uniformity.[121] The use of the holy war idiom וָאֶתֵּן אוֹתָם בְּיֶדְכֶם

---

[115] Noth, *Josua* (1953), 137.
[116] Noth, *Josua* (1953), 139.
[117] Noth, *Josua* (1953), 135.
[118] Noth, *Josua* (1953), 135.
[119] Noth, *Josua* (1953), 136.
[120] Noth, *Josua* (1953), 137.
[121] Noth, *Josua* (1953), 137.

"I gave them into your hand" in v. 8, which might otherwise have been considered a linkage to other pre-deuteronomistic traditions in the book, Noth considered simply stereotypical and thus, for him, the chapter remained based on ancient traditions isolated from others in the book aside from the deuteronomistic editing.[122] The remainder of the book also does not know of Cisjordanian Amorites found at vv. 15 and 18—deuteronomic references are to the two Transjordanian kings (2:10; 9:10; 12:2; 13:10, 21; 24:12) and Amorites are nevertheless found among the lists of nations (3:10; 9:1; 12:8; 24:11).[123] Ultimately Noth thought of the covenant inauguration/renewal (?) at Shechem tradition, behind ch. 24, as based on an event of great historical significance and at some odds with the tradition of Sinai found in the Pentateuch; he saw it as an expansion of the Sinai covenant to the twelve tribes,[124] which was not unlike Rudolph's view.

Noth rejected the extension of any pentateuchal documentary sources—including P—to the deuteronomistic and post-deuteronomistic book of Joshua. He extended this same categorical rejection to the pre-deuteronomistic traditions as posited by Steuernagel (mostly E),[125] not only based on the lack of אלהים (ה) "God" used in the particular manner of E, and Rudolph's negative argument that nothing speaks against J,[126] but on the observation that *the events of the Pentateuch do not really show up in Joshua in recognizable form*.[127] For example, the description of the Jordan River crossing (cf. Reed Sea miracle) at Josh 2:10 and 4:23 using הוביש "dried up" for the *water* does not match Exod 14 where the water is *divided* with the *land* becoming dry. He believed the

---

[122] Noth, *Josua* (1953), 137.
[123] Noth, *Josua* (1953), 137.
[124] Noth, *Josua* (1953), 139.
[125] See e.g., Steuernagel, *Deuteronomium und Josua*, 132–35.
[126] See Rudolph, *Elohist*, 258–63.
[127] Noth, *Josua* (1953), 16.

pentateuchal and Joshua traditions must be independent. Nonetheless, he did wonder

what became of the conquest traditions that must have accompanied the pentateuchal

material at one time.

So, Noth agreed with Rudolph in the one essential that he considered Josh 1–12—

and much other material in Joshua—as older pre-deuteronomistic traditions, but he did

not agree with him that they were an extension of the pentateuchal J source. Noth also

thought that Judges was written as a continuation to Deuteronomy and the Joshua story in

order to fill in the chronological gap to 1 Sam 12,[128] which is against Rudolph's view

(already noted above) that the Deuteronomist shaped the preexisting Joshua (J source)

material *in response* to an independent deuteronomic book of Judges. Ultimately, even

though Noth held to the view that there is a secondary deuteronomistic hand at work in

Joshua and Judges, he differentiated himself from Rudolph's view (one for Judges and

then a later one for Joshua) in attributing an *authorial* character only to the first hand who

had arranged and created a continuous work stretching from Deuteronomy to 1 Sam 12

and beyond into the periods of the kingdoms (i.e., up to the end of Second Kings), while

the second stage simply added to a unified original in the same style.[129] Of some

importance to this present study is Noth's emphasis that Judg 2:6–10 ought to be

considered a creation of the Deuteronomist (with vv. 8–9 on Joshua's age at the time of

his death, and his burial place, not needing to be reliant on a book of Joshua as its source

[against Rudolph]), which was only rather duplicated in Josh 24:29–31 "when the book

of Joshua was made into an independent literary unit and thus a concluding remark on the

---

[128] Noth, *Deuteronomistic History*, 34–44.
[129] Noth, *Deuteronomistic History*, 20.

death of Joshua was felt to be necessary."[130] As intriguing as this proposition might be—

and it may not be provable, or even stand up to eventual scrutiny—it is instructive that

Noth recognized the possibility of a later partitioning of the great biblical corpuses into

the current books.

   Now, it must be recognized that Noth's impressive synthesis can no longer stand

as originally presented in all of its details—especially considering his dating and

minimization of subsequent adaptations to the grand work of the Deuteronomist as he

envisioned it. Nevertheless, subsequent modifications have had the potential to

significantly strengthen it.[131] Relevant comments on some of those adaptations will be

made in the analysis chapters below.

   1.4.4 Alberto Soggin (1970 [1972]; 1981), and Robert G. Boling (1975; 1982)

Throughout the remainder of the last century, many commentators would adopt Noth's

conjecture of a Deuteronomistic History. Two, in particular, would write commentaries

for prominent English language series on both Joshua and Judges from this general

perspective—Alberto Soggin (*Joshua* [1972] and *Judges* [1981], translated from French

and Italian respectively for The Old Testament Library series) and Robert Boling (*Judges*

[1975] and *Joshua* [1982] for The Anchor Bible series). Soggin accepted as compositions

by the Deuteronomist, like Noth, Josh 1:1–18; 8:30–35; 21:43—22:6; 23:1–16.[132] He

identified a number of parallels between the second part of Joshua (13–21) and Judg 1[133]

---

[130] Noth, *Deuteronomistic History*, 22n3.

[131] Levin, "Nach siebzig Jahren," 73–74.

[132] Soggin, *Joshua*, 3; Noth, *Josua* (1953), 9. The idea that Josh 8:30–35 was composed by the Deuteronomist goes against the idea that it is based on an ancient Shechem tradition (cf. Josh 24) maintained by von Rad ("Form-critical Problem of the Hexateuch," 38). Soggin treats Josh 8:30–35 in conjunction with Josh 24:1–27 based on thematic similarities of Shechem gatherings (*Joshua*, 229).

[133] He wrote:

that are of interest to this present study. He also agreed with Noth that the

Deuteronomist's narrative originally proceeded from Josh 23:16 directly to Judg 2:6 (and

the parallel at Josh 24:28), that there are large later interpolations of Josh 22:7–34 and

Josh 24:1–Judg 2:5,[134] and that Josh 23 was derived in some manner from Josh 24, even

though Josh 24 was incorporated later.[135] He considered the text of Josh 24:28–30, which

is paralleled and expanded at Judg 2:6–10, to be superior and the dismissal of the people

more fitting as an ending to a book of Joshua rather than as part of an introduction to a

book of Judges.[136] He did, however, make it clear that he had adopted the

Göttingen/Smend School view of the Deuteronomistic History with its schema of three

exilic *redactors*—DtrG (=DtrH [historic]), DtrP (prophetic), and DtrN (nomistic)—in

place of Noth's one main exilic author.[137]

Boling had taken a different approach to the introductory material in Judges by

assigning Judg 2:6—3:6 to an eighth century compiler, 2:1–5 to a seventh century

deuteronomic editor (i.e., the Deuteronomist), and 1:1–36 to a sixth century

deuteronomistic updating.[138] In relating the introduction of Judges to the ending of

---

The second part also contains a number of very ancient fragments, parallel to Judg. 1, which are in contradiction to the unitary vision of the conquest as the Deuteronomic redactor presents it. These are the descriptions of territories which the tribes did not succeed in occupying; and they show how questionable it is to speak of the conquest of Palestine in the period which preceded the united monarchy: Josh. 15:13–19 // Judg. 1:11–15; Josh. 15:63 // Judg. 1:21; Josh. 16:10 // Judg. 1:29; Josh. 17:11–13 // Judg. 1:27–28; Josh. 19:47 // Judg. 1:34–35 (Soggin, *Joshua*, 13).

[134] Soggin, *Joshua*, 217–18.
[135] Soggin, *Joshua*, 227.
[136] Soggin, *Judges*, 40–41. In this he went contrary to Noth.
[137] Soggin, *Judges*, xi; see also O'Brien, *Deuteronomistic History Hypothesis*, 7–10, for a brief description of these redactional theories and their proponents.
[138] Boling, *Judges*, 30–31. Boling's actual view of the compiler's introduction, "the epic prologue," was not as homogeneous as he indicated by this scheme, as he went on to distinguish Judg 3:5–6 as deuteronomic from the time of Josiah and Judg 2:18–19; 3:2 as deuteronomistic and exilic, as well as alluding to other sections stemming from these later periods (76, 79).

Joshua he also thought that Josh 24 was old tradition and that Josh 23 was inserted later, in the final deuteronomistic updating, in conjunction with Judg 1.[139] He believed that "the last two chapters of the book are heavily redundant, with an address modeled on the blessings and curses of the covenant (chap. 23) now serving as hortatory preparation for participating in renewal of the covenant at Shechem, where again those two elements of the form (i.e., blessings and curses) are most prominent (chap. 24)."[140] So by the time of his writing of the *Joshua* commentary, Boling had adapted his view and recognized a version of ch. 23 in the first edition (Dtr 1) of Joshua that was later "overwritten" in the later edition (Dtr 2).[141] With respect to Josh 8:30–35, Boling suggested that it may have been a liturgical *incipit* for the description of the Shechem covenant ceremony events of ch. 24, which was put into its place in the existing narrative between the battle of Ai and the Gibeonite deception,[142] in order to intentionally situate the events of ch. 24 early in the pacification of Canaan rather than about the time of Joshua's ch. 23 farewell speech.[143]

1.4.5 Alexander Rofé (1977 [1982]; 1991; 1994)

Alexander Rofé approached the Joshua–Judges nexus from a different angle, relying much more on the distinct textual witnesses of the LXX. He also objected to Noth's conception of the Deuteronomistic History as the product of a single author in that he did

---

[139] Boling, *Judges*, 37.

[140] Boling, *Joshua*, 526.

[141] Boling, *Joshua*, 526.

[142] Notwithstanding that the LXX has the gathering of the foreign kings to do battle *before* the Shechem valley ceremony, whereas the MT has the gathering of kings after the ceremony. In 4Q47, the ceremony occurs immediately upon crossing the Jordan River. These variable locations in the different textual traditions suggests that Josh 8:30–35; 24:1–28 may be quite late in their incorporation/positioning.

[143] Boling, *Joshua*, 246.

not believe that Noth had answered Charles Burney's stylistic evidence for a primarily

Late Ephraimitic editorial hand for Josh 24–1 Sam 12 (minus Judg 1:1—3:11; 17–21).[144]

Rofé thought that Judg 1:1—2:5 is an appendix to the book of Joshua, much like Judg

17–21 is to the book of Judges.[145] He excised Judg 2:6—3:6 on the basis of a number of

different criteria: first, that its *preliminary* character as a historical survey is unlike all of

the other *summarizing* surveys found at Josh 24, 1 Sam 12, and 2 Kgs 17; second, the

subject matter of nations remaining in the land does not agree with the remainder of the

editorial framework to the stories in Judges that focuses on the insubordination of the

people; and third, there is the evidence of the LXX that moves directly from οἱ δὲ υἱοὶ

Ισραηλ ἀπήλθοσαν ἕκαστος εἰς τὸν τόπον αὐτῶν καὶ εἰς τὴν ἑαυτῶν πόλιν "the Israelites

went away, each to their place and to their own city" (Josh 24:33b LXX; cf. this as a

response to Joshua sending the people away at Josh 24:28 LXX and MT, interrupted by

the various burial notices) to the notice of worship of foreign gods and the Lord giving

them over to Moabite oppression by Eglon.[146] The story of Othniel at Judg 3:7–11 was,

for Rofé, a merely representative, pro-Judahite insertion, with little actual content.[147]

Rofé saw a decidedly distinct Northern theological perspective in his representation of an

earlier version of the book of Judges that included Josh 24, Judg 3:12—16:31, and 1 Sam

1–12, one that accepted multiple places of worship of the LORD as opposed to the

Southern perspective of the Deuteronomist that demanded its centralization.[148] Other

characteristics of that Ephraimite tradition were that the LORD was king and that it was

---

[144] Rofé, "Ephraimite versus Deuteronomistic History," 222–24; Burney, *Judges*, xli–l.
[145] Rofé, "End of the Book of Joshua," 30.
[146] Rofé, "End of the Book of Joshua," 30–31; "Editing of the Book of Joshua," 75.
[147] Rofé, "End of the Book of Joshua," 31–32; "Editing of the Book of Joshua," 75.
[148] Rofé, "Ephraimite versus Deuteronomistic History," 224–25.

the LORD that fought for Israel.[149] So for Rofé we can recognize a completely different

compositional history context for what constitutes the present transition between Joshua

and Judges.

The most important evidence concerning the movement from the book of Joshua

to the book of Judges examined by Rofé is clearly the shortened path from the dispersal

of the Israelites from the (Shechem?) assembly and the burial notices at the end of Josh

24 to the subjugation by Eglon, king of Moab in the LXX, which by implication

completely skips over the entirety of Judg 1:1—3:11. Rofé was of the opinion that this

omission existed in the *absolutely autonomous* Hebrew *Vorlage* used by the translator.[150]

The *additions* of LXX Josh 24:31a, 33a, 33b, and the transposition in the Greek to Josh

24:29 (LXX) of its Hebrew equivalent from its location at Josh 24:31 (MT), could

certainly be considered text-critical problems, but they also point more directly at the

possibility of a distinctly different Hebrew *Vorlage* as described by Rofé. The final clause

of Josh 24:33b makes this difficulty explicit—καὶ παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς Κύριος εἰς χεῖρας

Ἐγλὼμ τῷ βασιλεῖ Μωάβ, καὶ ἐκυρίευσεν αὐτῶν ἔτη δέκα ὀκτώ "and the LORD

delivered them into the hand of Eglom the king of Moab, and he dominated them

eighteen years." This ties the ending of the LXX Joshua directly with Judg 3:14 (LXX

and MT), and this fact bears on the nature of the relationship of the traditions found in

Joshua and Judges, and on the nature of the material found preserved especially in Josh

23–24 and Judg 1:1—3:14. The compositional history of this material in the MT has yet

to be completely explained satisfactorily and Rofé has shown that the LXX has the

potential to provide some additional insight into the problem. Concerning another

---

[149] Rofé, "Ephraimite versus Deuteronomistic History," 225–30.
[150] Rofé, "End of the Book of Joshua," 29–30, 36; "Editing of the Book of Joshua," 75.

significant textual inconsistency—the one concerning the placement of MT Josh 8:30–35

after Josh 9:2 in the LXX and between Josh 4 and Josh 5 in 4Q47—Rofé thought it

plausible that "an editor of Joshua appointed the erection of the altar and the reading of

the Torah as the first action of Joshua in Canaan" as direct *obedience to the command*

found at Deut 27.[151] This would, of course, point to significant variability in the written

traditions and/or editorial activity on those traditions at quite a late stage.

1.4.6 Hartmut N. Rösel (1980; 2007; 2009; 2011)

The important 1980 essay by Hartmut Rösel reinvigorated a previous proposal by Otto

Eissfeldt that the first transition from Joshua to Judges included Josh 24 and Judg 1; 2:1a,

5b, and the second, Josh 23 (to replace Josh 24:1–27) and Judg 2:6–9;[152] both recount an

assembly, a speech by Joshua, and the death of Joshua. His thesis brought under attack,

once again, the notion of the planned unity of the work of Noth's Deuteronomist by

denying that essential pillar of Noth's hypothesis of the more original smooth transition

from Josh 23 to Judg 2:6. Rösel relied on the assumptions that Josh 24:28–33 cannot be

separated from Josh 24:1–27—it is its expected ending—and that Judg 1:1aα, וַיְהִי אַחֲרֵי

מוֹת יְהוֹשֻׁעַ "So then after the death of Joshua," naturally develops off of a prior account of

Joshua's death.[153] The substance of Rösel's refutation of Noth began with the relative

ages of the parallel transitions, again a reasonable assumption based on the wide

acknowledgement at the time that the traditions behind Josh 24 and Judg 1 are almost

certainly more ancient than the work of any Deuteronomist. Specifically, he considered

---

[151] Rofé, "Editing of the Book of Joshua," 78.

[152] Rösel, "Überleitungen," 342; Eissfeldt, *Old Testament Introduction*, 255. Eissfeldt thought that the two different versions became combined later.

[153] Rösel, "Überleitungen," 343–46; "Nomistische Redaktion," 187–88.

secondary the *additions* of וַיֵּלְכוּ בְנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל "the Israelites went" and לָרֶשֶׁת אֶת־הָאָרֶץ "to take possession of the land" at Judg 2:6, as compared to וַיְשַׁלַּח יְהוֹשֻׁעַ אֶת־הָעָם אִישׁ לְנַחֲלָתוֹ "Joshua sent the people away, each to his/its inheritance" at Josh 24:28, and the adjective גָּדוֹל "great," as well as a *change* of verb to ראה "see/know" at Judg 2:7 compared to ידע "know/observe" (cf. Judg 2:10) at Josh 24:31.[154] He also thought the positive assessment of the people serving the LORD during Joshua's lifetime at Judg 2:7 and LXX Josh 24:29 to be out of place before the notice of Joshua's death (cf. Josh 24:31 יְמֵי הַזְּקֵנִים אֲשֶׁר הֶאֱרִיכוּ יָמִים אַחֲרֵי יְהוֹשֻׁעַ "days of the elders whose days had extended beyond Joshua," which presupposes Joshua's death).[155] Rösel conceived of the second—*deuteronomistic*—introduction of Judges, beginning at Judg 2:11, as later than the Josh 24 to Judg 1 union.[156] These arguments carry some weight, but are perhaps not decisive.

Rösel saw original connections between Josh 21:43–45, which he thought to be the climax of the book of Joshua with the successful conquest and possession of the land, and rest all about, and Josh 24 (especially v. 13 indicating a past event), which elaborates these themes.[157] He also saw a link between Josh 24:25–27 where Joshua makes a covenant with the people and Judg 2:2 וְאַתֶּם לֹא־תִכְרְתוּ בְרִית לְיוֹשְׁבֵי הָאָרֶץ הַזֹּאת "and you shall not make a covenant with those who dwell in this land,"[158] but he also recognized a disjunction in the transition from Josh 24 to Judg 1 in that, all of a sudden for the reader now, there is not a complete conquest and there are enemies in the midst of Israel.[159]

---

[154] Rösel, "Überleitungen," 344.
[155] Rösel, "Überleitungen," 344.
[156] Rösel, "Überleitungen," 345.
[157] Rösel, "Überleitungen," 345–46.
[158] Rösel, "Überleitungen," 346n12. This link is extremely weak as the prohibition against making covenants with the land's inhabitants is nowhere found in Josh 24, but is much more aligned with Josh 23:7, 12.
[159] Rösel, "Überleitungen," 346.

Nevertheless, Rösel was convinced that separate books of Joshua and Judges were joined

by an early deuteronomistic editor at Josh 24 and Judg 1, in spite of their distinct

outlooks, and that a later (i.e., Noth's classic) deuteronomistic editor attempted to smooth

over the differences by providing the secondary Josh 23 to Judg 2:6 transition[160]—both

transitions depending on an already existing Josh 21:43–45 that pushed any conquest well

into the past.[161] He supposed that the replacement material had the theological rationale

of pushing guilt on to the generations of the Judges period.[162] By postulating that Noth's

original Josh 23 to Judg 2:6 transition by a Deuteronomistic Historian is secondary to a

previously existing transition of Josh 24 to Judg 1 by an earlier editor, Rösel denied what

he saw as a fundamental support for Noth's Deuteronomistic History hypothesis.[163]

<center>1.4.7 Trent Butler (1983; 2009; 2014)</center>

Shortly after the publication of Boling's *Joshua* commentary, Trent Butler produced the

first edition of his commentary on *Joshua* as one of the first Old Testament offerings in

the new Word Biblical Commentary series. Butler generally adhered to the concept of a

Deuteronomistic Historian, like Soggin and Boling before him, but he thought of the

composition of the book of Joshua more in terms of an original compiler of older

traditions—mostly from Benjaminite Gilgal, but also from Shechem and Shiloh—and a

later deuteronomistic editorial *process* (rather than in stages like DtrG/H, DtrP, and

DtrN).[164] He thought that the book of Joshua was programmatic for the whole of the

---

[160] Rösel, "Nomistische Redaktion," 188.
[161] Rösel, "Überleitungen," 346–47; "Nomistische Redaktion," 187.
[162] Rösel, "Überleitungen," 348.
[163] Rösel, "Überleitungen," 346; "Nomistische Redaktion," 188.
[164] Butler, *Joshua*, xx–xxiii. See O'Brien, *Deuteronomistic History Hypothesis*, 7–10, for an assessment of the exilic redactional stages proposed by Rudolf Smend, and his students Walter Dietrich and Timo Veijola.

Deuteronomistic History in its canonical form—that it compared Israel's unfaithfulness to God's faithfulness to the covenant law.[165] Butler saw that the "literary problem is illustrated by a comparison of Josh 11:23; 21:43–45 with 13:1–7; 15:63; 16:10; 17:12–13; 19:47; Judg 1:17–36 . . ." (Joshua took the whole land as commanded in ch. 1, allotted it, and it had rest because the LORD had done it all, versus, much land remains to allot and inhabitants remained because they did not or could not drive them out) ". . . or by a comparison of Josh 10:36–39 with 14:13–15; 15:13–19; Judg 1:10–15" (putting towns to the ban and abandoning them, versus, driving occupants out and then occupying their towns).[166]

Butler considered Josh 23 to be a "liturgy of covenant renewal (that) has become the sermon of a dying leader," culminating in a curse, which finds eventual fulfilment in the Assyrian and Babylonian exiles, but even closer at hand with the oppressions in Judges.[167] "Josh 23 is the theological explanation of the history of Israel herself."[168] On the other hand, he thought Josh 24 to be a report of the making of a covenant that distinguished itself from Josh 23 by focusing on the victories of the LORD (versus the allotment of land), service to the LORD (versus obedience to the Law), and continuing worship of ancestral gods (versus marriage entanglements with the inhabitants of the land).[169] Butler carefully refrained from making judgements concerning the relative dates of Josh 23 and Josh 24, and he did not discuss their compositional interrelationships or their relationships with the introduction(s) to Judges in that commentary—he would leave

---

[165] Butler, *Joshua*, xxvi.
[166] Butler, *Joshua*, xxix–xl.
[167] Butler, *Joshua*, 253.
[168] Butler, *Joshua*, 254.
[169] Butler, *Joshua*, 265–66.

that for some 26 years later with the publication of his *Judges* commentary in the same series.

In his *Judges* commentary, Butler reviewed Noth's Deuteronomistic History hypothesis in some detail, as well as the subsequent interaction with it by a number of scholars, but again refrained from making a judgement on the details of the compositional process himself, recognizing only some form of attachment to a preceding book of Joshua and a following account of a kingdom period.[170] His focus was clearly more on the literary narrative form of the finished product, and his understanding of the introduction of Judges was that ch. 1 constitutes the territorial military situation of the land of Israel and that ch. 2 constitutes the religious situation—it was his opinion that ch. 3 "begins the body of the narrative proper."[171] By the time of his revision of the *Joshua* commentary in 2014, Butler would be somewhat more forthcoming in his views concerning a compositional history—

> Ultimately, a historian in the time of the united monarchy created the individual book of Joshua as a call to unity between the forces of David and those of Saul and ultimately between David/Solomon and the rebellious forces in the northern tribes. Slightly later, the editor of Judges incorporated parts of Joshua into his work and created a pro-Judean work aimed against the revolt of Jeroboam I. Still later, an editor joined Joshua/Judges into an ultimate history reaching through Kings.[172]

With respect to the traditional redaction-critical scholarship around the books of Joshua and Judges he stated: "I simply do not see the presuppositions behind such work as valid."[173]

---

[170] Butler, *Judges*, xlv–li.
[171] Butler, *Judges*, 12.
[172] Butler, *Joshua 1–12*, 84.
[173] Butler, *Judges*, 10.

1.4.8 Chris Brekelmans (1989 [1991])

In his presidential address to the thirteenth Congress of the International Organization for

the Study of the Old Testament (27 August to 1 September 1989), Professor Chris

Brekelmans emphasized the intentional nature of the placement of Josh 24 at the

important turning point in the history of Israel at the end of the Hexateuch.[174] In addition

to looking back at that history by its content as "einen Hexateuch in kleinster Form" (a

Hexateuch in miniature),[175] it projects forward through its connections with Judg 2:1–5;

6:8–10; 10:10–13; 1 Sam 7:3–4; 10:17–19. He made the distinction "between the so-

called historical creeds as a confession of faith (*Bekenntnis*) and the summaries which

lead to an admonition or a threat (*Verkündigung*),"[176] and saw only Josh 24:17–18—the

response of the people—as a confession, and all the remainder as proclamations against

the people.[177] He also made an interesting observation that these *Verkündigung*

(threatening proclamations) are not found in the Deuteronomistic History after   1 Sam

12, and thought that this weakened support for that History's unity; and he also remarked

that the prophetic rehearsal of the nation's salvation history by Samuel at 1 Sam 12:8–12

bookends the unique section of Josh 24–1 Sam 12 within that History.[178]

1.4.9 William T. Koopmans (1990)

The Theological Academy of the Johannes Calvijnstichting (Kampen) dissertation by

William Koopmans was a focused endeavor to demonstrate that Josh 24:1–28 is *poetic*

---

[174] Brekelmans, "Joshua 24," 5.
[175] Brekelmans, "Joshua 24," 4; von Rad, "Form-critical Problem of the Hexateuch," 8.
[176] Brekelmans, "Joshua 24," 6.
[177] Brekelmans, "Joshua 24," 7.
[178] Brekelmans, "Joshua 24," 7–8.

narrative. In addition to that emphasis on a synchronic reading, and even though limiting

the detailed poetic analysis strictly to Josh 24:1–28, he provided extensive surveys on the

history of interpretation[179] and previous research[180] concerning all of the main historical-

critical issues relating to Josh 24. He did not see any pentateuchal sources J, E, or P in

Josh 24:1–28, nor did he allow that there was any deuteronomistic editing other than a

very few late expansions at Josh 24:5a, 17b, and the נחלה "inheritance" of v. 28.[181] He

also interacted with a number of other pertinent questions of a diachronic nature. With

respect to the textual issue of Josh 24:28–31 and Judg 2:6–10 he stated,

> Judg 2:6–10 contrasts two different generations, the faithfulness of Joshua's day,
> and the infidelity of the subsequent generation. For that reason, the author of Judg
> 2:6–10 places vs. 7 in a sequence other than that of Josh 24:31. The sequential
> shift makes the colon *wyhy ʾḥry hdbrym hʾlh* (Josh 24:29A ["So then after these
> things"]) irrelevant and it is accordingly dropped. If retained, the phrase would
> create a logical problem because it would no longer refer to the covenant
> ceremony. This in fact is the case in the LXX of Josh 24:29 ff., which
> inappropriately has the wording of the MT in the order of Judg 2:6 ff.[182]

Thus, the priority of Josh 24:28–31 is settled for him. On the question of what kind of

Hebrew *Vorlage* the LXX represents, Koopmans, after a close comparison of the

meaningful textual variants, saw enough discrepancies to assert "that it is necessary to

speak of different *editions* of the Hebrew text, not simply a better or poorer witness to the

original."[183]

On the relationship between Josh 23 and Josh 24 he considered Josh 23 to be

deuteronomistic and firmly linked into the narrative progression of the book, unlike Josh

---

[179] Koopmans, *Joshua 24*, 1–95.
[180] Koopmans, *Joshua 24*, 97–163.
[181] Koopmans, *Joshua 24*, 343–44.
[182] Koopmans, *Joshua 24*, 368.
[183] Koopmans, *Joshua 24*, 270.

24:1–28.[184] In addition to closing off the narrative arc concerning possession of the land,

he believed Josh 23 to work in conjunction with Josh 24:1–28 to make the transition from

Joshua to Judges in the final editorial stages *by anticipating the double introduction to*

Judges.[185] Not only that, but he thought that Josh 24:1–28 was programmatic for the

remainder of Judges through to   1 Sam 12; examples include the dependence of the

important historical resumés in the prophetic speeches at Judg 6:7–10 and 1 Sam 10:18

on Josh 24:2–24.[186]

1.4.10 K. Lawson Younger, Jr. (1990; 1994; 1995)

In the published form of his 1988 University of Sheffield dissertation, K. Lawson

Younger set out to demonstrate how cultural encoding is integral to ancient Near Eastern

historical narrative.[187] In the context of evaluating the conquest narrative of Josh 9–12 he

proposed that "the function of narrative form is not just to relate a succession of events

but to present an ensemble of interrelationships of many different kinds as a single

whole."[188] In order to assess the types of stylization used by ancient Near Eastern writers

of annalistic and summary literature, he applied a detailed method of

comparative/contrastive (i.e., contextual)[189] literary analysis on ancient Near Eastern

conquest accounts, thereby offering a *controlling* factor.[190] That control component of his

comparative literature method was a semiotic (manner in which a referent, deep structure,

---

[184] Koopmans, *Joshua 24*, 397.
[185] Koopmans, *Joshua 24*, 398–99.
[186] Koopmans, *Joshua 24*, 392.
[187] Younger, *Ancient Conquest Accounts*, 36, 38.
[188] Younger, *Ancient Conquest Accounts*, 43.
[189] Younger, *Ancient Conquest Accounts*, 57.
[190] Younger, *Ancient Conquest Accounts*, 52.

reality is encoded within a text) approach to the *text* itself,[191] which revealed a shared

imperialistic ideology in many ancient Near Eastern conquest narratives.[192] This method

would greatly assist him in his later examinations of the introduction(s) to the book of

Judges.[193]

Younger considered Josh 9–12 a narrative *unit* depicting the Israelite conquest

with setting, emplotment, and resolution,[194] and that it is similar to other ancient Near

Eastern *annalistic* conquest accounts in its *transmission codes* (i.e., common set

language;[195] e.g., complete destruction of the enemy with no report of one's own

casualties)[196] and *syntagmic structuring* (e.g., one stereotyped syntagm is "the LORD

gave [the city] into Israel's hand," or another, "Joshua put [the city] and everyone in it to

the sword"),[197] which reveals its underlaying figurative nature.[198] For example, he

thought that the *all-Israel* ideology need not be a late imposition as Noth thought, but that

it "is nothing more than a commonly encountered *synecdoche* found in ancient Near

Eastern conquest accounts."[199]

A short while later in an article, Younger took issue with the oft-asserted opinion

that Judg 1 is based on older traditions than its corresponding accounts in the book of

Joshua and is therefore more historically reliable.[200] Using his comparative literature

methodology he found that "Judges 1 utilizes its south-to-north geographic arrangement

---

191 Younger, *Ancient Conquest Accounts*, 55–56.
192 Younger, *Ancient Conquest Accounts*, 255.
193 Younger, "Judges 1"; "Configuring of Judicial Preliminaries."
194 Younger, *Ancient Conquest Accounts*, 197.
195 Younger, *Ancient Conquest Accounts*, 266.
196 Younger, *Ancient Conquest Accounts*, 261.
197 Younger, *Ancient Conquest Accounts*, 266.
198 Younger, *Ancient Conquest Accounts*, 237, 252.
199 Younger, *Ancient Conquest Accounts*, 248–49.
200 Younger, "Judges 1," 207.

of the tribal episodes in order to foreshadow the geographic orientation of the Judges

cycle in 3:7—16:31. . . . In addition, there is a literary movement that finds its climax in

the Dan episode."[201] He deduced that the chapter is temporal exposition or representation,

like Assyrian *summary* inscriptions, depicting lengthier periods of time in a shorter

reading experience.[202] It has the effect of compressing time so that the normal sequential

representation of events has the sense of simultaneity.[203] The literary crescendo of the

chapter—from Judah to Dan—coincides with a moral decline, in "an artificial aesthetic

structure,"[204] foreshadowing the following Judges cycle in the main part of the book.[205]

The representation of the time of the generation after the person Joshua in Judg 1 is

different than in the time when Joshua allotted the land at Josh 15–19; he appreciated that

in the book of Joshua the culpability of the tribes for not driving out the land's inhabitants

is spread more evenly over all of the tribes than it is in Judg 1.[206] Younger also extended

the notion of *simultaneity*—a function of its summary nature—from the military failures

of Judg 1 to the religious failures depicted in Judg 2:6—3:6, thus indicating a double

introduction (and matching double conclusion) for the book of Judges.[207]

He once again, in a following article, compared the first introduction of Judges to

certain parallels in Josh 13–19 by attempting to establish some level of literary

dependence of Judg 1 on Joshua by the writer's use of paralleling the activities of Judah

with the House of Joseph in each set of accounts.[208] Additionally, he reflected that "both

---

[201] Younger, "Judges 1," 216.
[202] Younger, "Judges 1," 217.
[203] Younger, "Judges 1," 219.
[204] Younger, "Judges 1," 222.
[205] Younger, "Judges 1," 216–22; "Configuring of Judicial Preliminaries," 80.
[206] Younger, "Judges 1," 220–22.
[207] Younger, "Judges 1," 224.
[208] Younger, "Configuring of Judicial Preliminaries," 76–79.

accounts testify to the moral decline in Israel through the imposition of the tribal,

geographic arrangement."[209] He pointed out the subtle shift in outlook from Joshua to

Judges as a move from implicit criticism to a declaration that is more explicit.[210]

1.4.11 Erhard Blum (1997; 2018)

The important essay by Erhard Blum, "Der Kompositionelle Knoten am Übergang von

Josua zu Richter ein Entflechtungsvorschlag,"[211] was a comprehensive analysis of the

redactional issues concerning the transition from Joshua to Judges. He thought that

research on the transition represented a *hopeless Gordian knot* concerning the joining of

the Deuteronomistic History and Pentateuch/Hexateuch.[212] He began to outline his

position with a number of clearly stated assumptions:

– Josua 23 und Richter 1:1—2:5 unterscheiden sich in der Konzeption der (unvollständigen) Landnahme so grunlegend, daß die Zuweisung zur gleichen redaktionellen Schicht ausgeschlossen erscheint.
– Ebenso gravierend ist die Differenz zwischen Richter 1 und 2:1–5. Die Malʾak-Episode ist nachweislich nicht als Abschluß und theologische Deutung von Richter 1 *gestaltet* worden.
– Josua 24 gehört nicht zur dtr Hauptschicht in Josua (und Richter). Dagegen stehen die dafür untypische sprachliche und topische Prägung sowie die Hexateuchkonnexionen von Josua 24.
– Josua 23 gehört ebenfalls nicht zur dtr Grundkomposition, ausweislich der Differenzen zur Landnahmekonzeption in Josua 1–12 und 21:43 ff.
– Die Parallelen Josua 24:28–31 // Richter 2:6–10 erklären sich in ihren spezifischen Ausprägungen vom jeweils primären Kontext her. Der so beliebte direkte Wortlautvergleich trägt für die relative Datierung nicht aus.[213]

---

[209] Younger, "Configuring of Judicial Preliminaries," 83.

[210] Younger, "Configuring of Judicial Preliminaries," 85–86.

[211] Blum, "Kompositionelle Knoten" (A Proposal for Disentangling the Compositional Knot at the Transition from Joshua to Judges).

[212] Blum, "Kompositionelle Knoten," 181.

[213] Blum, "Kompositionelle Knoten," 182. (– Josh 23 and Judg 1:1—2:5 differ in the conception of the [incomplete] acquisition of the land so fundamentally that the assignment to the same editorial layer seems impossible. – The difference between Judg 1 and 2:1–5 is just as serious. The *malʾak* [messenger/angel] episode has demonstrably not been *designed* as a conclusion or theological interpretation of Judg 1. – Josh 24 does not belong to the main deuteronomistic layer in Joshua [and Judges]. It contrasts by means of its atypical linguistic and topical imprint, and its Hexateuchal connections. – Josh 23 is also

Those assumptions, for which he would proceed to provide various kinds of evidence,

seem based on the obvious *conceptual* differences between the various layers. We see

that he considered the idea of the completed conquest found in Josh 1–12; 21:43–45 as

basic to the main layer of the deuteronomistic historical work (cf. 2 Sam 7:1; 1 Kgs

5:4).[214] He also saw as basic, now that there were no more Canaanites, that vigilance was

still required not to conform to the practices (abominations) of the former inhabitants and

surrounding nations (cf. Deut 12:29–32; 1 Kgs 14:24; 2 Kgs 16:3; 21:2, 11).[215]

Pertaining to a second layer—Josh 13:1b–6; 23:1–16 (which is incompatible with Josh

21:43); Judg 2:6–10—he wrote that the occupation of the periphery was actually not so

complete and that there were *people remaining there*, but there is no particular

blameworthiness attached to it.[216] That corrective updating (DtrG^2), with its idea of *land

left over* at the time of Joshua's death, is also at odds with Josh 1–12; it does not explain

the lapse in the completeness of the conquest, but Josh 23 does introduce a heightened

level of threat against association with any of the nations of the land left *alongside*

Israel.[217] Judges 2:6–10 also has the appearance of being constructed as a continuation of

Josh 23.[218]

Blum believed that the messenger episode of Judg 2:1–5 is *not* to be connected

with Judg 1 as a theological comment, as many have thought, but rather that it is a

distinct editorial layer of comment on Israel's unfaithfulness to the covenant of the

---

not part of the basic deuteronomistic composition, as evidenced by the differences to the concept of the
conquest in Josh 1–12 and 21:43 ff. – The parallels Josh 24:28–31 // Judg 2:6–10 are explained in their
specific manifestations from their respective primary contexts. The ever so popular direct comparison of
wording does not have any bearing on the relative dating.)

[214] Blum, "Kompositionelle Knoten," 182–83.
[215] Blum, "Kompositionelle Knoten," 183–84.
[216] Blum, "Kompositionelle Knoten," 184–87.
[217] Blum, "Kompositionelle Knoten," 185–87.
[218] Blum, "Kompositionelle Knoten," 184; "Once Again," 233.

LORD—specifically, their alliance with the Gibeonites in Josh 9 with its setting in Gilgal
(cf. Josh 9:6–7 and Judg 2:1–2).[219] It also fits neatly, in a narrative sense, between Josh
23 and Judg 2:6–10, with the angel leading the people from Gilgal to Bochim and then
Joshua dispersing the congregation from there—this arrangement would, of course, imply
a level of judgement against Joshua's generation![220] Blum also thought that the episode
was part of a narrative arc going back to a close parallel in Exod 23:20–26; 31–32 where
the *malʾak* (messenger/angel) is first introduced to Israel, picking up the covenant motifs
of leadership, protection, commanding, and judging—the incompleteness of the conquest
of the land is now seen as a punishment for violation of the covenant.[221]

With respect to Josh 24, Blum saw it as an early post-exilic insertion with
connections to Ps 81 and Judg 6:7–10 (in terms of the recounted salvation history) and
that it contrasted with the deuteronomistic tradition for its new context by means of its
inclusiveness as to what might constitute Israel;[222] there is an emphasis on Jacob, Joseph,
and Shechem (i.e., not foremost on Judah/Judea) that links back to Genesis and
Exodus.[223] In Josh 24:26a there is a critical shift in terminology from סֵפֶר תּוֹרַת מֹשֶׁה (Book
of the Law of Moses) to סֵפֶר תּוֹרַת אֱלֹהִים (Book of the Law of God);[224] Blum considered
this as a signal for that stage being the amalgamation of the book of Joshua with an
existing Pentateuch into a Hexateuch (with Josh 24 as its conclusion, and a corresponding
severance from the book of Judges and the Deuteronomistic History).[225]

---

[219] Blum, "Kompositionelle Knoten," 187–88; "Once Again," 227.
[220] Blum, "Kompositionelle Knoten," 188, 191.
[221] Blum, "Kompositionelle Knoten," 190; "Once Again," 225.
[222] Blum, "Kompositionelle Knoten," 199–200.
[223] Blum, "Kompositionelle Knoten," 201–2.
[224] Blum, "Kompositionelle Knoten," 203–4.
[225] Blum, "Kompositionelle Knoten," 204–5.

So then, Judges would need an actual introduction now that it was disconnected from the front end of the continuous History of which it was a part. Blum pointed out many connections of Judg 1 with Judg 17–21 (e.g., Bethel, Dan's late conquest, Jebusite Jerusalem), suggesting that at this point Judges was made into an *editorially independent* book.[226] Judges 1 picks up again the idea of land not taken, but primarily in the heartland rather than just the periphery. Blum recognized the friction between Judg 1, where the guilt for not implementing the ban is downplayed, and Judg 2, where breach of the covenant is highlighted—he explained the discrepancy as a possible result of the harkening back to the desire for strong central leadership (i.e., kingship) to help maintain covenant obedience (cf. the refrain at Judg 17:6; 18:1; 19:1: 21:25).[227] Finally for Judges, he identified Judg 2:17 (וְגַם אֶל־שֹׁפְטֵיהֶם לֹא שָׁמֵעוּ כִּי זָנוּ אַחֲרֵי אֱלֹהִים אֲחֵרִים וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲווּ לָהֶם סָרוּ מַהֵר מִן־הַדֶּרֶךְ אֲשֶׁר הָלְכוּ אֲבוֹתָם לִשְׁמֹעַ מִצְוֹת־יְהוָה לֹא־עָשׂוּ כֵן [the Israelites], on the contrary, had not listen to their judges, but had whored after other gods and bowed down to them. They had quickly turned aside from the way in which their fathers had walked; to obey the commandments of the LORD, they had not done so") as a late insertion, as he did the *testing* references at Judg 2:22; 3:4.[228] The last update to the Joshua–Judges transition he saw as the P (editorial) notice of Eleazer's death and burial at Josh 24:33.[229] Blum's compositional account is generally consistent internally, and explains many of the features of the transition from Joshua to Judges.

---

[226] Blum, "Kompositionelle Knoten," 207.
[227] Blum, "Kompositionelle Knoten," 208.
[228] Blum, "Kompositionelle Knoten," 209.
[229] Blum, "Kompositionelle Knoten," 210–11.

1.4.12 Reinhard G. Kratz (2000 [2005]; 2018)

In Reinhard Kratz's detailed treatment of *Die Komposition der erzählenden Bücher des Alten Testaments* (*The Composition of the Narrative Books of the Old Testament*), he spent a few pages laying out his vision of the composition history of the transition from Joshua to Judges.[230] He considered that the original connection between the book of Joshua and that of Judges was from Josh 11:16aα, 23b; 12:1a, 9–24 (i.e., Joshua took all the land . . . it had rest from war . . . and a list of the Cisjordanian kings defeated) to Judg 2:8–9; 3:7–10 (i.e., the death and burial of Joshua and the oppression by Cushan-rishathaim), indicative of a basic deuteronomistic layer—"Everything else . . . are [sic] secondary."[231] He alleged that Josh 23–24 was subsequently attached to Josh 1–12 by means of Josh 13:1a = 23:1b, "and Joshua had grown old, advanced in days," and that the overlap of Josh 24:28–31 and Judg 2:6–10 (dismissal of the Israelites and Joshua's death and burial) demonstrates that Judg 1; 2:1–5 are even later insertions.[232]

---

[230] Kratz, *Composition*, 197–200.

[231] Kratz, *Composition*, 198.

[232] Kratz, *Composition*, 198. He later admitted that he opted to "begin with the external textual evidence, here the textual overlap in Josh 24:28–31 // Judg 2:2–10, and the narrative connections that it shows, (rather than) with the conceptual differentiation of the chapters regarding the subject of 'Israel, the land and the people' and the relative chronology which follows from this differentiation" ("Literary Transition," 241). His preferred solution was based on the following course of literary development:

1) Joshua's death and burial (Josh 24:29–30 // Judg 2:8–9) at the transition from Joshua to Judges, determining which texts preceded and followed this transition depends on the analysis of the broader context (Josh 11; 21; 23–24 and Judg 2–3)
2) Joshua's farewell speech(es) in Josh 23–24 + the people's dismissal in Josh 24:28 + Joshua's death and burial (Josh 24:29–30 // Judg 2:8–9) + Judg 2:11 ff.
3) The change of generation after Joshua's farewell speeches, death and burial in Josh 24:31 // Judg 2:7–10 to mark the change of epoch
4) The insertion of Judge 1:1—2:5 "after Joshua's death" between Josh 24:28, 29–30 and Judg 2:8–9, with the resumption of Josh 24:28 in Judg 2:6 (cf. Deut 34 // Josh 1:1) and the duplication or insertion of the change of generation in Josh 24:31 // Judg 2:7, 10 (cf. Gen 50 // Exod 1:6, 8)
5) Further supplementation to indicate the change of epoch in Josh 24:31a, 32–33 (MT and LXX) ("Literary Transition," 249).

Within the first block of secondary material (Josh 23:1—24:28; Judg 2:6—3:6),

Kratz attempted to explain divergent literary threads based on the themes of service either

to the LORD or other gods (first chronologically), and either a complete conquest or the

presence of other people in the land—Josh 24:14–28 (as an original continuation of Josh

23:3); Judg 2:7, 10, 11–19 belongs to the first and Josh 23:4–16; Judg 2:1–5, 6; 2:20—

3:6 belongs to the second category; Josh 24:1 (cf. Josh 23:2) makes of the material a

second speech set in Shechem this time, and Josh 24:2–13 replaces Josh 23:3 as the

historical summary.[233] However, he did not account for the focus of Josh 23:8, 16 on

continued service to the LORD in this scheme.

1.4.13 Serge Frolov (2008; 2009; 2013)

In his 2013 commentary, *Judges*, in The Forms of the Old Testament Literature series,

Serge Frolov stated as his first assertion about the book of Judges "that the exegetes still

routinely assume the book's status as a literary unit, a proposition that does not withstand

consistent form-critical scrutiny."[234] His view was primarily focused on the idea that the

five-fold cycle of formulae—Israel did evil in the eyes of the LORD, the anger of the

LORD burned against them, Israel cried out to the LORD, the oppressor was subdued,

and then the land had quiet—does not begin until ch. 3 and extends to the end of the

Philistine oppression in 1 Sam 7.[235] He also noted that another linked formula— וַיְהִי אִישׁ

This description seems to me to assume, unnecessarily, the physical continuity between the books of Joshua and Judges throughout all stages of the compositional history. This is likely a result of him viewing the textual overlap in Josh 24:28–31 // Judg 2:2–10 as a *Wiederaufnahme* (resumptive repetition) ("Literary Transition," 250) rather than as proleptic and an indication of a separation of the books of Joshua and Judges.

[233] Kratz, *Composition*, 198–99.

[234] Frolov, *Judges*, 2.

[235] Frolov, "Rethinking Judges," 28–31; *Judges*, 17–18.

אֶחָד "there was a certain man" (Judg 13:2 [Manoah] directly following the Israelites again doing evil)—is found also at 1 Sam 1:1 (Elkanah) as well as with variations at Judg 17:1 (Micah), 7 (Levite from Bethlehem); 19:1 (Levite from Ephraim/Bethlehem); 1 Sam 9:1 (Kish).[236] So, on form-critical grounds he thought that the literary continuity of the judges-period extended beyond Judg 21 through to at least 1 Sam 1–7 (i.e., to the end of Samuel's judgeship), and even perhaps to 1 Sam 12 where the transition to kingship happens. This accords with many previous findings of historical criticism.[237] Even though Frolov's focus was on the main part of the canonical, so-called, book of Judges extending past Judg 21 into First Samuel, he did also consider the transition from Joshua to Judges.

Frolov believed, based on the non-disruptive narrative *wayyiqtol* sequence,[238] that "As far as syntax is concerned, Judg 1:1–26 properly belongs, in defiance of the canonical division, with Joshua rather than with the balance of Judges."[239] With Judg 3:7—21:25 belonging to the 1 Sam 1–7(12?) material, that left Judg 1:27—3:6 to

---

[236] Frolov, "Rethinking Judges," 31–32; *Judges*, 19.

[237] Cf., e.g., Noth, *Deuteronomistic History*, 67–85.

[238] Frolov articulated a basic narrative syntactic structure, reminiscent of Robert Longacre's discourse analysis as follows:

- Quoted speech and dependent clauses do not disrupt the master sequence even if they are syntactically divergent. Clauses that follow the demonstrative הנה and the impersonal ויהי are seen as dependent. . . .
- Perfect main clauses outside quoted speech are disruptive unless the use of the form is attributable to rhetorically motivated shift of the subject or the object to the forefront or the presence of the negative particle לֹא before the verb.
- *Waw*-consecutive perfects, plain imperfects, participles, and nominal clauses are disruptive if they occur in narratorial discourse and do not depend upon main clauses governed by *waw*-consecutive imperfects.
- Magnitude of a disruption is directly proportional to that of the intrusion of divergent forms. Minor intrusions . . . divide the narrative into elementary units, referred to . . . as episodes. . . . Major ones delineate series of episodes or even larger literary entities, especially when a clause or a series of clauses is formulated asyndetically (*Judges*, 6).

[239] Frolov, "Rethinking Judges," 33; see also *Judges*, 25. Marc Brettler even thought that all of Judg 1:1—2:10 originally functioned as an appendix to the book of Joshua and that that explained the *Wiederaufnahme* (resumptive repetition) of Josh 24:28–31 and Judg 2:6–10 ("Appendix to Prologue," 433–35).

clarify.[240] He saw it as a whole as the introduction to the cycles of Judg 3:7—1 Sam 7:17,

and beyond to the end of Second Kings.[241] He outlined the relevant sections as follows:

I. Narrative account of the events that followed the distribution of the land among the tribes of Israel	Josh 21:41–Judg 1:26
A. Conflict over a Transjordan altar and its resolution; Joshua's farewell discourses and death, etc.	Josh 21:41—24:33
1. Account proper	Josh 21:41—24:31
2. Narrator's digression: Joseph's reburial, etc.	Josh 24:32–33
B. Tribes begin to take over their allotments	Judg 1:1–26
II. Transition/introduction	Judg 1:27—3:6
A. Narrator's digression: tribes' failure to dislodge Canaanites	Judg 1:27–33
B. Narrative account of the failure's consequences	Judg 1:34—2:23
C. Narrator's digression: remaining non-Israelite populations	Judg 3:1–6[242]

This is a significant departure from most attempts to outline these sections of the text that

we have examined. By putting a hard book-seam between Judg 1:26 and 27, Frolov was

able to eliminate the necessity to designate Judg 2:6–9 as either a *Wiederaufnahme*

(resumptive repetition) or a literary flashback of Josh 24:28–31.[243] He identified the

events of Judg 1:27–33 as being before those of Judg 1:1–26; as evidence, he contended

that Judg 1:27–28 quotes from Josh 17:11–13, and Judg 1:29 quotes from Josh 16:10.[244]

1.4.14 Thomas B. Dozeman (2011; 2023)

In a form of canonical criticism that emphasizes *literary context*, Thomas B. Dozeman

differentiated the unique MT and LXX contexts for the book of Joshua—he understood

---

[240] Frolov, "Rethinking Judges," 36.
[241] Frolov, "Rethinking Judges," 36–37.
[242] Frolov, *Judges*, 29.
[243] Frolov, "Joshua's Double Demise," 317.
[244] Frolov, "Joshua's Double Demise," 318–19.

that late editorial activity on Joshua produced a more integrated place for the book in the

LXX (i.e., possibly within an Enneateuch), whereas in the MT there is more separation

from what precedes and follows it (i.e., the Pentateuch especially).[245] The textual

differences in Josh 1:7–8 ("all *the* Torah" [singular] is missing in the LXX; reference to

the teaching[s] of Moses is plural [αὐτῶν] in the LXX),[246] and the inclusion of Phinehas'

burial, the apostasy of the next generation, and the subjugation by Eglon in the LXX Josh

24 were the primary basis for this evaluation.[247] With respect to the ending of the MT

Josh 24:29–31 he wrote that it "lacks the theme of intergenerational transition; it is

intended to be a conclusion to the book of Joshua."[248]

1.4.15 Cynthia Edenburg (2012; 2017; 2018)

Cynthia Edenburg affirmed "the basic structural and compositional unity of the history

work from Deuteronomy to Kings,"[249] with its sources and deuteronomistic framework,

but sought to elicit post-deuteronomistic revisions of the text. She thought that "the

account of the conquest of the towns in Judah (Josh 10:16–39) appears to be an

afterthought tacked on to the story of the victory at Gibeon,"[250] as it deviates from the

Benjaminite/Ephraimite orientation of its context. She also believed Josh 13–19 to be

appended non-deuteronomistic material that discounts the notion of a complete conquest

while promoting a pro-Judaean agenda.[251] This agenda of disparaging the northern tribes

---

[245] Dozeman, "Joshua as Intertext," 208–9; *Joshua 1–12*, 43.
[246] Dozeman, "Joshua as Intertext," 200; *Joshua 1–12*, 38.
[247] Dozeman, "Joshua as Intertext," 202–3; *Joshua 1–12*, 39.
[248] Dozeman, *Joshua 13–24*, 352.
[249] Edenburg, "What is *Not* Deuteronomistic," 444.
[250] Edenburg, "What is *Not* Deuteronomistic," 451.
[251] Edenburg, "What is *Not* Deuteronomistic," 451–52.

is carried out even further by the narrative interruption in Judg 1.[252] She also believed that Josh 24:1–28 is very late, using late material from the Pentateuch and Former Prophets, and much like its original form.[253] She thought that the social context for its creation could be an appeal to either the Samarian or the Eastern Diaspora community[254] based on the selective nature of the recital of the people's history, especially the omission of reference to any specific previous covenant or sanctuary location.[255]

With respect to the opening to Judges (Judg 1:1–36 and Judg 2:1–5), Edenburg stated that it shares the same timeframe as the closing, Judg 17:1—18:31, and due to the late insertion of Judg 20:28a, Judg 19:1—21:25.[256] Judges 1 and 18 each contain a story of the taking of a city following a reconnaissance and the notion that Dan is not settled, and the Micah and Bochim stories both seem to contain a polemic against Bethel. However, the lack of any verbal correspondences prohibits the determination of the precedence of either Judg 1:1—2:5 or Judg 17–18.[257] Nevertheless, Judg 19–21 does share a number of unique verbal correspondences with Judg 1:1—2:5 that separate these portions from the main body of the book. In Judg 1:1 we have the statement וַיִּשְׁאֲלוּ בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל בַּיהוָה לֵאמֹר מִי יַעֲלֶה־לָּנוּ (the Israelites inquired of the LORD saying: "who shall go up for us") that is essentially duplicated at Judg 20:18 as an echo singling out Judah with וַיִּשְׁאֲלוּ בֵאלֹהִים וַיֹּאמְרוּ בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל מִי יַעֲלֶה־לָּנוּ (the Israelites inquired of God; they said: "who shall go up for us").[258] In Judg 20:48 there is the expression כָּל־הֶעָרִים הַנִּמְצָאוֹת שִׁלְּחוּ בָאֵשׁ

---

[252] Edenburg, "What is *Not* Deuteronomistic," 452.
[253] Edenburg, "Diaspora-oriented Overriding," 173.
[254] Edenburg, "Diaspora-oriented Overriding," 180.
[255] Edenburg, "Diaspora-oriented Overriding," 174. Rather than as a cult site, Edenburg saw Shechem in Josh 24 as the location of a witness marker for the covenant described.
[256] Edenburg, "Envelopes and Seams," 356.
[257] Edenburg, "Envelopes and Seams," 356.
[258] Edenburg, "Envelopes and Seams," 356–57.

(all the cities they found they set on fire) that is modeled on Judg 1:8 וְאֶת־הָעִיר שִׁלְּחוּ בָאֵשׁ

(and the city they set on fire) as the phrase שִׁלְּחוּ בָאֵשׁ (set on fire) is only elsewhere found

at Ps 74:7.[259] The repetition of weeping at Bochim (Judg 2:5) and Bethel (Judg 20:23, 26;

21:2) also links the opening to the ending of the book, without strong connection to its

main body, as something of an inclusio delimiting a single scroll.[260] The repetition of

Joshua's death and burial at Judg 2:6–10, and the mentions of the location Shiloh at Judg

21:19 and 1 Sam 1:3, served then for Edenburg to position the reading of the Judges

scroll between those of Joshua and First Samuel.[261]

1.4.16 Sarah Schulz (2018)

The novel hypothesis of Sarah Schulz, "that there were originally two independent

bridges between the Hexateuch and Samuel–Kings: Josh 13(–19); 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,"[262] was her analytical start-point. Her analysis of Josh 23 identified vv. 2, 4a, 5b,

14 as the basic layer encouraging future possession of the land as Joshua's death nears,

with vv. 5a, 6, 12–13 concerning the conditional nature of the LORD's continued help

added in a first redaction, and vv. 7–11, 15–16, added even later, providing the motive of

love/loyalty for the LORD, as well as threats of future expulsion from the land for

violating the covenant.[263] She further thought that Judg 1 "presents an account of the

attempt to conquer the land announced in Josh 23. But in contrast to Joshua's optimistic

---

[259] Edenburg, "Envelopes and Seams," 357. The usual phrase for setting a city on fire is שָׂרְפָתְ בָאֵשׁ אֶת־הָעִיר (burn the city with fire, cf. Deut 13:17).
[260] Edenburg, "Envelopes and Seams," 357–60.
[261] Edenburg, "Envelopes and Seams," 363–66.
[262] Schulz, "Literary Transition," 257.
[263] Schulz, "Literary Transition," 258–60.

assumption in Josh 23, the Israelites largely fail."[264] She viewed Judg 2:1–2, 4–5 as an

accusation of that failure, and depicted it as prior to the first redaction of Josh 23 (i.e., the

addition of vv. 5a, 6, 12–13, which prohibit mixing with the nations but do not raise the

matter of the covenant), and Judg 1 older still—she suggested that Judg 2:3 might have

been added at the same time as Josh 23:7–11, 15–16.[265] With respect to Josh 24 Schulz

believed that vv. 19–21, 23–24, and possibly 14b, are additions.[266]

Schulz had Josh 11:23a proceeding directly to Judg 2:6, 8 (the dismissal of the

people and the death notice of Joshua) as an original ending to the Hexateuch, with Judg

2:7, 10 (descriptions of the two distinct generations) providing linkage to the following

saviour stories.[267] She separated out Judg 17–21 and denied that those chapters should be

seen as appendices to the book of Judges based on their chronological connection to the

generation following Joshua and Eleazar.[268] She thought that the saviour stories were

better connected directly with the narratives about the monarchy in Samuel–Kings

because they shared the Ammonites and Philistines as common enemies on either side of

the joining, the saviour stories lack mention of former inhabitants of the land whereas in

Judg 17–21 they are presumed to be present, and the saviour stories rail against worship

of foreign gods while Judg 17–21 are about illegitimate worship of the LORD.[269] She

saw an independent connection of Judg 17–21 with the following period of the monarchy

as more subversive in terms of denigrating Saul the Benjaminite in comparison with

David.[270] The coherence of Josh 24 and Judg 2:6—16:31 (the Judges saviour stories)

---

[264] Schulz, "Literary Transition," 261.
[265] Schulz, "Literary Transition," 261–62.
[266] Schulz, "Literary Transition," 265–66.
[267] Schulz, "Literary Transition," 267.
[268] Schulz, "Literary Transition," 268.
[269] Schulz, "Literary Transition," 268–69.
[270] Schulz, "Literary Transition," 269–70.

was, for her, based on Israel's violation of the first commandment, and "the incomplete

and leaderless conquest" connects Josh 23 to Judg 1:1—2:5; 17–21.[271]

1.4.17 Christian Frevel (2018)

The rejoinder by Christian Frevel to Blum, Kratz, and Schulz captured the complexity

and diversity of the discussion surrounding the book-seam.[272] He critiqued Kratz's

redaction-critical findings as disconnected from established broader compositional

theories about the Pentateuch, Hexateuch, Deuteronomistic History, and Enneateuch, and

as ultimately unverifiable.[273] He thought that Schulz's source-critical approach

introduced some interesting—even provocative—notions about the compositional history

of the Enneateuch, but commented that it lacked sufficient explanatory power for the

repetition at Judg 2:6–10 in particular.[274] He was fairly closely aligned with Blum on the

question of the basic layer of Josh 23 and remarked that "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."[275] Thus, for him, the deuteronomistic character of Judg 2 is

secondary, "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."[276] Frevel

saw the tension between the categorical prohibition against worshiping other gods in Josh

---

271 Schulz, "Literary Transition," 270.
272 Frevel, "Untying Tangles," 281–94.
273 Frevel, "Untying Tangles," 282.
274 Frevel, "Untying Tangles," 283.
275 Frevel, "Untying Tangles," 284.
276 Frevel, "Untying Tangles," 285.

23 along with its accompanying threat of removal from the land, and the LORD's command not to make covenants with the people of the land but at the same time the inviolability of LORD's covenant with the ancestors of the Israelite people found in Judg 2:1–5; he thought that the tension was compositionally deliberate in order to function as a transition/separation of eras.[277]

Concerning the near repetition of, specifically, Josh 24:31 (ויעבד ישראל את־יהוה כל ימי יהושע וכל ימי הזקנים אשר האריכו ימים אחרי יהושע ואשר ידעו את כל־מעשה יהוה אשר עשה לישראל "Israel served the LORD all the days of Joshua, and all the days of the elders whose days had extended beyond Joshua and who had observed all the work that the LORD had done on behalf of Israel") at Judg 2:7 (ויעבדו העם את־יהוה כל ימי יהושע וכל ימי הזקנים אשר האריכו ימים אחרי יהושוע אשר ראו את כל־מעשה יהוה הגדול אשר עשה לישראל "The people served the LORD all the days of Joshua, and all the days of the elders whose days had extended beyond Joshua, who had seen all the great work that the LORD had done on behalf of Israel"), Frevel compares them with Deut 11:7 (כי עיניכם הראת את־כל־מעשה יהוה הגדל אשר עשה "For your eyes [were] seeing all the great work of the LORD that he did"). The relevant textual issues are underlined. He argued that Judg 2:7, because it more closely resembles Deut 11:7, was later conformed to it, and that mention of elders and the people (cf. Josh 24:2, 16, 19, 21, 22, 24, 25, 27, 28) in Judg 2:7 seems out of place, this time conforming to Josh 24.[278] He thought that the notice לָרֶשֶׁת אֶת־הָאָרֶץ "to take possession of the land," unique to Judg 2:6 in the repetition of this section, is analeptic and makes better sense as a closure to the book of Joshua. The accumulation of these arguments suggested to Frevel that "the separating function of the repetition cannot be

---

[277] Frevel, "Untying Tangles," 286–87.
[278] Frevel, "Untying Tangles," 288–89.

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."[279]

1.4.18 Summary of Investigations Concerning the Joshua–Judges Book-seam

So, we revisit the original question concerning this examination of the historical and

literary evidence to determine if Judges (or for that matter Joshua also) ought to be

considered an independent book—perhaps fitted in toward the end of the compositional

history of the larger corpus—or as essentially just part of a larger single composition

(Deuteronomistic History or Enneateuch) not necessarily delineated by significant

literary markers or boundaries at the places where the book-seams currently sit. From the

selective and somewhat representative descriptive survey above we have seen that the

past century's worth of research on the transition from the book of Joshua to the book of

Judges was mainly focused on diachronic, historical-critical studies (source, tradition,

form, and redaction), with a few venturing into more synchronic, narrative or

comparative literature types of approaches. It might also be reasonably noted that there

has been a resurgence of support for the idea of a Hexateuch more generally, which has

had a significant impact on the direction of those studies. Even with the recent increase in

interest for diachronic investigation specifically into the transition between Joshua and

Judges,[280] some difficulties in understanding stubbornly remain and it can be said that

> 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 consensus

---

[279] Frevel, "Untying Tangles," 290.
[280] Berner and Samuel, *Book-Seams in the Hexateuch 1*.

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.[281]

It might also be said that Judges is now a distinct work no matter what one believes about a Deuteronomistic History. Perhaps it did not always exist as a distinct work from Joshua (and/or Samuel), but it has now been created with a special introduction.[282] The fact that we have Joshua in two textual editions further makes that case clear.

It seems to me that the overarching deuteronomistic character of the book-seam between Joshua and Judges is incontrovertible, as is a general deuteronomistic mood for the narrative framework found in the Deuteronomistic History. This, however, does not mean that the most basic compositional layers were *first* formed into a continuous history exactly after the manner of Noth's theory. Noth's recognition of the literarily problematic nature of the transition between Joshua and Judges, and the efforts he undertook to explain it, underline the importance of that issue. We have seen many variations above for possibilities in understanding how these transitional texts could have been created, and there were some intriguing prospects discussed concerning the contexts and motivations for adapting these writings at various stages of a presumably very complicated compositional process. The most important disruption in the historical context of the biblical materials was, of course, the Babylonian exile of Judah. The warnings of loss of the land are all focused on that eventuality.

---

[281] Frevel, "Untying Tangles," 293–94.
[282] Levin, "Nach siebzig Jahren," 76–78, 88.

The deuteronomistic character of Joshua and Judges specifically is not evenly observed throughout, and it is different again from the overall tenor found in Samuel–Kings that is focused on centralization of the cult and the looming potential for loss of the land. Loss of the land is not a primary concern of Judges, but oppression by outsiders for Israel's breach of the LORD's covenant by whoring after other gods and making agreements with the inhabitants of the land is. The book of Joshua is intent to describe, at least in its earlier forms, the wholesale conquest of the land through the power of the LORD and in conformity with the LORD's previous promise; in some of its later adaptations, the provisional possession of the land seems dependent on refraining from associations like marriage with the people of the land. The differences in the settings and emphases between the farewell speech of Josh 23 (e.g., loss of land due to association with its inhabitants [vv. 12–13]) and the covenant renewal speech of Josh 24, which is more like Judges in its notice of foreign gods (vv. 14, 23), are emblematic of those distinctions. Judges 1; 2:1–5, 11–23; 3:1–6, 7–11 are also each distinguishable. Judges 1 moves from an *all-is-well* mood at its beginning through a crescendo of blameworthiness that culminates in the unexplained unwillingness and ultimate inability to drive out the Canaanite. Judges 2, in one way or another, speaks to the breach of covenant, either by making covenants with the inhabitants or by worshiping their gods, and the predictable results of the LORD's anger. Judges 3 introduces the notion of the nations left in the land in order to test the Israelites. Those observations tend to support Rudolph's notion that Josh 23; Judg 2:6–10, 13, 20–22; 3:1a, 3, 4, 6 was a coherent conclusion to the book of Joshua in a previous iteration.[283]

---

[283] Rudolph, *Elohist*, 242.

These observed inconsistencies in the present text go some way to establish multiple perspectives and to serve as evidence for a series of contributing authors. The details of any construction, however, remain tentative, as the plethora of views reviewed above have demonstrated by their mutual incompatibility. This does not mean, nonetheless, that some broad lines of a compositional history of the texts under consideration cannot be drawn as a working hypothesis. Blum's outline seems to capture many of its essentials with the fewest problems, and is a refinement of Noth's solution. Blum thought that the completed conquest (Josh 1–12; 21:43–45) was basic to the Deuteronomistic History,[284] that a second layer was added with the inclusion of Josh 13:1b–6; 23:1–16; Judg 2:6–10,[285] with Judg 2:1–5 provided later as a narrative link.[286] With respect to Josh 24, he saw it as an early post-exilic insertion when there was the amalgamation of the book of Joshua with an existing Pentateuch into a Hexateuch with Josh 24 as its conclusion, and a corresponding severance from the book of Judges and the Deuteronomistic History. This would have created the need for Judg 1 as a new introduction—especially Judg 1:1aα modeled on Josh 1:1aα—and the duplication of Judg 2:6–10 at the end of Josh 24.[287] So, with respect to the differences between the closing of Joshua and the introduction to Judges concerning the Israelites serving the LORD throughout Joshua's life—i.e., before Joshua's death as in Judg 2:7, or after his death as in Josh 24:31—it might be plausibly argued, as Rudolph noted, that *both* positions support *literary* reasons for their specific placements within the larger replication.[288]

---

[284] Blum, "Kompositionelle Knoten," 182–83.
[285] Blum, "Kompositionelle Knoten," 184–87.
[286] Blum, "Kompositionelle Knoten," 188, 191.
[287] Blum, "Kompositionelle Knoten," 204–7.
[288] Rudolph, *Elohist*, 241n6.

The investigations into the compositional history of the texts under consideration in this study as reviewed in this chapter have provided invaluable potential insight into the thinking of the authors and redactors. However, historical studies are not the only way of analyzing the texts. Toward the last quarter of the last century there was an increasing scholarly interest in literary approaches to biblical narrative. We turn now in the next chapter to sketch a brief outline of some key drivers of that impetus and then provide a rationale for, and a detailed explanation of, the methodological approach of the remainder of the study.

CHAPTER 2: APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY

2.1 The Rise in Interest in the Bible as Literature

In the last chapter we noted the predominance of diachronic methods in the scholarly

analysis of our texts. This dominance throughout biblical studies began to be challenged

when James Muilenburg set a new course for the field with more deliberate focus on

synchronic approaches. In his Presidential Address, delivered at the annual meeting of the

Society of Biblical Literature on 18 December 1968, he lauded the merits of form

criticism, and at the same time encouraged biblical scholars to investigate beyond *the*

typical, recognizing the diversity, skill, and artistry of the ancient biblical writers.[1] He

wanted to stress to his colleagues "that there are other features in the literary

compositions which lie beyond the province of the *Gattungsforscher* (form critic)."[2] He

thought it only natural that the *linguistic patterns* of the writings should provide insight

into the ideas expressed in those writings. Insofar as his address focused mainly on

stylistic considerations of Hebrew poetry, he also thought that the discernment of

structural patterns and rhetorical devices was key to more fully understanding prose as

well.[3] For him, the most important of those features were the recognition of the *opening*

and *closing* to a literary unit (i.e., delimiting it), and the identification of the *culminating*

predications (i.e., climaxes).[4] He would conclude that

---

[1] Muilenburg, "Form Criticism and Beyond," 1–5.
[2] Muilenburg, "Form Criticism and Beyond," 6.
[3] Muilenburg, "Form Criticism and Beyond," 8.
[4] Muilenburg, "Form Criticism and Beyond," 8–9.

> Persistent and painstaking attention to the modes of Hebrew literary composition will reveal that the pericopes exhibit linguistic patterns, word formations ordered or arranged in particular ways, verbal sequences which move in fixed structures from beginning to end. It is clear that they have been skillfully wrought in many different ways, often with consummate skill and artistry.[5]

The increase in the interest in treating the Bible like any other literature was likely inevitable. As the newer modes of assessing literature in general became more prominent in universities, they began to be applied to the Bible. Northrop Frye would declare by 1981 that "A literary approach to the Bible is not itself illegitimate: no book could have so specific a literary influence without itself possessing literary qualities."[6] Paul R. House traced the rise in literary interest in the Bible through the successive stages of rhetorical criticism (1969–1974), then structuralism (1974–1981), and finally formalism (from 1981).[7] Robert Alter, with the 1981 publication of *The Art of Biblical Narrative*,[8] provided an accessible method of doing literary analysis of the biblical narrative texts by means of formalism. His approach was to pay "attention to the artful use of language, to the shifting play of ideas, conventions, tone, sound, imagery, syntax, narrative viewpoint, compositional units, etc."[9] Alter pushed back against a purely *excavative* approach to the Hebrew Bible. He provided analyses of biblical narrative as artistically constructed fiction. His approach was evocative, but the use to which he put so-called type scenes probably cannot bear the literary weight he gave to them. He made some truly interesting observations on the age of the texts (generally older than most critics would allow), dialogue as preeminent over narration, uses of different kinds of repetition, reticence of

---

[5] Muilenburg, "Form Criticism and Beyond," 18.
[6] Frye, *Great Code*, xvi.
[7] House, "Rise and Current Status," 4–5.
[8] Alter, *Art of Biblical Narrative*.
[9] Alter, *Art of Biblical Narrative*, 12.

the omniscient and reliable narrator (particularly with respect to characterization), and the complexity of the composite nature of the text as literary art. In all of this he did not forget that there is a compositional history of the Bible, but he did emphasize that there is a need for more recognition of the artistry with which the final redactors exercised their craft.[10]

Meir Sternberg was a key voice in coming to terms with potential motivations of the writers of Biblical Hebrew narratives. Whereas some scholars like Robert C. Culley were more interested in the repetition of conventional patterns in the biblical stories, and their roots in oral formulaic storytelling,[11] Sternberg asserted that "form has no value or meaning apart from communicative (historical, ideological, aesthetic) function."[12] His 1985 collection of studies in the Indiana Studies in Biblical Literature series[13] was a major work in the application of literary theory and method to biblical narrative. He came from a clear perspective that gave precedence to the intentional author who combines language and craft to communicate an ideology. The reader, through understanding the poetics—or science—of the literary endeavour, would be a better interpreter. He viewed the biblical narrative as decidedly historical, however not of the modern type, and the ideology presented is one of an all-knowing and all-powerful God. Interest is generated by the writer telling something between *the truth* and *the whole truth*.

There have been a number of book-length studies on the book of Judges[14] using narrative approaches that encompass rhetorical criticism, structuralism, and formalism—

---

[10] Alter, *Art of Biblical Narrative*, 19–20.
[11] Culley, *Studies in Structure*, 110–15; "Exploring New Directions," 183.
[12] Sternberg, *Poetics of Biblical Narrative*, xii.
[13] Sternberg, *Poetics of Biblical Narrative*.
[14] The most relevant of those will be discussed more fully in the analysis of Judges below.

many fewer on Joshua[15] for the obvious reason that there is only a bare narrative

framework for the second half of the book. Some of their conclusions will be evaluated in

later chapters.

In an associated area of investigation, Brevard S. Childs would argue "the case

that the biblical literature has not been correctly understood or interpreted because its role

as *religious* literature has not been correctly assessed."[16] Childs sought to elevate "the

analysis of the canonical literature of the synagogue and church" over seeking "to

describe the history of the development of the Hebrew literature and to trace the earlier

and later stages of this history."[17] That emphasis on understanding the biblical literature

in its broader religious/cultural context led Childs to develop a method that would

account for both the historical and sacred natures of the writings—

> Canonical analysis focuses its attention on the final form of the text itself. It seeks
> neither to use the text merely as a source for other information obtained by an
> oblique reading, nor to reconstruct a history of religious development. Rather, it
> treats the literature in its own integrity. Its concern is not to establish a history of
> Hebrew literature in general, but to study the features of this peculiar set of
> religious texts in relation to their usage within the historical community of ancient
> Israel. To take the canonical shape of these texts seriously is to seek to do justice
> to a literature which Israel transmitted as a record of God's revelation to his
> people along with Israel's response. The canonical approach to the Hebrew Bible
> does not make any dogmatic claims for the literature itself, as if these texts
> contained only timeless truths or communicated in a unique idiom, but rather it
> studies them as historically and theologically conditioned writings which were
> accorded a normative function in the life of the community. It also acknowledges
> that the texts served a religious function in closest relationship to the worship and

---

[15] We saw, in Koopmans' analysis above on Josh 24, the use of rhetorical and structural features to mark out the chapter as *poetic narrative* (*Joshua 24*). Sarah Lebhar Hall's synchronic assessment of the kinds of characterization of the leader Joshua in Josh 1–11 was a noteworthy contribution in seeing a complex yet coherent presentation of the person within a unified portion of narrative (*Conquering Character*). L. Daniel Hawk's commentary in the Berit Olam series uses a more thematic narrative approach, focusing on boundaries of "land, religion, and ethnic separation" (*Joshua*, xiii). Lori L. Rowlett's New Historicist analysis of the book goes beyond formalism to uncover the importance of the ideology behind the text (*Joshua and the Rhetoric of Violence*, 16–29). Gordon Mitchell's study focused on describing the opposing points of view in the narrative of Joshua (*Together in the Land*).

[16] Childs, *Introduction to the OT*, 16 (emphasis added).

[17] Childs, *Introduction to the OT*, 40.

service of God whom Israel confessed to be the source of the sacred word. The witness of the text cannot be separated from the divine reality which Israel testified to have evoked the response.[18]

Like the other approaches to the Bible as literature, the transmitted form of the text is the basis for Childs' analysis. Nonetheless, Childs was not particularly interested in such things as the poetics, aesthetics, kerygma, deep structure, and narrative unity of biblical texts, but rather sought to find the theological impress of the received text.[19] For him, its interpreter ought to seek to understand the text's function within the faith community. Even so, he seemed to lean heavily on the history of the formation of the text to inform his exegesis of the canonical text.

Throughout the past half-century, the increased scholarly interest in the various literary approaches to biblical narrative, be it rhetorical criticism, structuralism, formalism, or a canonical approach, has opened up some valuable insights of a synchronic nature into the broader texts under consideration in this study. Some of these will be brought into the conversation during the specific analyses in later chapters. However, there is no noticeable contribution to *the specific problem* of accounting for the obvious change of outlook between the books of Joshua and Judges as specifically exemplified at the book-seam. That lapse is the reason for undertaking this study, and the application of a textlinguistic approach to the problem holds the promise of additional fruitful discovery. To the origins of this field we now turn our attention.

---

[18] Childs, *Introduction to the OT*, 73.
[19] Childs, *Introduction to the OT*, 74.

2.2 Textlinguistics and the Summer Institute of Linguistics (SIL) Discourse Analysis

Ferdinand de Saussure established himself as a founder of the science of linguistics and the field of semiotics through the editorial work of two of his students—Charles Bally and Albert Sechehaye—in the collation and 1916 publication of his *Cours de linguistique général*.[20] He thought that the subject matter of linguistics includes all manner of human *speech* (as well as written texts, which represent language), and that the practice of linguistics ought to describe the history of languages, and find out what general principles and dynamics are at work in all languages, which he saw as social-psychological phenomena—constructed things.[21] For him, the essence of language was the closed cycle of the physiological phonation and audition, and the corresponding psychological process of sound-image in its relationship to concept,[22] in other words, the ability to speak, hear, and understand. A primary premise of linguistics as he understood it is the overall arbitrariness of the distinctive "sign" (the totality of the psychological process) which is constituted by the "signified" (the concept) and the "signifier" (the sound-image).[23]

The emphasis in his work was *the clear separation of synchronic from diachronic linguistic phenomena*. Two areas were brought to light: the distinction between phonetics (diachronic evolution of speaking sounds) and phonology (synchronic description of speaking sounds),[24] and the distinction between changes in usage (diachronic and evolutionary) and grammar (synchronic, static language-state) as a complex system of relational interactions—it is that *static* and *grammatical* perspective that is important for

---

[20] Saussure, *Course in General Linguistics*.
[21] Saussure, *Course in General Linguistics*, 6.
[22] Saussure, *Course in General Linguistics*, 15.
[23] Saussure, *Course in General Linguistics*, 66–70. This is the purview of semiotics.
[24] Saussure, *Course in General Linguistics*, 33.

our study. The description of the system he embraced was that "if one speaks of a law in synchrony, it is in the sense of an arrangement, a *principle of regularity.*"[25] In other words, there is no imperative in the law, it is general and merely expresses conventional patterns. He indicated that "A language constitutes a (complex) system . . . (it) is not completely arbitrary but is ruled to some extent by logic."[26] His aim as a linguist was to describe the limitations on that arbitrariness,[27] and his explanations would become the basis of later theories of tagmemics[28] and textlinguistics.

In dealing with the idea of a language-state, Saussure saw "signs and their relations" as the *concrete entities* of the science of linguistics, in need of *delimitation* (i.e., identification as significant units, e.g., words).[29] He believed that language is a system of values for understanding reality because "our thought—apart from its expression in words—is only a shapeless and indistinct mass."[30] It links thought and sound in form. The delimitation of the different units of the form present values of *this, not that*. Meaning of a represented concept essentially rests in oppositions or distinguishing differences (negations)—only by the consideration of signifier and signified together in association is meaning positively established. The complex system of a language-state can be described linguistically through the categorization of those patterns of opposition and associations in the signifier (form) / signified (value). For him,

---

[25] Saussure, *Course in General Linguistics*, 93.
[26] Saussure, *Course in General Linguistics*, 73.
[27] Saussure, *Course in General Linguistics*, 133.
[28] A *tagmeme* is "the smallest meaningful unit of grammatical form; a constituent of a meaningful grammatical relation that cannot be analyzed into smaller meaningful features; it may be marked by features of word order, selection of allomorphs, agreement with finite verb forms, elaboration by preceding adjectival modifiers" (Pei, *Glossary of Linguistic Terminology*, 275).
[29] Saussure, *Course in General Linguistics*, 102.
[30] Saussure, *Course in General Linguistics*, 111. I am not generally convinced of the absolute correctness of this particular view, though I would agree that language provides useful precision and clarity in one's thought processes.

grammar was "the description of a language-state,"[31] and was not just restricted to morphology and syntax.

So we can see that Saussure conceived of human language as a complex cultural artifact, and it is from this basis that Kenneth L. Pike thought that generalization about a theory of language must also be linked to non-language human behaviour,[32] and "that human behavior must be analyzed as consisting of various simultaneous structurings of its activity, structurings which (he) called modes."[33] The modes he described are: feature (contrast, lexicon), manifestation (variation, phonology), and distribution (grammar).[34] He developed a theoretical framework dealing specifically with the complexity of interrelationships of events (within classes and systems), activities, the physical universe, artifacts, culture, language, meaning, etc. In a merging of cultural anthropology and linguistic theory, he explored the intricacies of phonemics/phonology, morphemics/morphology, and tagmemics. He concluded that language is actually a form of human behavior, and a descriptive theory needed to include both verbal and non-verbal human activity.[35] He coined the terms *emic* and *etic* "to describe behavior from two different standpoints . . . the etic viewpoint studies behavior as from outside of a particular system (comparatively creative) . . . the emic viewpoint results from studying behavior from inside the system (culturally specific discovery)."[36] One important outcome of Pike's tagmemics theory was that it "looks beyond the boundaries of both

---

[31] Saussure, *Course in General Linguistics*, 134.
[32] Pike, *Language in Relation*, 6.
[33] Pike, *Language in Relation*, 93.
[34] Pike, *Language in Relation*, 8–9.
[35] Pike, *Language in Relation*, 26.
[36] Pike, *Language in Relation*, 37.

sentences and text toward (larger) complexes of human interaction. . . . The text was

defined as a unit larger than the sentence."[37]

The move to consider grammar beyond the scope of the sentence, opened the field

of linguistics up to approaches gathered under the heading of *textlinguistics*.[38] For

Robert-Alain de Beaugrande and Wolfgang Ulrich Dressler, "A TEXT will be defined as a

COMMUNICATIVE OCCURRENCE which meets seven standards of TEXTUALITY."[39] They

listed their seven standards (*constitutive principles*) of textuality as cohesion (including

systematic and repetitive grammatical relationships in the surface structure of the text,

i.e., syntax, plus longer-range recurrence), coherence (of knowledge or concepts),

intentionality, acceptability (i.e., relevance to the receiver), informativity, situationality,

and intertextuality. There are also *regulative principles* such as efficiency, effectiveness,

and appropriateness. They used a procedural approach to the study of the patterns of texts

and how texts bring about communication, viewing the elements as interactive rather than

modular for the purposes of study.[40] Again, with textlinguistics pursuing the examination

of texts grammatically, beyond the boundaries of the sentence, it led to the recognition of

the linguistics sub-discipline of discourse analysis as represented primarily by Robert E.

Longacre, a long-time colleague of Pike.

> The term *textlinguistics* was and is still primarily used by European linguists
> (who) take the whole text as the necessary scope of studying the language. . . .
> American linguists whose primary interests are in discourse tend to use the

---

[37] Beaugrande and Dressler, *Introduction to Text Linguistics*, 18, 23.

[38] *Textlinguistics* "designates any work in language science devoted to the text as the primary object of inquiry" (Beaugrande and Dressler, *Introduction to Text Linguistics*, 14). Harald Weinrich provided some further elucidation on the term. "Text linguistics is a further development of structural linguistics, understood here as the scholarly term for a linguistics based on Ferdinand de Saussure's *Course in General Linguistics*. It is not concerned with linguistic signs in isolation or in a merely historical ('diachronic') perspective, but investigates the significance of a linguistic sign in the larger structural context of a linguistic code or one of its subsystems" (*Tempus*, 11–12).

[39] Beaugrande and Dressler, *Introduction to Text Linguistics*, 3.

[40] Beaugrande and Dressler, *Introduction to Text Linguistics*, 3–12.

expression, *discourse analysis*, rather than *textlinguistics*. *Discourse*, however, may refer to only spoken data for some and dialogue for others, as in a conversational analysis. Whether you use the term *textlinguistics* or *discourse analysis*, it is a linguistic study of texts, whether written or spoken, monologue or dialogue. Specifically, Longacre's theory of textlinguistics focuses on the areas of the intersection of the morphosyntax[41] and the discourse structure. He (Longacre) states (that) "The goal of the textlinguist is to confront the morphosyntax of a language with the structure of texts in that language to the mutual elucidation of both. This leads not only to a better understanding of the linguistic structure of the language, but also to a kind of text hermeneutic." He urges us to study the structure of the text as a whole while analyzing the parts of the text in light of the whole.[42]

It is with that approach to discourse analysis developed primarily by Longacre that our present study will mainly concern itself.

The term, and method of, *discourse analysis* were brought into the field of linguistics by Zellig S. Harris through his 1952 article "Discourse Analysis" in the journal *Language*.[43] He described his method as having "to provide statements of the occurrence of elements, and in particular of the relative occurrence of all the elements of a discourse within the limits of that one discourse."[44] He applied the method to determine the structures of text types and the roles of the various elements making up a text.[45] The term, and method of, *discourse analysis* were brought into the field of Biblical Hebrew grammar by Francis I. Andersen in his 1974 monograph *The Sentence in Biblical Hebrew*. He believed that "*The strong points of tagmemics are its empirical approach, its respect for living language data, its concern for analytical description rather than generation, its search for units and for classes, (and) its interest in relationships within*

---

[41] *Morphosyntax* is the "surface structure of grammar; morpheme, word, phrase, clause levels of grammar" (Longacre and Hwang, *Holistic Discourse Analysis*, 219).

[42] Hwang, *Development of Textlinguistics*, xi. The quotation of Longacre is from "Some Hermeneutic Observations," 170.

[43] Harris, "Discourse Analysis."

[44] Harris, "Discourse Analysis," 5.

[45] Harris, "Discourse Analysis," 30.

specific constructions rather than abstract functions as such."[46] He described the

relationship between grammar of the sentence and grammar of a discourse as follows.

> As a unit in the grammatical component of a language, a sentence may be defined
> as a construction that is grammatically complete or self-contained; that is, the
> grammatical functions of all the elements in a given sentence can be described in
> terms of relationship to other elements within the same sentence.

> Such definitions take us somewhere, but they do not take us very far. The
> set of sentences for any language, identified as units in speech by phonological
> criteria, is likely to include a variety of construction types from the grammatical
> point of view, ranging from a single word to an extended text. (We use TEXT to
> refer to any given specimen of a language, spoken or written.) Grammatical
> completeness, as a *sine qua non* of sentence identity, may prove as hard to
> establish as completeness of thought. If we can identify parts of a sentence as
> elements of that sentence, then these ingredients, in their own way, will have
> some measure of internal integrity that permits their isolation. A WORD, a
> PHRASE, a CLAUSE has its own internal structure or completeness. And few
> sentences, however complete within themselves, are likely to be as entirely
> without relationships to their context as the definition requires. Bloomfield's
> famous definition—"a sentence is an independent linguistic form, not included by
> virtue of any grammatical construction in any larger linguistic form"—if applied
> strictly, would identify the unit we call DISCOURSE. Most sentences function
> within larger discourse of some kind, to say nothing of the non-linguistic
> behavioural context. Grammatical completeness is therefore a matter of degree,
> and cannot be made an absolute criterion for the identification of sentences.[47]

The work of Andersen and Longacre on Biblical Hebrew was highly interdependent as a

comparison of *The Sentence in Biblical Hebrew* with Longacre's "Flood Narrative" and

Joseph: A Story of Divine Providence should demonstrate.

Longacre was a missionary to Mexico from 1947, doing fieldwork among the

Trique in Oaxaca State for more than twenty years, and translating the New Testament

into the Trique language.[48] Under the supervision of Zellig Harris and Henry

---

[46] Andersen, *Sentence in Biblical Hebrew*, 19 (emphasis added).

[47] Andersen, *Sentence in Biblical Hebrew*, 21–22. The quotation from Bloomfield comes from *Language* (170).

[48] The biographical information in this section comes from the Summer Institute of Linguistics, "Remembering Dr. Robert Longacre," and Hwang and Merrifield, *Language in Context*, xi–xiv.

Hoenigswald, Longacre earned his PhD in linguistics in 1955 from the University of Pennsylvania[49] based on his linguistic reconstruction of Mesoamerican languages. He was a consultant to the Summer Institute of Linguistics (SIL), conducting linguistics workshops beginning in the early 1960's, working alongside its President, Kenneth Pike. He taught linguistics at the University of Texas in Arlington from 1972 until 1993. He also served as the President of the Linguistic Association of Canada and the United States for the period 1994–1995.

Longacre's doctoral dissertation on Proto-Mixtecan was fundamental to placing the Oto-Manguean language family in the same timeframe as the Proto-Indo-European family, though of course continents apart. He continued to investigate the historical linguistics of Mixtec, Trique, and other related Mesoamerican languages. Based on his fieldwork he further developed Pike's pioneering work in tagmemics and Harris's linguistic string analysis. His long career was largely associated with the SIL where he provided leadership and training to countless students. His first two monographs, *Proto-Mixtecan* (published version of his 1955 doctoral dissertation) and *Grammar Discovery Procedures*,[50] were model studies that generated a great deal of subsequent research by others and were of considerable help to students and practitioners of translation doing practical fieldwork. They represented the tagmemic approach of Longacre that he considered both "analytic and taxonomic."[51] His method was distinct from the European structural linguistics theories that developed from Saussure's work, and was a significant

---

[49] This was the same year that Avram Noam Chomsky received his PhD in linguistics from the University of Pennsylvania for his work on transformational grammar even though he had not been registered as a student there for four years (Sperlich, *Noam Chomsky*, 36).

[50] Longacre, *Proto-Mixtecan*; *Procedures*.

[51] Longacre, *Procedures*, 10.

departure from the American psychological structuralism (Bloomfieldian) and

generative/transformational (Chomskyan) approaches to linguistic theory current at the

time. His dependence on Pike's model in contradistinction from the other approaches can

be seen in his opening to *Grammar Discovery Procedures*:

> How is grammar related to other aspects of linguistic structure? Until recently American structural linguistics has assumed a model of language in which phonemes built into morphemes which in turn built into syntactic units. As a result, phonology, morphology, and syntax were regarded as successively higher layers of structure. Generative grammar has turned this model upside down and ordered it rule-wise with a cover symbol for sentence as the first rule and phonological rules for transcription into terminal sentences as the last section of rules. However novel may be certain aspects of generative grammar, it has not challenged the model in any essential way.
>
> The present procedures are based on a more radical departure from former American structuralism than that found in generative grammar. It is here assumed that language is structured in three semiautonomous but interlocking modes, phonology, grammar, and lexicon (Pike's trimodalism). Phonology is not taken up into morphology which is in turn taken up into syntax. . . .
>
> These procedures develop, then, a method for grammatical analysis as distinguished from both phonological and lexical analysis. Grammatical analysis leads to formulae, statements, and operations which can generate the grammatical patterns of novel utterances beyond the scope of one's corpus.[52]

Longacre's tagmemic approach to grammar was intended to be comparative,

straightforward and summary in its analysis.[53] We also see here the separation of the

physical elements of language from the psychological.

Longacre was the founder and editor of, and occasional contributor to, the *Journal*

of Translation and Textlinguistics, and eventually authored or co-authored over two

hundred books and articles. His book, *The Grammar of Discourse*, is a standard graduate-

---

[52] Longacre, *Procedures*, 8–9.
[53] Longacre, *Procedures*, 14.

level text in linguistics and is in its third iteration.[54] It focuses on discourse as a process

of language in the real world—the data used to support theoretical findings in this

textbook are examples of *language in context*, which may be seen as a recurrent theme in

much of his work. More specifically in support of Old Testament studies, his *Joseph: A*

Story of Divine Providence is in its second edition and continues to be the exemplary

application of his discourse analysis method to biblical Hebrew.[55] In *Joseph* he refined

his understanding of how specific verb forms other than the preterite dictate *distance*

from the main narrative line rather than being simply on or off it as described in his

seminal "The Discourse Structure of the Flood Narrative" articles.[56] He also made great

strides in describing how dialogue is represented in Hebrew narrative. Others would

eventually use Longacre's discourse analysis to substantiate and refine the method with

respect to how it described the Hebrew verbal system, in particular in the context of

further studies on the Joseph Story.[57] The following summary of his latest work rounds

out the discussion of his major contributions.

> Even after he formally retired from SIL in 1994, he continued to make
> contributions to his field, collaborating on his last two books with long-time

---

[54] Longacre, *Grammar of Discourse* (1996), vii. Previous iterations were *Grammar of Discourse* (1983) and *Anatomy of Speech* (1976). The trajectory of this standard text on linguistics ends with the outline of a framework for surface and notional discourse structures based strongly on Pike's trimodal approach. He starts by comparing and contrasting surface and notional correlations at the various levels and in many different languages. His goal is a relatively universal description of how meaning is encoded in human language. Just as traditional grammar articulates the manner in which surface structure works in a language, the *case frames* he develops aim to distinguish the deeper encoding of meaning in the notional structures (generally successfully).

[55] Longacre, *Joseph* (1989); *Joseph* (2003). These books explain how cohesion (grammatical) and coherence (referential) manifests the texture of the discourse by means of the interplay between the main storyline and circumstantial material, and the reference to thematic participants. Key to these distinctions is the ranking of verb types (in narrative, preterite action verbs rank highest—i.e., hold sway over the main storyline), and how structure is constituted (e.g., clause types, sentences, paragraphs and their types, episodes, etc., and embedding). Predictive and expository discourse have verb rank structures different than narrative. With respect to participant reference, the importance of theme, dialogue, and speech-acts is considered.

[56] Longacre, "Flood Narrative" (1976); "Flood Narrative" (1979).

[57] Niccacci, *Syntax of the Verb*; Eskhult, *Studies in Verbal Aspect*; Endo, *Verbal System*; Heller, *Narrative Structure*.

colleagues. *Holistic Discourse Analysis*, co-authored with Dr. Shin-Ja Hwang, was published by SIL in 2012. *Understanding Hebrew Verb Forms: Distribution and Function across Genres*, co-authored with Dr. Andrew Bowling, (was) released . . . in 2015. Many of his unpublished or otherwise hard-to-find articles are included in *The Development of Textlinguistics in the Writings of Robert Longacre.* A number of respected linguists contributed to the 1992 festschrift *Language in Context: Essays for Robert E. Longacre.*[58]

Discourse analysis was the main approach followed by Longacre, though he recognized that on its own it provides minimal elucidation of the deep structure meaning of the discourse. It is, instead, descriptive in terms of a composition's formal aspects and surface storyline. Culley—a true advocate of the newer literary approaches of the time—suggested that discourse analysis on the model of Longacre's should be pursued on more texts, with a view to providing a base of data upon which a more thorough evaluation of the approach can be taken. He also suggested that "the flood story is not an ideal text with which to initiate the study for discourse in biblical Hebrew prose, for this story has long been considered by most scholars to be a composite work."[59] But Longacre actually provided an adequate basis in his "Flood Narrative" articles for the use of discourse analysis as a demonstration of some form of narrative unity in spite of the biblical account's presumably composite nature. These were the instrumental articles of a linguist, with knowledge of biblical Hebrew, decisive in bringing discourse analysis to the study of the Bible.

---

[58] Summer Institute of Linguistics, "Remembering Dr. Robert Longacre." *Holistic Discourse Analysis* is a companion volume to *Grammar of Discourse*. It is a how-to-do-it workbook on discourse analysis for Bible translators. Etic typologies are refined beyond the two parameters of contingent temporal succession and agent orientation—resulting in narrative, procedural, behavioural, and expository types—to include tension and temporal projection as guides to further sub-types (see Table 1 in this chapter). All different manners of charting inner-discourse relationships are presented with examples from various languages. The authors continued to focus on the deliberate functioning of word order, verb forms, participant reference mechanisms, and how clauses relate to each other and signal the nature and purposes of the sequences.

[59] Culley, "Exploring New Directions," 170.

Whereas Longacre's discourse analysis used his refined notions of various verb forms differentiating the main storyline (*wayyiqtol*) from off-line circumstantial material (all other forms) in order to elucidate narrative features of the Joseph Story,[60] a series of studies followed over the course of the next couple of decades that used the method of textlinguistic discourse analysis to sharpen our understanding of the Hebrew verbal system. Alviero Niccacci's handbook was revised and translated from Italian into English in 1990.[61] He was working the other way around from Longacre's approach by segregating foregrounding narrative from background commentary and analyzing the functions of the verb forms used.[62] One of the main distinctions he made was that

> In broad terms QATAL can be described as a verb form functioning retrospectively, used in narrative and in discourse (i.e., direct speech), but in different ways. Generally, it is not a narrative form, in spite of what most grammars say, unlike WAYYIQTOL, precisely because instead of being used to convey information concerning the 'degree zero' (i.e., the tense of the narrative), it conveys recovered information (an antecedent event or flashback) or even a comment on the main events.[63]

He noted, of some importance concerning Biblical Hebrew clauses, that *wayyiqtol* forms are always in first place in narrative.[64]

In 1990 Mats Eskhult published his dissertation dealing with the aspectual nature of Hebrew verb forms in narrative. He described aspect "as the essentially subjective way

---

[60] Longacre, *Joseph* (1989), ix–xiv.

[61] Niccacci, *Syntax of the Verb*. This grammar text is based on textlinguistics and identifies *wayyiqtol* with narrative (events), *qatal* as comment (retrospective) on narrative, and *yiqtol* as the dominant form for what he termed discourse (i.e., more accurately, reported speech). When used in reported speech, *qatal* is always in first place (and still retrospective), whereas the reporting *qatal* in narrative is never first. The use of prepositions and other particles before verbs is also usefully discussed. *Weqatal* often notes repeated action and *wayəhî* introduces temporal clauses. *Waw-x-qatal* in narrative (i.e., following *wayyiqtol*) sometimes emphasizes concurrence/simultaneity rather than sequence, but is always background compared with foreground. Indicative *yiqtol* never comes first.

[62] Niccacci, *Syntax of the Verb*, 19–21.

[63] Niccacci, *Syntax of the Verb*, 35.

[64] Niccacci, *Syntax of the Verb*, 44.

a speaker looks upon a situation. From this follows that the aspectual *values* of verbal

forms can hardly be studied in isolation from the utterances in which they exist as

integrate parts."[65] He went on to state that "*textlinguistic* research cannot be left without

reference, for it is important to realize that 'aspect' from a discourse perspective is a

device, used by a speaker (or writer) in order to guide his audience through a text."[66] He

made the observation that from a discourse perspective the foregrounding function of

wayyiqtol is associated with *motion* (i.e., movement through the structure of a narrative)

whereas the backgrounding function of suffix conjugation forms correlate to an *aspectual*

state.[67] He also interestingly noted that in Judges he noticed a very regular framework of

"episode-initial circumstantial clauses."[68] This accords with Longacre's criteria for

determining the opening and closing of episodes in narratives and will be used

extensively in the analysis chapters that follow below.

While the three previous studies all used the Joseph Story extensively for their

analytical examples, the following two studies focused very much on evaluating the

entire Joseph Story narrative, much like Longacre did, except that like the studies of

Niccacci and Eskhult they were more interested in *describing* certain characteristics of

the Biblical Hebrew verbal system than in elucidating the narrative structure using the

verbal forms as indicators of narrative features. Yoshinobu Endo challenged some of

Longacre's notions—he did not think that the distinction between foreground and

background in narrative is a valid factor in the choice of Hebrew verbal forms, and he did

not believe word order has any bearing on the choice of verbal form—but he did agree

---

[65] Eskhult, *Studies in Verbal Aspect*, 9.
[66] Eskhult, *Studies in Verbal Aspect*, 9.
[67] Eskhult, *Studies in Verbal Aspect*, 121–22.
[68] Eskhult, *Studies in Verbal Aspect*, 122.

that the *wayyiqtol* form had the syntactical function of expressing completion in a past

context in a sequence, even though he discounted some of its relevance for narrative

coherence.[69] Perhaps one of his more important observations is that the semantic value of

a word (i.e., stative, modal, passive, etc.) has an effect on how prefixal or suffixal verbs

might be understood. For example, a prefixal verb expressing *intention* might be rendered

in the present, but having future or modal orientation.[70] He also correctly thought that the

narrative framework controls direct speech.[71] Of some particular interest is his distinction

of *tense* between past and non-past, and future and non-future.[72] His focus on sequence

constructions in dialogue is a useful expansion on Longacre, and he reinforces and refines

some of Longacre's views on narrative. Longacre commented on Endo's overall

assessment in the following manner.

> Endo's attempt to take sequentiality as basic rather than foregrounding initially impressed me as a mere terminological squabble. After all, foregrounded clauses in narrative are sequential. Foregrounding is a general term which is extendible to other discourse types (e.g., expository or descriptive) where sequentiality is not a concern. But Endo's argument tries to separate the conjunction *waw* from the verb form and say that the sequentiality is due to the latter not the former. Thus, on page 67 he insists that "The conjunction looks back to the preceding clause, while the sequential verb form looks forward to the next clause." This really is quite futile. It is precisely the combination of the *waw* and the following form that is distinctive in establishing a consecutive form.[73]

I tend to agree with Longacre that the *wayyiqtol* form is distinctly used, for all intents and

purposes, as a preterite-like verb in narrative sequences to carry the main storyline.

Not only did Roy L. Heller conduct another discourse-linguistic analysis of the

Joseph Story (Gen 37, 39–47) clause-by-clause, in a manner similar to Longacre, but he

[69] Endo, *Verbal System*, 320–25.
[70] Endo, *Verbal System*, 79, 97–98.
[71] Endo, *Verbal System*, 91.
[72] Endo, *Verbal System*, 154–60.
[73] Longacre, Review of *Verbal System*, 217.

extended his body of text for analysis to include 2 Sam 9–20 and 1 Kgs 1–2 in the 2004

published version of his Yale University dissertation.[74] He took as his starting point the

manner in which Thomas O. Lambdin differentiated between the pragmatic functions of

narrative/imperative sequences as conjunctive clauses, and those of disjunctive clauses in

Hebrew prose.[75] He thought that "Lambdin's insights have paralleled the work of

discourse linguists, who take their basic stance toward language by asking 'What does

this verbal form/word/clause do?' instead of asking 'What does this verbal

form/word/clause mean?'"[76] He contended for consistency in the function of the various

forms when viewed in a discourse context. He worked from the text upward through

statistics to deduce verb type function, rather than from general linguistic theory. He

treated narrative as distinct from dialogue or other direct speech (which he divided into

his narrative, predictive, expository, hortatory and interrogative discourse types). So,

whereas he set out to use discourse analysis to determine the clause functions and larger

narrative structural features somewhat differently than Longacre, his rigorous and

quantifiable evaluation of verb forms for their function at the clause level[77] within the

selected narratives and his various embedded and distinctive discourse types is a valuable

extension to Longacre's analyses. Additionally, his investigations into categorizing non-

---

[74] Heller, *Narrative Structure*.

[75] Heller, *Narrative Structure*, 2; Lambdin, *Introduction to Biblical Hebrew*, 162–65.

[76] Heller, *Narrative Structure*, 2.

[77] Heller stated that he would "make a distinction between narrative and direct discourse within two extended portions of biblical prose and, in turn, investigate the presence and pragmatic function of the various types of clauses both in narrative and in direct discourse" (*Narrative Structure*, 25). A more accurate description of what he called direct discourse would be *reported* or *narrated* direct speech. This description accounts for the embedding of reported speech within narratives close to the main storyline, usually as the direct object of a *wayyiqtol* quotation formula. It is also useful to consider the verbal constellations associated with the five discourse (i.e., direct speech) types of Heller (narrative, predictive, expository, hortatory and interrogative) as applicable to Longacre's more broadly considered discourse/text types.

wayyiqtol clauses to "provide objective criteria by which one may differentiate between the providing of non-sequential information or the marking of episode boundaries,"[78] is useful in deciding between episodic structural features (e.g., introductory temporal clauses) or simple off-line comment in narrative that does not move the storyline along.[79]

Heller's methodology was constructively applied to the entire text of Judges by Mark J. Boda and Mary L. Conway in their contribution to the Zondervan Exegetical Commentary on the Old Testament: A Discourse Analysis of the Hebrew Bible series.[80] They carefully classify each clause as one of narrative backbone, initial or terminal marker, inner-paragraph comment (background, prospective, retrospective, simultaneous, resumptive, emphatic, contrastive, parallel, summative, focus, or aetiological), extra-paragraph comment, or direct discourse / spoken dialogue (actually any form of reported/narrated direct speech including monologue) of the following types—narrative, predictive, expository, and hortatory.[81] They have assimilated Heller's interrogatory type into their narrative and expository types.[82] Their commentary is a model of the explanatory potential that discourse analysis has on Biblical Hebrew narrative.

The discourse analysis method pioneered by Longacre has been used in Hebrew Bible scholarship in various other ways. Whereas the dissertations by Endo[83] and Heller[84] sought to refine and clarify the specifics of the verbal constellations used in various kinds of Biblical Hebrew discourse by extending Longacre's analyses, Nicolai Winther-Nielsen used a computer-assisted functional grammar to "articulate structure, coherence and

---

[78] Heller, *Narrative Structure*, 26.
[79] Heller, *Narrative Structure*, 52–63.
[80] Boda and Conway, *Judges*, 53–66.
[81] Boda and Conway, *Judges*, 56–60.
[82] Boda and Conway, *Judges*, 59–60.
[83] Endo, *Verbal System*.
[84] Heller, *Narrative Structure*.

themes"[85] through a pragmatic discourse analysis related to Longacre's. Additionally,

Mary Conway used discourse analysis of the *systemic functional linguistics* type (i.e., not

Longacre's) in her narrative appraisal of the book of Judges, but admitted that a better

understanding of the function of Hebrew verbal forms would have helped her analysis.[86]

A number of other dissertations have utilized Longacre's discourse analysis on Hebrew

texts, bolstering its validity as a methodology, including Steven G. Dempster's

investigation into Classical Hebrew narrative's linguistic structure (especially the

distribution of certain kinds of sentences and their constituent parts),[87] Ewell R.

Clendenen's interpretation of hortatory material in Malachi,[88] Stephen W. Kempf's

discourse analysis of Gen 2–3,[89] George G. Omerly's examination of verb hierarchies and

narrative structures in Josh 1–11,[90] Baek Sung Choi's demonstration of the cohesion and

coherence of the text of Job,[91] Jill Riepe's description of main clause verbs, quotation

formulas, and verbs in quotations in the book of Esther,[92] Neal A. Huddleston's

comparison of discourse structures between Deuteronomy and ancient Hittite

subordination treaties,[93] Xiubin Zhang's explanation of the holiness theme in Ezek 40–

48, and Roger D. Ruiz Araica's evaluation of the temporal phrase הָעֵת הַהִיא "that time" at

Dan 12:1 by using diachronic and synchronic approaches in tandem.[94] *Longacre's type of*

analysis provides a good understanding of the function of the verbal forms, and beyond

---

[85] Winther-Nielsen, *Functional Discourse Grammar*, iv.
[86] Conway, *Judging the Judges*, 213. She would eventually use an SIL-type discourse analysis in a commentary on Judges (Boda and Conway, *Judges*).
[87] Dempster, "Linguistic Features."
[88] Clendenen, "Interpretation of Hortatory Texts."
[89] Kempf, "Discourse Analysis of Genesis 2:4b—3:24."
[90] Omerly, "Verb Hierarchy and Discourse Structure."
[91] Choi, "Unity and Symmetry."
[92] Riepe, "Verbs of Esther."
[93] Huddleston, "Deuteronomy as *Mischgattung*."
[94] Ruiz Araica, "העת ההיא in the Hebrew Bible."

that it helps clarify the presence of important narrative features. This study should add to the body of evidence supporting both of those lines of inquiry, and it is its explanatory power that is the impetus for adopting this method to apply to the problem of the Joshua–Judges book-seam.

2.3 Research Methodology and Procedure

2.3.1 Preamble

The fundamental research framework of the dissertation will be a discourse analysis—i.e., a textlinguistically-informed narrative approach insofar as the temporal and spatial aspects, characterization, plot structure, and narrative points of view and perspective of the selected texts will be elicited. The points of view of implied author, narrator, characters, and implied reader will be important factors in this approach. Characters, time, and space are the basic building blocks of stories and the essential components used to generate plot.[95] Narrative perspective is important and useful for describing how various points of view such as those of the author, narrator, audience/reader, and characters contribute to the ideology, theology, and reception of the stories.[96] Discourse analysis will be the primary analytical tool used to investigate the narrative features and explore their meaning.

The textlinguistic discourse analysis method of the Summer Institute of Linguistics (SIL) as developed primarily by Pike, and especially Longacre, will be

---

[95] Dearman, *Reading Hebrew Bible Narratives*, 15–22; Amit, *Reading Biblical Narratives*, 49, 69–71, 103–5, 115–17.

[96] Sternberg, *Poetics of Biblical Narrative*, 129–31.

applied to the pertinent Hebrew texts.[97] Longacre's particular form of discourse analysis has already demonstrated considerable utility for its ability to explain precise meaning within stories in conjunction with narrative features.[98] The application of discourse analysis will function as a control mechanism on the seemingly more subjective judgments found in the not-fully-compatible findings of different narrative approaches already applied to the texts.[99] SIL discourse analysis is a precise and relatively quantifiable methodological tool when used to elicit certain aspects of time, space, characterization, and plot development in Biblical Hebrew narrative.

The general procedure to be used in this study will be the careful articulation of some specific narrative features (plot, foregrounding and backgrounding, perspective and point of view, characterization, and spatio-temporal structuring considerations as commonly found in narrative approaches to Biblical Hebrew literature) of the overlap/transition texts noted above using the textlinguistic data of Longacre's SIL form of discourse analysis. Those observations will indicate an uneven application of the so-called historian's supposedly overriding theological perspective between the two books—Judges being more severe than Joshua. Finally, and where appropriate, there will be brief

---

[97] See Longacre, *Grammar of Discourse* (1996), vii–viii and 1–6 for a brief historical note and sketch of the main elements of the method; Pike, *Language in Relation*, 93, who stated, "It is the thesis of this volume that human behavior must be analyzed as consisting of various simultaneous structurings of its activity, structurings which are here called modes." The modes to which he referred are feature, manifestation, and distribution. His analysis in *Language in Relation* dealt specifically with the complexity of interrelationships of events, activities, the physical universe, artifacts, culture, language, and meaning. For Pike, the structure of human behaviour was directly reflected in human language.

[98] See, e.g., Longacre, "Flood Narrative" (1976 and 1979); Longacre, *Joseph* (1989 and 2003).

[99] One example of this incompatibility is that scholars have been divided over what they believed constitutes the introduction to the book as it now stands. Several scholars with a historical-critical orientation assigned Judg 1:1—2:5 as the introduction (Moore, *Judges*, xiii–xv; Soggin, *Judges*, 4; Martin, *Judges*, 1–9; Lindars, *Judges 1–5*, 5–6). On the other hand, some scholars viewed Judg 1:1—3:6 as the proper introduction, defined from a more literary perspective (Polzin, *Moses and the Deuteronomist*, 147–55; Webb, *Integrated Reading*, 116–18). Klein thought that it extended to Judg 3:11 (*Triumph of Irony*, 35–36).

comparisons, at points, of the narrative-approach-through-discourse-analysis findings

with some of the key results of historical criticism from the past century to demonstrate

that synchronic approaches may on occasion generate answers to persistent diachronic

questions such as the apparent dislocation of Josh 8:30–35 from between Josh 24:27 and

28.[100]

2.3.2 Purpose of the Study

The overall aim of this study is to use discourse analysis *as* a narrative approach on the

overlapping (i.e., synoptic) and book-seam (i.e., Josh 23–24; Judg 1:1—3:11) texts of

Joshua and Judges in order to help bring better understanding to the narrative shape and

purposes of the *closing* to the book of Joshua and the *opening* to the book of Judges

within the context(s) of those two books. The study will demonstrate, insofar as it is

possible, the intentional continuity and differences in outlook between the books in those

sections of narrative.[101] This approach combines the rigour of textlinguistic theory and

discourse analysis, with the creative sensitivity of the implied reader's understanding of

the narrative. The essence of the methodology will be the use of the most important

elements of narrative approaches (spatio-temporal aspects, characterization, and to a

lesser extent point of view, as they pertain to plot development) and the application of

discourse analysis as an interpretive vehicle, and as a control mechanism on the inherent

subjectivity of narrative approaches in general. *The application of textlinguistic discourse*

---

[100] See Soggin, *Joshua*, 226–44 on this problem.

[101] I mean here that notwithstanding the likelihood that sources are used, and that these passages have undoubtedly had a complicated history of redactional activity, they have editorial perspectives that exhibit overall cohesion and coherence, as well as differences in emphasis and perspective, between the books. In other words, for the most part, they come from the standpoints of implied authors.

analysis as used by Robert E. Longacre and further developed by others will be the

primary method of evaluating the pertinent texts.

Longacre was the first to apply a specifically textlinguistic approach to an

extended Hebrew Bible text in his articles, "The Discourse Structure of the Flood

Narrative."[102] He summarized his general goals and methodology as

> interested in questions of the classification of discourse genre, e.g., the matter of distinguishing a narrative discourse from other sorts of discourse such as procedural, behavioral, expository, and the further matter of distinguishing specific genre within these types; the articulation of parts of a discourse such as formulaic beginnings and endings, episodes, and high points in the story (called peaks); the status of discourse constituents such as sentences, paragraphs, and embedded discourses; the cast of participants in a given discourse, and the thematic participant(s) of a given paragraph; author viewpoint and author sympathy as indicated in the text; the relation of the abstract plan of the discourse to its full, unrestricted text; the main-line development of a discourse as opposed to subsidiary and supportive materials; the role of tense, aspect, particles, affixes, pronominalization chains, definitivization, paraphrase, and conjunctions in providing cohesion and prominence in a discourse; ways of marking a peak in a narrative; and the function of dialogue in a discourse.[103]

He also carefully described the mechanisms to structure narratives in terms of aperture,

stage, episodes (including peaks), closure, and *finis*.[104] These structural terms account for

the rising action, climax, loosening tension or dénouement, and wrap-up typical of

narrative accounts. He was able to provide objective criteria from the text for his

interpretation of the Flood Narrative.

Longacre's approach was uniquely pioneering—in essence, he used textlinguistic

theory *as* a discourse analytical tool to describe the detailed contours of narrative. While

he had ideas about the distribution and linguistic functions of various verb forms in

Biblical Hebrew, drawn from his general linguistic theories, he also aimed to use his

---

[102] Longacre, "Flood Narrative" (1976 and 1979).
[103] Longacre, "Flood Narrative" (1979), 90.
[104] Longacre, "Flood Narrative" (1979), 95; Longacre and Levinsohn, "Field Analysis," 104–5.

ideas in support of the discovery of narrative discourse structure.[105] One of the significant outcomes of this study will be to establish more securely Longacre's methodological approach to discourse analysis as particularly useful for interpreting ancient Hebrew narrative texts.

2.3.3 The Reasons for Choosing Longacre's Discourse Analysis Method

The Primary History of the Hebrew Bible presents itself as one long story from Genesis through to Second Kings—in other words, a narrative. To be sure, there are other kinds of discourse found in this portion of Scripture such as procedural, expository, and behavioural; there are also a variety of genres present, for example, individual stories, poems, lists, speeches, aetiologies, legends, etc. Nevertheless, all of these various kinds of writing are found embedded in *a narrative framework*. There is a narrator present who guides the reader, providing the information needed to make the writing relevant, understandable, and properly focused. The role of the author is to use narration to make the stories interesting and to provide the temporal sequencing that keeps the stories moving forward in the senses of time, place, character development, and most importantly, the heightening and loosening of tension. The fact that these stories still engage many readers thousands of years after their formation is a testament to the skill and artistry of the storytellers.

Stories are not likely to be written generally for scholarly analysis; rather, they are written to communicate at a popular level. The *meaning*, or popularly perceived deep structure, is usually readily determined from a straightforward reading. It is often not

---

[105] Longacre, "Flood Narrative" (1976), 235.

difficult for the typical reader, even in translation, to follow a storyline and understand it competently. Therefore, one must wonder whether much further effort within the academy to penetrate the received unity of the biblical narrative in search of independent and redeemably coherent sources is too speculative a solitary enterprise. Will it produce any more results that would be substantial enough to be worthwhile exegetically, considering their tentativeness? Robert Polzin adopted the position that there is a "need for a competent literary analysis to precede historical critical considerations of biblical materials such as this (narrative)."[106] This literary analysis ought to, first of all, categorize the type of literature under consideration. But beyond this there is a need to describe the style of the work, grasp the story of the characters about whom the writing is, insofar as there is a discernible authorial intent behind the text, explain it, and consider how audiences might react to what is written.

This study proceeds with a concentration on the received text rather than its historical context primarily. This does not mean that the historical context is unimportant for eliciting meaning from the text(s) under consideration, but this context has already been sufficiently emphasized in traditional biblical scholarship. I will instead, attempt to fill a deficiency with respect to the knowledge of the implied author's purposes in the presentation of a specific set of narratives. If insight into the historical process of composition is gained, then that is salutary.

---

[106] Polzin, *Moses and the Deuteronomist*, 91.

2.3.4 Limitations of Textlinguistic and Related Approaches

Longacre's discourse analysis method has already demonstrated some of that literary analytical power Polzin thought advantageous. It must also be recognized that on its own a textlinguistic approach provides minimal elucidation of the deep structure meaning of the discourse. It is instead, descriptive in terms of the composition's formal aspects and surface storyline (i.e., paragraph grammar). It is desirable then, to incorporate elements of a narrative approach that ascribe at least a generic (i.e., broadly defined) level of meaning to the various *functions* (in Vladimir Propp's narrative structure terminology)[107] that are working at a deeper level within a text. While Propp's folklorist approach could become reductionistic and lack flexibility in its application, thereby posing the danger of imposing a meaning upon the text under consideration, there does seem to be the potential for syntheses between discourse and narrative analyses, and discourse and structural analyses. In fact, during the early period of the application of new literary approaches to the biblical text, Robert Culley grouped structural, narrative, and discourse analyses together as a new direction in the field and recognized the potential of Francis Andersen's and Longacre's tagmemic approach "to be expanded to consider structures of content as well."[108] This is in fact how Longacre proceeded as we will see in the section on his method that follows below.

The tendency of some structuralist approaches to gravitate toward explaining the form in terms of a *grand theory* of meaning—and thereby downplaying any positive notion of specific meaning in a text (e.g., the extremes of deconstruction)—is not

---

[107] Wienold, "Textlinguistic Approaches," 141. For Propp, "*Function is understood as an act of a character, defined from the point of view of its significance for the course of the action*" (*Morphology of the Folktale*, 21) (emphasis is in the original).

[108] Culley, "Exploring New Directions," 169.

necessarily inherent in structural analyses in general. Structuralism is closely related to narrative approaches in its search for deep structure meaning, but it is philosophically (as opposed to textlinguistically) based;[109] so there is the possibility of progress in the search for meaning in a text through a cooperative combination in the application of those methods.

Longacre's discourse analysis used the tagmemic and textlinguistic theories he helped develop to elicit structural features and narrative meaning in the texts he examined—the Flood Narrative and the Joseph Story. The application of his general method to the narratives of the selected texts in this study, especially in the comparison of findings between the near-duplicate texts, ought to demonstrate even subtle differences in orientation and meaning. If this is, in fact, the demonstrated case, then the method will have been shown to be more broadly effective and can therefore also be used and established as an effective control on narrative approaches that often operate with inadequate methodological constraints.

2.3.5 Procedure

A constrained narrative approach will be the basis of my study within the overall context of the general goals of discourse analysis as originally presented by Longacre, which are: genre classification as narrative; articulation of discourse parts (formulaic beginnings and endings, episodes, peaks); status of constituents (sentences, paragraphs, embedded discourses); cast of participants (in the discourse) and thematic participants (in the paragraphs/episodes); author viewpoint and sympathy; main line development versus

---

[109] Powell, *What is Narrative Criticism?*, 13.

subsidiary and supporting elements; the role of grammar in providing cohesion and

prominence (primarily the verbal system); ways of marking the peak; and the function of

dialogue.[110] Longacre would continue to develop an increasingly sophisticated approach

to these goals. He refined the tools of discourse analysis to explain the nuances of, for

example, how verbal systems work in narrative discourse, and how variation in direct

speech is marked (i.e., the roles of various quotation formulas) in Biblical Hebrew

specifically as well as other languages in general.[111] Perhaps his most penetrating insight

would be that grammar works not just within the sentence but that syntax must be

examined within the paragraph structure in order to fully evaluate it—there is no

arbitrariness in surface structure word order in his view. "Grammatical issues, such as

word order variation, tense/aspect/modality of verb forms, and nominal forms in

participant reference, that are not adequately described within the domain of the sentence

. . . require a holistic discourse perspective to understand the variable forms."[112] Longacre

assumes that there ought to be an expectation that there will be differences in style and

syntax as follows: the peak will be somehow different than the remainder; direct speech

(in the case of the Flood Narrative, God's monologues; much of Josh 23–24; in the case

of Judg 1:1—3:11, the direct speech of the Israelites, the LORD, Judah, the lord of

Bezek, Caleb, Achsah, the reconnoiters of Bethel, and the messenger of the LORD) will

be different than the narrative in which it is embedded, mostly through the use of a

different constellation of verbal forms; background information will be different than

---

[110] Longacre, "Flood Narrative" (1976), 235. With respect to narrative cohesion, "we have to assume that there is an *event-line*, an *agent-line*, and maybe even a *repartee-line*. The event-line indicates successive events, successive times, or even successive places (trajectory), or a combination of these three" (Longacre and Levinsohn, "Field Analysis," 106–7).

[111] See especially Longacre, *Grammar of Discourse* (1983 and 1996); Longacre, *Joseph* (1989 and 2003); Longacre and Hwang, *Holistic Discourse Analysis*.

[112] Longacre and Hwang, *Holistic Discourse Analysis*, 1.

backbone narration; and separate parts will be different than others with regard to tense and aspect—likely due to the narrator's intended perspective.[113] *Those features can and shall be described textlinguistically in this study.*

In the Flood Narrative articles that inaugurated the application of discourse analysis to Biblical Hebrew narrative, Longacre spent some effort delineating the embedded story from its surrounding context (i.e., the *tôlǝdōt* [generations] of Noah from the *tôlǝdōt* of Adam and from the *tôlǝdōt* of the sons of Noah) by means of describing sections at the seams like the birth of Noah and his sons at Gen 5:28–32, the inciting incident of Gen 6:1–4 (יָבֹאוּ בְּנֵי הָאֱלֹהִים אֶל־בְּנוֹת הָאָדָם "the sons of the gods went to the daughters of Adam"), and the story of Noah and his sons at Gen 9:18–27 as not part of the Flood Narrative proper.[114] He described the LORD's decision to destroy humanity at Gen 6:5–8 as a *preview* to the story that acts as a transitional anticipation to the new *tôlǝdōt* section of Genesis that follows directly.[115]

In terms of applying his textlinguistic theory he marked out Gen 6:9b–12 as the stage of the story, in effect, setting the scene for what will take place.[116] He identified episodes at 6:13–22; 7:1–10, 11–16, 17–24 (peak); 8:1–5, 6–12, 13–19, 20–22; 9:1–17 (secondary peak) based often on introductory temporal clauses or terminal circumstantial clauses, though at times episodes could start directly on the main storyline.[117] He identified the main storyline with all of the *wayyiqtol* clauses.[118] Episodes (i.e., the narrative equivalent of a grammatical paragraph) were also often confirmed by using the

---

[113] Longacre, "Flood Narrative" (1976), 237.
[114] Longacre, "Flood Narrative" (1979), 91–93.
[115] Longacre, "Flood Narrative" (1979), 100.
[116] Longacre, "Flood Narrative" (1979), 101.
[117] Longacre, "Flood Narrative" (1979), 95. The chart there works as a constituent display of sorts.
[118] Longacre, "Flood Narrative" (1979), 96–97.

feature of thematic participants, which is simply put, a matter of counting and

categorizing the types of references made to characters in a given section of text.[119]

Longacre's identification of Gen 7:17–24 as the peak/climax to the Flood Narrative

highlighted a certain uniqueness to this kind of episode. Specifically, there is a much

more concentrated use of the *wayyiqtol* preterite than anywhere else in the narrative, and

the amount and style of recapitulation and paraphrase approaches the repetition rate and

chiastic/parallelistic structure of Biblical Hebrew poetry. The story comes to a gripping

near-standstill in spite of the concentration of action in the sequence of build-ups, and

there is an element of extreme pathos introduced by this technique. The flood-waters

themselves take on the character of thematic participant.[120] All of these

tagmemic/textlinguistic data served to bring better understanding of the Flood Narrative

as a cohesive and coherent text.

Longacre went on to refine his application of discourse analysis to Biblical

Hebrew narrative in *Joseph: A Story of Divine Providence*.[121] Those works are more

clearly nested in his overall approach to linguistic theory[122] and deal more adequately

with the functions of various verb forms by positing verb ranking in terms of bands or

layers of verb types within a constellation that could be used to determine distance from

the main event line for clauses of different kinds in discourses of various types.[123] He also

made significant advances in describing the role and significance of reported direct

speech and quotation formulae embedded in narrative,[124] and accompanied his evaluation

---

[119] Longacre, "Flood Narrative" (1979), 97–98.
[120] Longacre, "Flood Narrative" (1979), 113–18.
[121] Longacre, *Joseph* (1989 and 2003).
[122] Cf. Longacre, *Grammar* of *Discourse* (1996).
[123] Longacre, *Joseph* (2003). E.g., on the different verbal constellation rankings see page 79 for narrative, and page 106 for predictive discourse.
[124] Longacre, *Joseph* (2003), 155–202.

of the story's macrostructure with a detailed functional display marking out the entire story's narrative slots.

The procedure to be followed in this study is to elicit through discourse analysis, and eventually compare, interpretations of the texts of the books of Joshua and Judges surrounding the book-seam. This shall be done in order to determine the differences of overall outlook, perspective, and ideology of those two books. The following sections will describe in some detail the detailed procedural approach, important narrative features relevant to the texts to be analyzed, and the importance of categorizing the various types of verb usage.

2.3.6 Identifying Narrative Discourse as Distinct from Procedural, Behavioural, and Expository Discourse

Before describing Longacre's discourse analysis procedure on narratives in detail, it is useful to situate narrative discourse within the broader scheme of text typology. Uniquely, narrative texts are "those utilized to arrange *actions* and *events* in a particular sequential order. There will be a frequency of conceptual relations for *cause*, *reason*, *purpose*, *enablement*, and *time proximity*,"[125] and characters are obviously an essential part of any story. The following model in which narrative may be set is applicable to different languages, and so, is somewhat generic in its outlook, but it is useful and usable enough to enable the easy identification of the text type of written discourse. It consists of two parameters—contingent temporal succession and agent orientation.[126] Longacre and Shin Ja Hwang described the four possible varieties in the following manner.

---

[125] Beaugrande and Dressler, *Introduction to Text Linguistics*, 184.
[126] Longacre and Hwang, *Holistic Discourse Analysis*, 35.

Narration (stories of all sorts) is positive in regard to both of these parameters. A story is not a story without successive perfective events (at least in partial causal connection) nor without a slate of participants who engage in voluntary actions as well as things happening to them. PROCEDURAL or how-to-do-it discourses are plus in regard to contingent temporal succession (procedures must be ordered and causally connected) but minus in regard to agent orientation. The minus value is seen in that procedures are goal-oriented rather than agent-oriented; any qualified agent may implement them in regard to the intended goal. BEHAVIORAL discourse (a pep talk, a hortatory sermon, a eulogy, a political speech) is minus contingent temporal succession but plus in regard to agent orientation. Finally, EXPOSITORY discourse is minus in regard to both parameters. It has logical rather than temporal connections, and themes rather than agents.[127]

Each of the two parameters may be extended by the addition of another sub-parameter; contingent temporal succession may have plus or minus *projection* (i.e., future outlook versus past), and agent orientation may have plus or minus *tension*. The following table reveals the sub-types of texts that may be encountered.[128]

---

[127] Longacre and Hwang, *Holistic Discourse Analysis*, 35–36.

[128] Longacre and Hwang, *Holistic Discourse Analysis*, 36–37. Heller saw five types of discourse: narrative, predictive, expository, hortatory, and interrogative, but these are all restricted to direct speech at that point in his treatment (*Narrative Structure*, 458). This follows from the different meaning Heller gave to *discourse*, using it to signify only direct speech, whereas Longacre used *discourse* primarily to mean any of the four types of written language communication in general—narrative, procedural, behavioural, and expository—with direct speech as an embedded component (Longacre, as with many other discourse grammarians, was not always consistent in this respect). Heller has perhaps misunderstood Longacre's use of the term *discourse* (i.e., the more expansive definition) by restricting Longacre's four types only to direct speech (*Narrative Structure*, 23). Heller's expansion and articulation of the nuances of the types of direct speech embedded in narrative (*Narrative Structure*, 26, 456–75) is, however, very useful in eliciting the meaning of Joshua's speech in Josh 24 (see below in Ch. 4), and is also applicable in non-direct speech contexts.

		+ **Agent Orientation**		- **Agent Orientation**	
		+ Tension	- Tension	+ Tension	- Tension
+ Contingent Temporal Succession	+ Projection	Prophecy		How to do it	
		Plot/Climax	*Episodic*	*Obstacles*	*No Obstacles*
		NARRATIVE		**PROCEDURAL**	
	- Projection	Story		How it was done	
		Plot/Climax	*Episodic*	*Obstacles*	*No Obstacles*
- Contingent Temporal Succession	+ Projection	Hortatory		Future Things	
		Argument	*No Argument*	*Argument*	*No Argument*
		BEHAVIOURAL		**EXPOSITORY**	
	- Projection	Eulogy/Speech		Current Things	
		Argument	*No Argument*	*Argument*	*No Argument*

Table 1. Text Typology

2.3.7 Verbal Constellations for Narrative Discourse and Direct Speech

2.3.7.1 Narrative

In Biblical Hebrew narrative, the backbone of the narrative is carried by *waw* plus

prefixal verbs, the preterite (*wayyiqtol*) form, which singularly marks a special narrative

tense.[129] It has no tolerance for preposed elements, including negation. Negation

interrupts the temporal sequence and is generally considered, by definition, to be off the

main event line (i.e., the narrative backbone) in any case.[130] Circumstantial clauses which

add detail and background use suffixal verbs and preposed nouns or negative particles

(therefore excluding all *waw* plus prefixal verbs), nominal clauses, medial verb הָיָה "be,"

or participles. These clauses commonly introduce paragraphs but can also be found

paragraph medial.[131]

It is worth noting that Longacre developed a five-level verb rank scheme for

independent clauses in Biblical Hebrew narrative.[132] Band one uses the *wayyiqtol*

preterite to carry the main storyline. The verb invariably comes at the beginning of the

clause. Band two consists of secondary material with either *qatal* initial, or noun-in-focus

then *qatal*, structures—in that order of rank—at a bit of a distance from the main

storyline.[133] Band three is further from the storyline, signifying background activities, and

---

[129] In his discussion of this verbal form in its tense-aspect-modality meanings as the narrative past, Ulf Bergström declares that *wayyiqtol* "is commonly treated as a verbal form in its own right" (*Aspect*, 15).

[130] Longacre, "Flood Narrative" (1976), 239–40; Longacre, *Joseph* (2003), 79.

[131] Longacre, "Flood Narrative" (1976), 239; Longacre, *Joseph* (2003), 71–78.

[132] Longacre, *Joseph* (2003), 78–80.

[133] Niccacci essentially agreed, stating that

> In narrative, for instance, *wayyiqtol* is the only verb form for the mainline, but for the subsidiary line we have the simple nominal clause and the compound nominal clause in both its forms, that is *waw*-X-*qatal* and *waw*-X-*yiqtol* (and) the criterion behind the choice of one of these possibilities . . . is aspect. In fact, the simple nominal clause is chosen for contemporaneity or for a descriptive function (e.g., Exod 36:8–13), while *waw*-X-*qatal* indicates a unique event and *waw*-X-*yiqtol* repetition or custom ("Hebrew Verbal System," 129).

is arranged in three successively more distant constructions: הִנֵּה (particle of existence /

exclamation of immediacy)[134] plus participle, participle alone, and noun plus participle.

Band four provides the important signifiers of setting (opening) and termination of

narrative episodes and has four levels of remoteness from the main storyline. They are, in

order, the preterite of הָיָה "to be" (e.g., וַיְהִי [wayəhî]),[135] the perfect of הָיָה with *waw* "and"

(e.g., וְהָיָה [wəhāyâ]), verbless nominal clauses, and existential clauses with יֵשׁ (particle of

existence, e.g., "there is"). Band five is the furthest from the storyline and is

characterized by the negation of any verb clause.[136]

2.3.7.2 Direct Speech

There are a few things that need to be said about direct speech in general. The first thing

to note is that the constellation of verb forms often changes drastically. For the main

events of the past that are being recounted in direct speech, the *qatal* form is mostly

used,[137] unless it is being told as a story by the speaking character as a narrator using

preterites (see, e.g., Josh 24). For activities deemed to be future from the speaker's

---

[134] Lambdin, *Introduction to Biblical Hebrew*, 168; Waltke and O'Connor, *IBHS*, 675–76; Van der Merwe et al., *Biblical Hebrew Reference Grammar*, 412–13.

[135] Longacre asserts special status for the verb הָיָה (to be).

> The verb *hāyâ*, 'be', even in its preterite form *wayhî*, 'and it happened', does not function on the storyline of the narrative. In this respect, the behavior of Hebrew is similar to that of a great many contemporary languages around the world. For example, English uses its past tense to encode the storyline of a story, but the verb *be* (and some other stative verbs)—even when in the past tense (for example, forms such as *was*, *were*)—is typically descriptive and depictive and does not figure on the backbone of a story. This is simply a peculiarity of the verb *be* in many languages past and present (*Joseph* [2003], 64).

[136] Longacre, *Joseph* (2003), 79. It should be noted that negation is occasionally—but only rarely—on the main storyline if it is a monumental negation for the purposes of the story and/or comes during peaks in the story.

[137] Heller, *Narrative Structure*, 458–59.

perspective, *yiqtol* and *weqatal* sequences predominate.[138] Expository speech uses

participle and verbless clauses,[139] and hortatory speech predominantly uses imperative,

jussive, or cohortative forms.[140]

Speeches of any length, particularly if they aim to persuade, often contain a

semblance of plot. To be sure, emplotment, strictly speaking, is the artificial creation of

an author that functions in relationship to recounted events and time as presented in

fictional narrative.[141] Nonetheless, Longacre has built a case that the notional structures

of discourse types—other than narrative with plot, climax, etc.—while having their own

distinctive schemata, share some of the features of narrative, including the notion of a

peak.[142] So whereas

> Plot in the strictest sense of the word should be reserved for the notional structure
> of climactic narrative. . . . Hortatory discourse is . . . the struggle to convince the
> hearers of the soundness of the advice and to launch them on the course of
> conduct advocated or to discourage them from a course of conduct which is being
> proscribed. It would seem therefore that an artful expository or hortatory
> discourse will have a meaningful cumulative thrust. This should correlate in at
> least some discourses with a marked surface structure peak. I believe that of the

---

[138] Heller, *Narrative Structure*, 462.
[139] Heller, *Narrative Structure*, 465.
[140] Heller, *Narrative Structure*, 468.
[141] Ricoeur, *Time and Narrative*, 2:3–6.
[142] Longacre wrote that

> *Hortatory* discourse, which aims at influencing conduct, has four elements: (1) the authority or
> credibility of the text producer; (2) indication of a problem/situation; (3) one or more command
> elements—which may be brusque or mitigated; (4) motivation (essentially threats or promises). . .
> . For *Persuasive* discourse, which aims at influencing beliefs and values, four elements can be
> posited: (1) presentation (sometimes in considerable detail) of a problem or question; (2) proposed
> solution or answer; (3) supporting argumentation which may or may not include an appeal to the
> authority or experience of the text producer; (4) an appeal to give credence or to adopt certain
> values. (*Grammar of Discourse* [1996], 34n2; see also Longacre and Bowling, *Biblical Hebrew
> Verb Forms*, 10).

Even though hortatory and persuasive discourse are distinguished here, Longacre admitted that "the two are
ultimately inseparable" and are to be considered under the broader category of *behavioural* discourse
(Longacre and Hwang, *Holistic Discourse Analysis*, 37–38). Longacre's description of these two categories
and their elements admits considerable overlap.

various devices available for marking of surface structure peak in expository and hortatory discourse, rhetorical underlining is probably the most frequently used.[143]

In his analysis of the verbal constellations marking direct speech, Heller indicated that

> The structure of direct discourse in biblical Hebrew prose differs from that of narrative proper in several respects. Because they are marked otherwise, no predominant verbal or clausal type characterizes the beginning or ending of speeches of characters. Moreover, whereas narrative is marked throughout by chains of *WAYYIQTOL* clauses, no consistent clause type occurs regularly throughout speeches. Likewise, in general, there is no consistent syntactically marked means of expressing points on or off the main line of the discourse. Furthermore, whereas the predominant purpose of narrative proper is to relate events in the past, only rarely is this the purpose of direct discourse. Finally, whereas narrative generally has the single predominant function of relating sequential events in the past, direct discourse has multiple functions: occasionally to relate past events, in other cases to predict or plan the future, in still other cases to explain universal truths or to declare immediate relationships or actions. Moreover, direct discourse, unlike narrative, can occasionally directly motivate action in its hearers, either as a response to a stated question or as a reaction (or rebellion) to a command or request. For this reason, the structure of direct discourse is more complex than that found in narrative. Although it is more complex, however, its structure is still consistent and regular.[144]

Heller also referred to reported/direct speech, "whose primary purpose is to relate the sequential occurrence of events before the speech event," as *narrative discourse*.[145] I find that this nomenclature has the potential to be somewhat ambiguous and confusing as the term *discourse* is generally used, and is certainly used by Longacre,[146] as in this study, in reference to multiple kinds of writing or speaking, not just reported direct speech (either monologue or dialogue). It must be admitted that writers have often used the term *discourse* specifically for reported or direct speech,[147] but others have distinguished direct

---

[143] Longacre, *Grammar of Discourse* (1996), 48.
[144] Heller, *Narrative Structure*, 456–57.
[145] Heller, *Narrative Structure*, 458.
[146] Longacre, *Grammar of Discourse* (1996), 7.
[147] E.g., Niccacci, *Syntax of the Verb* (however he did shift his approach, recognizing the confusion, in "On the Hebrew Verbal System").

speech more carefully.[148] The term *narrative* also took on multiple meanings for Heller

when he noted a "major difference between Narrative Discourse and narrative proper."[149]

In Longacre's scheme, *narrative* is the type of discourse that has positive agent

orientation and positive contingent temporal succession. *Narrative* includes *story* about

the past and *prophecy* about the future.[150] I tend to use the term *historical* for

reported/direct speech that deals primarily with the past from the speaker's point of view.

I use the term *narrative speech* for direct/reported speech specifically using *wayyiqtol* to

carry the main storyline when the speaker is telling a story.

The final thing to recognize concerning direct speech is that it is, in reality, not so

far removed from the main storyline and so carries the force of the storyline in

considerable measure, even though it has its own means of foregrounding and

backgrounding within the direct speech unit through different verbal constellations.[151]

This makes a certain amount of sense when one understands that the direct speech unit is,

in a true grammatical sense, the direct object of the quotation formula, for example, וַיֹּאמֶר

אֲלֵהֶם "he said to them. . . ."

Longacre was reluctant at first to provide a cline for the verb ranking of

expository material because he did not consider enough research had been done on it.[152]

He did consider that it might be the inverse of narrative or predictive discourse,[153] and so

nominal constructions, negation, participles, infinitives, and *hāyâ* ("be") constructions

---

[148] E.g., Eskhult, *Studies in Verbal Aspect*.
[149] Heller, *Narrative Structure*, 459n34.
[150] Longacre and Hwang, *Holistic Discourse Analysis*, 36–37; see also Table 1 on page 102 above.
[151] Longacre, *Joseph* (2003), 82.
[152] Longacre, *Joseph* (2003), 111.
[153] Longacre, *Joseph* (2003), 111.

would all be prominent.[154] The episode at Judg 1:28–36, while having an expository

character to a certain extent, is still nonetheless set within a narrative frame with

wayyiqtol clauses. The expository material in Judg 3:1–5 is also similarly set in a

narrative frame. These two examples seem to bring longer sections of narrative to

resolutions that then permit subsequent new narrative beginnings. The implicit *evaluative*

nature of these expositions[155] seems to lead to, and help prepare the reader for, the

following narratives that more explicitly judge the Israelites in a negative manner. In the

book of Joshua there is considerably more expository material, usually still set in bare

narrative frames, as extensive lists (e.g., kings conquered, boundaries, cities) that often

provide summarizing or evaluative functions on the text. Those features will be further

explored in the following analyses.

A clear distinction must be made between the reporting speech of the narrator and

the direct—reported—speech of the characters.[156] Jan Fokkelman makes this distinction

when he states: "Character text, whether monologue or dialogue, is 'only' embedded text

and is opposed to narrator's text. More than 95% of the narrator's text is reporting on the

distant past, and is governed by a string of verbs, every one of which is in some form of

preterite or other."[157] The ideas here are that the main storyline is *governed* by the

preterite (*wayyiqtol*) form of the verb, and that the direct speech of the characters may not

---

[154] Heller has extended Longacre's study of expository material and finds primary clause forms to be verbless, *hāyâ* with verb, incomplete clauses (interjections, etc.), and participials. Secondary material would be signified by an object plus a *qatal* or *yiqtol* form (*Narrative Structure*, 468).

[155] See Conway, *Judging the Judges*, 225–26, on the narrator's evaluative language for Judg 3:1–5.

[156] Robert Polzin popularized for the field of biblical studies the important literary distinction between "reported speech" and "reporting speech" made by Valentin Voloshinov and Mikhail Bakhtin, particularly with respect to Deuteronomy as compared with the remainder of the Deuteronomistic History (*Moses and the Deuteronomist*, 19).

[157] Fokkelman, *Reading Biblical Narrative*, 67.

necessarily directly communicate the writer's ideology or view of truth nearly so much as

the narrator does. It is useful to keep this distinction in mind as the analyses will

demonstrate that reported direct speech provides the opportunity for the writer to

incorporate a wider variety of perspectives and points of view into the narrative

presentation. Direct speech, nonetheless, uses an entirely different and distinct

constellation of verb forms from narration, often of a predictive (irreal) or expository

nature, and in which the *waw* plus suffixal verb form is at the fore to carry the main

speaking line of the character and with the prefixal/imperfect verb form clauses off-

line.[158]

2.3.8 Use of the Preterite in Coordination

2.3.8.1 Characterizing **wayyiqtol** *Use in Narrative*

There are a few observations here concerning what is typically called consecution in the

use of narrative tense.[159] Narratives gain cohesion and coherence when events and

activities on the main storyline progress in a temporally linear fashion. The time may

progress quickly or slowly, but it is usually assumed to be moving forward, at least

within a single episode. *This is not always precisely the case* as, for example, in Josh

24:28–33.[160] The death and burial of Joshua are clearly sequential, and the timeframe of

---

[158] Longacre, *Joseph* (2003), 106.

[159] Endo situated the use of *wayyiqtol* in both narrative and direct speech, by means of a discourse grammar (i.e., textlinguistic) approach, to carry the main discourse line within the following parameters: "In spite of the usual observation that the waYYIQTOL form signifies 'succession' . . . the waYYIQTOL form not only signifies temporal and/or logical succession, but also links simultaneous actions, antithetical actions and so on" (*Verbal System*, 245); "we should make a clear distinction between waYYIQTOL as a sequential form and both YIQTOL and waQATAL which function as a historical present in the past context in biblical Hebrew. If this is true, one may say that waYYIQTOL is not a neutral tense, but is like (a) preterite which denotes the simple past with complete aspect" (*Verbal System*, 160).

[160] See Buth ("Functional Grammar," 86) for the case of Jonah 1:16—2:1.

Israel serving the LORD extends into a time following these events, but as an activity it also extends back in time to include the entire time that Joshua had been alive and exercising leadership over Israel. The final *wayyiqtol* verb in the episode comes with the burial of Eleazar and the reader is naturally led to assume (maybe or maybe not correctly) that this event takes place at some time after the burial of Joshua, but there is also the potential that this event takes place before the end of the activity of Israel serving the LORD. Hypothetically speaking, if Eleazer was the last of that generation of elders that had outlived Joshua, then the event of his death would mark the end of the activity of Israel serving the LORD. The manner of the wording nonetheless does not permit us to make these kinds of judgement with any kind of certainty. Coordination between clauses is not necessarily straightforward, and the elicitation of nuances demands that syntax is examined within the broader context of paragraphs and the overall meaning of the narrative.

2.3.8.2 Parataxis

In view of the preceding, one thing that is reflected in the translations throughout this study that deserves comment is the non-use, for the most part, of the conjunction "and" before the simple past tense English verbs that are used in translation to carry the main storyline. This paratactic style, applied throughout, for the most part, to the rendering of *wayyiqtol* forms in particular, attempts to help the reader to refrain from prejudging (based on the influence of our native language models) the kinds of coordination that might be occurring between the clauses in the narrative. This seems an inevitable understanding of the *wayyiqtol* form as a preterite.

However, there are a great number of common verb pairs that often occur in quick succession in *wayyiqtol* form that function in a simple conjunctive manner. Words denoting perception (e.g., וַיִּשָּׂא עֵינָיו וַיַּרְא "he looked up and saw," Gen 18:2), motion (e.g., וַיָּקׇם וַיֵּלֶךְ "he got up and went," Gen 24:10), and utterance (e.g., וַיְדַבֵּר אֱלֹהִים אֶל־מֹשֶׁה וַיֹּאמֶר "God spoke to Moses and said," Exod 6:2) are commonly found in sequence in Hebrew narrative and are essentially either simultaneous, a continuous activity, or immediately sequential. An example in this study is found in Judg 2:4 where וַיִּשְׂאוּ הָעָם אֶת־קוֹלָם וַיִּבְכּוּ "the people raised their voice and wept."

2.3.9 Recapitulation and Temporal Considerations

Repetition is the recapitulative device used due to the inherently cumbersome nature of any potential sentence initial back-reference in Hebrew.[161] It is the manner in which cohesion is achieved between the recapitulation—which is often required so as to not outpace the reader—and the layering on of new information.[162] This is often the purpose of interjecting circumstantial material, with its distinct variety of verbal forms, into a series of otherwise straightforward *wayyiqtol* clauses that carry the main narrative line. This was an important insight on occasion in the Flood Narrative discourse studied by Longacre, however it is not as prominent in this study due to the relevant texts' more episodic and sometimes expository nature; this insight may be used in response to the traditional over-reliance by some scholars on the feature of repetition, using it to fragment the text into various sources or redactional layers.[163] Repetition is also used in a

---

[161] For example, use of the pluperfect ("*having done* that they proceeded to . . .").
[162] Longacre, "Flood Narrative" (1976), 239.
[163] E.g., Peckham, *Composition of the Deuteronomistic History*, 39–49.

manner that is not perfectly recapitulative, but which compares and contrasts while producing a similar effect to recapitulation by slowing down, or readjusting, narrative time. An important example is found in the episode of Judg 2:6–10 as follows.[164]

There is an obvious temporal dislocation at Judg 2:6 that marks the beginning of a new episode.[165] It was indicated in Judg 1:1 that Joshua had died, but here we see Joshua, alive again, dismissing the people in order that they might go and take possession of the land.[166] The main storyline here continues, "the Israelites went . . . the people served the LORD . . . Joshua died . . . they buried him . . . another generation rose up." Judges 2:10 begins with a circumstantial clause, "likewise, all *that* generation were gathered to its fathers," which should be understood as a *recapitulation*. It refers in a deictic manner to the generation of the elders in Judg 2:7 who were contemporaneous with Joshua but outlived him. Judges 2:10 also looks forward and prepares for the next episode by anticipating the new temporal setting through the introduction of the next generation; this is new information layered onto the narrative. Judges 2:10b moves the narrative forward in temporal sequence to the generation following Joshua with the relative clause, "who did not know the LORD, nor the work that (the LORD) had done for Israel." The *repetition* inherent in the relative clause is used here with a negative that distinguishes and contrasts the new generation's lack of knowledge with the previous generation that knew the work of the LORD. With the new temporal setting and a modest, if memorable

---

[164] The following paragraph is adapted from the main analysis below.

[165] Temporal indicators are important structural markers for narratives, as the main analysis will bear out later.

[166] The significance of this verse here is crucial as we will see in the analysis. It may be compared to its equivalent at Josh 24:28 where it *closes*, rather than opens, an episode.

(due to the repetition), description of one of the thematic participants of the next episode, the speedy apostasy that comes at Judg 2:11 has been anticipated.[167]

The various kinds of reduplication of material in the text is examined in more detail below in the section on Important Features of the Book of Joshua in the next chapter.

2.3.10 Perspective and Point of View

The following quotation has as its premise that written language is linked to time in a manner analogous to the visual arts being linked to the representation of space.

> If pictorial art, by nature, presupposes some spatial concreteness in its transmission of the represented world but allows temporal indefiniteness, then literature (which is essentially related not to space, but to time) insists as a rule on some temporal concreteness, and permits spatial representation to remain completely undefined. In fact, a greater reliance on temporal definition is inherent in natural language, the material from which literature is made, for the difference between language as a system and other semiotic systems is that linguistic expression, generally speaking, translates space into time. As M. Foucault has noted, a verbal description of any spatial relationship (or of any reality) is necessarily translated into a temporal sequence.
>
> This difference has its source in the special conditions of perception of literature and the pictorial arts; in the pictorial art, perception occurs basically in space, and not necessarily in time: in literature, perception takes place first of all in a temporal sequence.[168]

For Boris Uspensky, point of view was a "viewing *position*."[169] In the visual arts it is connected to perspective in a manner that includes what is represented (i.e., something outside the medium) and the representation (i.e., the medium)—external and

---

[167] The בְּנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל (Israelites) in Judg 2:11 is an anaphoric reference to the antecedent דּוֹר אַחֵר (other generation) of Judg 2:10b. *Anaphora* is a "Reference to something already mentioned (the thing referred to is called the ANTECEDENT, even if it follows)" (Pei, *Glossary of Linguistic Terminology*, 16).

[168] Uspensky, *Poetics of Composition*, 76–77. He referred to Foucault, *Les mots et les choses*.

[169] Uspensky, *Poetics of Composition*, 2 (emphasis is added).

internal.[170] Uspensky appropriated, by analogy through the art of drama (theatre and film), the structuring use of *montage*—the combining together of more than one point of view—to provide a compositional perspective.[171] For him, the possibilities for points of view included the spatio-temporal describer of events (i.e., the narrator), an ideological/evaluative position (e.g., authorial, normative, or other character), the phraseological plane (manifested most markedly in the direct speech or the narrators' descriptions of characters), and a psychological point of view (i.e., from a specific consciousness or combination thereof).[172] Narrative perspective is important and useful for describing how various points of view such as those of the author, narrator, audience/reader, and characters contribute to the ideology, theology, and reception of the stories.[173] Overall perspective is an agglomeration of the various points of view represented by the implied author; often, the narrator will present a sequence of character points of view in order to move the story along.

Making sense of the perspectival tangle between the represented world and the representing discourse is the task of the interpreter—it is a relational undertaking centred around a "subject and object, perceiving mind and perceived reality."[174] So, to author, narrator, and characters, we must add the reader's point of view—inevitably guided somewhat by the narrator—into consideration. It is also important not to lose sight of the unique perspective inherent in Biblical Hebrew narrative—that it gives precedence to the intentional author who combines language and craft to communicate an ideology. The

---

[170] Uspensky, *Poetics of Composition*, 2.
[171] Uspensky, *Poetics of Composition*, 5.
[172] Uspensky, *Poetics of Composition*, 5–7.
[173] Sternberg, *Poetics of Biblical Narrative*, 129–31.
[174] Sternberg, *Poetics of Biblical Narrative*, 129.

implied author is divine, and the narrator is quasi-divine and closely aligned with the implied author.[175] The reader, through understanding the poetics—or science—of the literary endeavour, will be a better interpreter. Meir Sternberg viewed the biblical narrative as decidedly historical, however not of the modern type, and the ideology presented is one of an all-knowing and all-powerful God. Interest is generated by the writer telling something between *the truth* and *the whole truth*.[176] It is the task of the interpreter to fill in the inevitable gaps. For the attentive reader, the nuances of characterization in the text are important indicators for eliciting the subtleties of perspective and point of view.

<div align="center">2.3.11 Thematic Participants and Characterization</div>

With respect to determining the thematic participants of a paragraph, they are usually introduced in the first or second sentence. They are repeated at least once more—often toward the end—and are the subject of at least one clause on the main event line (may be imperative, or *waw* plus suffixal verb if predictive or prescriptive) or repeatedly occur as other than the subject of such clauses. They are referred to several times successively by name (third-person) or pronoun (first- or second-person). There may be two primary thematic participants (equal prominence) or there may be one that is secondary (less prominent). If there appears to be several, they are probably subsidiary to the real thematic entity.[177] That regularity with respect to the placement of thematic characters is

---

[175] Sternberg, *Poetics of Biblical Narrative*, 129.
[176] Sternberg, *Poetics of Biblical Narrative*, 230–63.
[177] Longacre, "Flood Narrative" (1976), 240.

often helpful in delimiting the boundaries of episodes as will be evident during the

analyses below.

Carolyn Sharp maintained that "It is essential to remain attentive to

characterization in biblical narrative, and particularly to the differences in perspective and

reliability of various characters and personae."[178] The example she gave is:

> Thus in a synchronic reading of Numbers 22–24, the presence of the satirical
> donkey story suggests that there may be more going on in the oracles than
> Balaam's transparent rendering of exactly what God has put in his mouth . . .
> there are ample clues within the poetry, too, that support just such a skeptical
> reading of Balaam's prophesying. He says he can speak only what the Lord gives
> him and could not go beyond it "to do less or more" (22:18), but the narrator does
> not say this.[179]

A certain amount of perceptivity is required in the relating of characters' points of view

with those of the narrator or author—there are many different levels that may be

assessed. Adele Berlin noted some, with respect to characters' "poetics points of view,"

such as ideological, phraseological, spatio-temporal, and psychological.[180] For example,

הִנֵּה (*hinneh*) can "mark the perception of a character"[181] in something like a dawning of

awareness. It can also work in circumstantial clauses to indicate synchroneity.[182]

Switches in perspective can also happen with "alternative expressions" or "combining

points of view" (e.g., when a scene is described again by an entering character).[183] A

linear narrative scheme constituted by some kind of sequential orientation, complicating

action, evaluation, result or resolution, and coda[184] is helpful to keep in mind in sorting

---

[178] Sharp, *Irony and Meaning*, 141. It appears that what she referred to as "perspective" here is what Uspensky would have termed "point of view."

[179] Sharp, *Irony and Meaning*, 141.

[180] Berlin, *Poetics*, 55–56. Cf. also Uspensky, *Poetics of Composition*, 6.

[181] Berlin, *Poetics*, 62.

[182] Berlin, *Poetics*, 69.

[183] Berlin, *Poetics*, 72–74.

[184] Berlin, *Poetics*, 102.

out various kinds of comment in a story according to purpose, whether by a character or

the narrator. Shimon Bar-Efrat also notes the use of הִנֵּה (*hinneh*) to indicate a shift in

point of view to the now-perceiving (i.e., at that moment) character, as opposed to the

omniscient narrator.[185] Narrators sometimes use different terms for the same character

depending on whose point of view they are describing (e.g., Ishmael, the son of Hagar the

Egyptian, the child, his son, the lad).[186] "Narrators usually speak of the characters and

their deeds in a factual tone, but they are not indifferent to them."[187] All of these

interpretive choices contribute to the meaning derived from narratives, and the

application of discourse analysis as the narrative approach to the narratives under

consideration will sharpen our understanding.

2.3.12 Discourse Analysis as a Control on Narrative Approaches

The ultimate aim of the textlinguistic narrative approach of this study is the drawing out

of meaning—especially an ideological or theological impetus—by carefully relating the

various parts to each other in order to get a sense of the whole. Narrative approaches in

general tend to be creatively individualistic, and while adducing astute, intriguing, or

even penetrating readings, often lack the methodological controls that would lead to

consistent replicability of findings. Opposing that propensity to lack of restraint,

---

[185] Bar-Efrat, *Narrative Art*, 35. The assertions of both Berlin and Bar-Efrat on the use of *hinneh* with respect to the psychology of characters should be able to be tested textlinguistically. The expression is clearly used in the sense of characters' dawning awareness at Josh 8:20. It is used twice in Josh 14:10 where Caleb is imposing an agreement of past facts (i.e., combining points of view). In Josh 23:14 it has its common temporal immediacy connotation in view (i.e., "now at this time"), and in Josh 24:27 it has spatial immediacy in view ("*this here* stone"). This word is only found once in the passages under consideration in Judges at Judg 1:2, in a disjunctive clause, with the meaning "since/because" (Lambdin, *Introduction to Biblical Hebrew*, 170; Waltke and O'Connor, *IBHS*, 635).

[186] Bar-Efrat, *Narrative Art*, 36–37, with respect to Gen 21.

[187] Bar-Efrat, *Narrative Art*, 45.

Sternberg reacted strongly against literary approaches that discounted the historical

context or intentionality of the text.[188] He criticized four out of the following five

methodological assumptions Kenneth Gros Louis posited[189] for doing biblical literary

criticism.[190] Whereas Sternberg was agreeable to assume a semblance of unity of the text

for the purpose of literary analysis, he nonetheless disagreed that structure/organization is

the focus (I would tend to qualify this by suggesting that structure/organization is

sometimes very important), that fictionality automatically displaces questions of

historical reference, and that "the literary reality of the Bible can be studied with the

methods of literary criticism employed with every other text."[191] Sternberg was

absolutely correct, up to a point, that the discourse itself, not some psychological

projection concerning the writer, is the source of what we perceive as the *intention* of the

text.[192] Distinct meaning in a text really does only come from it having a real historical

context.[193] Narrative stance is a genuine literary feature, and it is truly helpful to keep in

mind that the biblical narrator has "access to privileged knowledge."[194] I will attempt to

demonstrate that the application of Longacre's method of discourse analysis provides

some desired methodological control.

It is also helpful to remember that a narrative has at least three main strata: 1.

language (the raw material); 2. representation (the world of the characters, events, and

setting); and 3. meaning—concepts, views, and values requiring interpretation.[195] The

---

[188] Sternberg, *Poetics of Biblical Narrative*, 4.
[189] Gros Louis, "Methodological Considerations," 14–17.
[190] Sternberg, *Poetics of Biblical Narrative*, 6–7.
[191] Sternberg, *Poetics of Biblical Narrative*, 7.
[192] Sternberg, *Poetics of Biblical Narrative*, 9.
[193] Sternberg, *Poetics of Biblical Narrative*, 11.
[194] Sternberg, *Poetics of Biblical Narrative*, 12.
[195] Bar-Efrat, *Narrative Art*, 197. Sternberg writes of texts "as a threefold complex—with the most variable interplay between discourse, world, and perspective—whose disentanglement by the reader forms

analysis of narratives requires different approaches at each level of investigation. Some of the main ideas of narrative approaches that will be considered in this study are the *style* of Biblical Hebrew narrative in its terseness and use of repetition, *point of view* throughout the narrative, and the contribution to *characterization* of the direct speech of participants.

In terms of using discourse analysis as a narrative approach, it bears noting some terminological interrelationships—the three terms "episode," "scene," and "paragraph" will be seen to share considerable overlap in the analyses. Whereas they all may describe the same extent of text under consideration in each section of an analysis, I will distinguish them as follows: episodes have to do with plot structure and are a feature of narrative (they have their own internal plot structure and contribute to the larger overall plot structure of the story); scenes have to do with time and/or place (a change in either will constitute a change in scene); and paragraphs are delimited grammatically, or better yet, textlinguistically with the features used by Longacre, some of which have already been mentioned above.

2.4 Application

The emphasis of the following analyses is the use of textlinguistic insight to determine the main discourse lines of the Joshua–Judges book-seam in the MT. There is a focus on Josh 23–24 and Judg 1:1—3:11 as the actual book-seam adjacent material, but there are also some synoptic or otherwise parallel passages throughout Joshua that are considered in the analyses. The overall examination is essentially on what might be termed the

---

neither a luxury nor a technicality but the very condition of making sense" (*Poetics of Biblical Narrative*, 129).

(double) *conclusion* of Joshua and the (extended [includes the Othniel story], perhaps double as well) *introduction* to Judges. The delineation of that material from the surrounding text is an essential preliminary matter in each analysis chapter. The rationale for focusing on main discourse lines within that material is not that subsidiary discourse lines are unimportant but that main discourse lines *govern* the meaning of the text. In the texts under discussion, the subsidiary discourse lines play an important role in structuring and situating the main discourse lines. The specifics and variety of linguistic choice on the part of the implied author was not random but motivated by function.[196] The discernment of the actual function of particular portions of the text makes the meaning of the text under consideration less ambiguous.

The determination of the text type of individual portions of text is based on the criteria put in place by the contingent temporal succession and agent orientation parameters of Longacre and Hwang.[197] There is no text in this study that could be considered *procedural*. *Behavioural* discourse—often hortatory—is found mainly embedded in reported speeches. *Exposition* is found predominantly in the central portion of the book of Joshua and generally serves a summarizing or evaluative purpose. For the most part—and like most of the material in the Primary History (Genesis–Second Kings)—we encounter *narrative* discourse. Even the direct speech found in those passages is embedded in the narrative by means of quotation formulas, and even the occurring exposition is found within a narrative framework. Each text type uses a particular constellation of verb forms, with each form of verbal construction denoting the

---

[196] Winther-Nielsen, *Functional Discourse Grammar*, 13–14.
[197] Longacre and Hwang, *Holistic Discourse Analysis*, 36–37.

particular function available in the text type under consideration. The delineation of main line versus off-line clauses, and structural features (e.g., setting), is emphasized.

The detailed analyses are preceded by relevant observations on overall structural concerns within each of the books based on previous diachronic and synchronic evaluations of the books. Those have to do with demarcations within the text, considerations of content and outlook, genre identification, themes, and some connections within and between the various sections of the two books. Comments are also made on the more far-reaching connections there are from the two books into the rest of the Primary History. That raises the issue of a Deuteronomistic History versus a Hexateuch, and so also all the diachronic historical concerns around the composition history of the texts under consideration. Some of the most important of those are discussed with the intention to elucidate *how* a text that has come into being through a complex process over considerable time, much of which remains opaque to the reader, can yet still be read as a coherent, synchronic whole. What few idiosyncrasies remain in the text from corruption in the editorial or transmission processes are also accounted for by the application of textlinguistic analysis.

The detailed analyses proceed by identifying the opening and closing features of episodes (for narrative) or other kinds of sections, and tracing the main discourse lines in distinction from circumstantial or otherwise subsidiary material. Those observations and comparisons shape the interpretive commentary. Distinctive points of view are of particular interest, especially in the occasional evaluations made by the narrator. The frequency, distribution, and manner of character references are also scrutinized for their influence on the structure and meaning of the text. The level of a character's

thematization will often dictate the importance that character's thoughts or actions. The

forward motion of the discourse—temporal sequence in narrative action or logical

progression in reported speeches—which generates plot (or a semblance of emplotment

in non-narrative), is a key component of the interpretation. Ultimately, it is the subtle, and

not so subtle, differences in perspectives between the book of Joshua and the book of

Judges on matters pertaining to the people of Israel's relationships with the LORD their

God, foreign gods, the land, and the inhabitants of the land that is the focus of this study.

In the end, there will be a summarization of the key findings of the ending to

Joshua, the introduction to Judges, the transition at the book-seam, and of the two books

overall. The findings will be compared and the distinctiveness of the various

presentations explained. There will also be evaluations of the effectiveness of the

methodology and how the surveys of past research on the topic informed the study. The

following two chapters will constitute the analyses of the relevant texts.

CHAPTER 3: ANALYSIS OF JOSHUA 23:1—24:33

This chapter provides the literary analysis of the double ending to the book of Joshua. It

begins with a brief sketch of scholarly thought on the overall structure of Joshua in order

to situate the detailed examination of Josh 23–24, and the synoptic passages and parallels

that will be evaluated in concert with Judg 1 in the following chapter. It continues with a

detailed discourse analysis of the narrative framework and embedded direct speech of

Josh 23–24. It concludes with some key observations on how Josh 23–24 functions as an

ending to the book of Joshua and as a component of the transition to the book of Judges.

3.1 Important Features of the Book of Joshua

3.1.1 Some Structural Features of the Book of Joshua

A number of commentators have generally agreed that the book of Joshua divides into

two main sections with chs. 1–12 describing the conquest of the land of Canaan by

Joshua and the Israelites, and chs. 13–24 dealing with the distribution of the land by

Joshua and Eleazar to the tribes of Israel.[1] This characterization is somewhat

rudimentary, however, and several commentators added other major divisions to this

scheme, especially with respect to the ending.[2] A slightly more refined view of the

---

[1] Dozeman, *Joshua 1–12*, 3–5; Goldingay, *Joshua*, 47–48; Nelson, *Joshua*, 13–14; Rösel, *Joshua*, 206–7.

[2] Soggin, (*Joshua*, 2–3) saw Josh 22–24 as an appendix. Polzin (*Moses and the Deuteronomist*, 73) and Woudstra (*Book of Joshua*, 42–44) also saw chs. 22–24 as a separate major thematic section. Butler demarcated a major division at the end of ch. 12 (*Joshua 1–12*, 183), but also one at the beginning of ch. 20

implied author's organization of the material of the book of Joshua may be described like this:

> First are the accounts of the preparations for and the actual crossing into the land west of the Jordan (Josh. 1–5). This is followed by an account which can be designated the "conquest tradition" (Josh. 6–11). Thereafter we find a series of chapters consisting of lists (Josh. 12–21) which register the different portions west of the Jordan taken as an "inheritance" by the tribes. Joshua 22 still belongs to this basic interest but deals with a special problem among the Transjordan tribes. In the final two chapters (Josh. 23–24) are a Deuteronomic farewell speech and an account of an early assembly of the tribal representatives at Shechem.[3]

Robert Boling was partially aligned with this arrangement by Walter Rast in not having a major division at the end of ch. 12, but rather at the ends of chs. 11, 21, 22, and 23. Boling also added major divisions between Josh 5:12 and 5:13, and at the end of ch. 19.[4] On the passage at Josh 5:13–15, Boling considered it "another fragment of epic" that belongs, rather, with the following section on warfare, instead of the preparation/crossing narratives that precede it.[5] It certainly anticipates the battle report that follows with the mention of Jericho.[6] However, it is also highly reminiscent of the encounter between Moses and the LORD in Exod 3:1–6 that, narrative-wise across the Hexateuch, started the chain of events leading to the first Passover, the Exodus, the Wilderness Wanderings, the Transjordanian Wars, and the Crossing of the Jordan River. The events of the second round of circumcision and Passover commemoration at Josh 5:1–12 are surely still in the preparatory phase that describes the content of the first four chapters of Joshua, rather

---

(*Joshua 13–24*, 190). Hawk, using a narrative approach, divided at the ends of chs. 1, 12, 21, 22, and 23 (*Joshua*, vii).

[3] Rast, *Joshua–Kings*, 23.

[4] Boling, *Joshua*, vii–x.

[5] Boling, *Joshua*, 198.

[6] Nonetheless, Jericho has already been anticipated at Josh 2:1–3; 3:16; 4:13, 19; 5:10, and so no special significance needs to be attached to its mention here at Josh 5:13.

than the actual warfare phase of Josh 6–11.[7] It seems that Josh 5:13–15, with its

manifestation of the LORD on holy ground, belongs foremost with Josh 5:1–12 as

something of a threefold climax to the narrative arc begun in Exod 3, even if it provides a

transition by means of catch-word link in Jericho to the following narrative section. The

grouping together of the narrative topics of a second circumcision, Passover, and holy

ground manifestation in these few verses in the same manner as Exodus is compelling.

On the matter of whether Josh 12 belongs with the preceding conquest of the land

section or the following distribution of the land section, several commentators saw it as a

summary of the conquered places, so thus, a part of the foregoing narrative.[8] It is easy to

discern why a reader might choose to group Josh 12 with what follows based genre-wise

on its character as a list, which it shares with the following chapters. Nevertheless, the

subject matter is the kings that have been conquered by Moses and Joshua, which relates

more readily to the previous narratives, as opposed to the boundaries and territories that

are allotted as inheritances in Josh 13–19 that follow. Chapters 20 (Cities of Refuge) and

21 (Levitical Cities) are interdependent and form a section focused on the Levitical

---

[7] The preparatory phase consists of the commissioning of Joshua, the preparations for the crossing including the reconnaissance of Jericho, the crossing of the Jordan River, the establishment of a base camp at Gilgal, and the preparations for battle.

[8] Butler, *Joshua 1–12*, 526–27; Dozeman, *Joshua 1–12*, 482 (who restricted it to "conclude the account of the war in Josh 9–12"); Nelson, *Joshua*, 1, 159; Rösel, *Joshua*, 195; Soggin, *Joshua*, 139–40 (who however included Josh 11:16–23 with it as a sub-section). Even Boling, who included it as part of "The Inheritance" section of Josh 12–19, stated: "This chapter is clearly intended to serve as a summary" (*Joshua*, 322). Goldingay considered it transitional in a sense, noting that this "addendum is also an anticipation of Josh. 13–21, where Joshua will commission the dividing of the land east of the Jordan (Josh. 13), then that west of the Jordan (Josh. 14–21). And it is an anticipation of Josh. 22, which takes up an implication of the ambiguous status attaching to the area east of the Jordan and to the eastern clans' position there" (*Joshua*, 254–55). Goldingay was not completely correct here in that the character Joshua only had to do with a word from the LORD about land remaining to be possessed west of the Jordan River in Josh 13:1–7. It is explicitly Moses who gave out inheritances east of the Jordan River in Josh 13:8–33. Chapters 20–21 are special cases that deal with cities of refuge and allotments to Levi on both the east and west side of the Jordan River.

families that can be distinguished from the material dealing with the other tribes.[9]

Nevertheless, the Deuteronomistic summary of Josh 21:43–45 concludes the distribution

of the whole land that was introduced at Josh 13:1 (and perhaps all of Josh 13:1–7) and

anticipated by Josh 11:23.[10]

Joshua 22 is distinctive, dealing specifically with the Transjordanian tribes, and

serves as something of a framework response, particularly the speeches within the

narrative at Josh 22:1–9, to Joshua's dialogue with those tribes at Josh 1:12–18,[11] and

with Josh 13:8–33 that concerns the "distribution of the land in the second half of the

book."[12] Chapters 23 and 24 are also distinctive, each in its own way, and together

constitute a conclusion to the book. This does not mean however that the final two or

three chapters of Joshua are not now highly integrated into the book. The notice that

וִיהוֹשֻׁעַ זָקֵן בָּא בַּיָּמִים "Joshua had grown old, advanced in days" in Josh 13:1a, and repeated

at 23:1b, provides an integrating function and is evidence for a deliberate editorial hand.

The book of Joshua brings together a quite diverse selection of different types of

written and traditional materials in a fairly sophisticated style of presentation. There is

unambiguously a *narrative framework* that carries the main storyline forward in time

from the death of Moses (Josh 1:1) until the death of his successor Joshua (Josh 24:29),

with plot, characters, spatio-temporal indicators, and distinct points of view of characters,

---

[9] Dozeman, *Joshua 13–24*, 272–91.

[10] Noth, *Josua* (1938), 101; Noth, *Josua* (1953), 133; Soggin, *Joshua*, 2–3, 206; Boling, *Joshua*, 498–500; Rösel, *Joshua*, 340; Dozeman, *Joshua 13–24*, 291. See also Kratz, *Composition*, 187, for Josh 22 as closely connected with Josh 21:43–45 as the overall conclusion to the section begun at Josh 13:1. Butler thought that these verses form "a theological conclusion of the book of Joshua up to this point (and) represent a literary conclusion to the previous narrative" (*Joshua 13–24*, 235), and Hawk wrote that the "narrator concludes the second phase of the book (i.e., 13:1—21:45 'Organizing Israel') with a brief summation that signals the completion of the entire program" (*Joshua*, 224).

[11] Boling, *Joshua*, 508; Rösel, *Joshua*, 345–47; Soggin, *Joshua*, 212.

[12] Dozeman, *Joshua 13–24*, 308.

narrator, and implied author represented. There are, besides, large sections of *expository descriptions*, on the one hand, and *persuasive direct reported speech*, on the other, which do not always fit neatly into the narrative framework.[13] There are, furthermore, occasions in the text where the spatial or temporal relationships between the various sections are not perfectly clear to the reader (e.g., Josh 23:1, where the location is unspecified; 24:1, where the time of this event is uncertain), and where the reader may struggle to understand the significance of a segment or the intent of the implied author at a particular point. The textlinguistic analysis can then provide insight on occasion into both perspective and the overall structure.

3.1.2 The Parallels

In addition to the unique overall structure of Joshua described just above, the Joshua–Judges complex exhibits a number of different kinds of duplications. In the following sections, various kinds of parallels, the double conclusion to Joshua in chs. 23 and 24, and the repeated notices that provide the basis for a narrative arc will be explored.

There are at least three kinds of parallels between the books of Joshua and Judges that merit comment. First, there are the historical traditions found in Josh 8–19 that seem also to be represented in some fashion in Judg 1. These are of a variety of different types,

---

[13] Nelson wrote concerning the attempts to integrate those diverse kinds of materials that:

> Joshua employs a wide range of materials to tell its story: divine war narratives, folktales with an etiological background, deuteronomistic sermons, border descriptions, city lists, and so forth. These disparate materials are not always in complete agreement. For example, the Rahab story seems to prepare for a different sort of conquest of Jericho than the one actually recorded. The list of kings in chapter 12 does not correspond to the preceding conquests. Joshua's great age prompts both his distribution of the land and his final words to the nation (13:1 and 23:1). The book ends with two unrelated final speeches of Joshua in chapters 23 and 24. All this is evidence that the final shape of Joshua is the product of a complex process of literary formation (*Joshua*, 5).

coming from portions of divergent genres (e.g., narrative, list). Second, there are literary

duplications that prompt a recollection for the reader of something already written (e.g.,

the resumptive repetition of Josh 2:14a at v. 20a), which may serve to signal a digression

or interpolation between the repetitions, or highlight in this manner an important aspect

of the story like the double recounting of the death and burial of Joshua (Josh 24:29–30;

Judg 2:8–9). Third, there are the detailed replications of stories in new settings, which

may nonetheless be based on specific historical events, yet are repeated with some

variation for literary or ideological purposes in the new setting (e.g., the sackings of Ai

[Josh 8] and Gibeah [Judg 20]).[14]

In order to gain a better understanding of the book-seam between Joshua and

Judges, a precise textlinguistically-informed narrative description shall be made of the

overlap of material from the book of Joshua. The relevant texts from Joshua will be

compared with the introductory material of Judges. The texts to be examined in that

comparison are of two different types: first, historical traditions from the land conquest

and distribution sections of Joshua that find echoes in the first chapter of Judges; and

second, the finale to the book of Joshua that recounts the death of Joshua and seems to

represent a deliberate linking of the books of Joshua and Judges by its near-duplication in

the introduction to Judges. The traditions of land conquest and distribution that are

paralleled in Judg 1will be analyzed in the next chapter in conjunction with Judg 1; the

---

[14] Peckham, *Composition of the Deuteronomistic History*, 39–49. In comments on the re-interpretive style of Dtn[2] he delineated: 1. repetition marking a parenthesis; 2. alternate versions (summaries, paradigms, pre-emptive variants); and 3. cross-referencing modified alternate versions (harmonization, prolepsis and resumption, inclusion). Peckham's particular emphasis on repetition was basic to his view of the compositional history of Genesis–Second Kings—that it was built up intergenerationally through the incorporation of new interpretations into the previous texts as commentary without casting aside anything of note from those previous texts (73).

account of the death and burial of Joshua will be analyzed in each of its specific literary

settings within the respective books in each of the next two chapters of this study.

The specific passages to be compared with Judg 1 are Josh 8:10–23; 12:9, 16 with

Judg 1:22–26 (the sacking of Ai/Bethel), Josh 10:1–5, 22–27; 12:10 with Judg 1:1–8

(Adoni Zedek/Bezek), Josh 14:6–15; 15:13–19 with Judg 1:9–16, 20 (allotment to

Caleb), Josh 15:63 with Judg 1:8, 21 (Jebusites persist in Jerusalem), Josh 16:10 with

Judg 1:29 (allotment to Josephites [Ephraim]), Josh 17:11–13 with Judg 1:27–28

(allotment to Josephites [Manasseh]), and Josh 17:14–18 with Judg 1:19 (Josephites

complain about their allotment).[15] A *special* comparison will be made of Josh 24:28–33

with Judg 1:1; 2:6–10 (the death of Joshua). The main purpose of those examinations is

to discern any underlying ideological differences that might help demonstrate unique

perspectives in the implied authors of these two books.

3.1.3 The Double Conclusion to the Book of Joshua

There is, in addition, a special, very large, and abrupt duplication toward the end of the

book of Joshua, in chs. 23 and 24, where there is recorded two distinct, so-called farewell

speeches by Joshua. The first has an indistinct geographical setting at a national assembly

in Joshua's old age—I have called it The Final Words of Joshua. The second has an

indistinct temporal setting at Shechem—I have called it The Assembly at Shechem. The

textlinguistic analysis of these two chapters below will take up a considerable portion of

this chapter, but a more detailed evaluation of some diachronic questions, tailored as

---

[15] Soggin has a slightly different list of parallels between Josh 15–19 and Judg 1 (*Joshua*, 13).

specific background to the following discourse analysis, is first necessary in order to

discover the character of this double conclusion and its role at the book-seam.

The whole of Josh 23–24, as it functions as a (double) conclusion to the book of

Joshua, is analyzed below as a narrative, and as having a role as part of the book-seam

(either between the Hexateuch and the extended historical narrative that follows in Judges

through Kings, or within the Deuteronomistic History between the individual books of

Joshua and Judges). The concept of *parallel* transitions from Joshua to Judges has been

important in historical studies of the text for some time. Various aspects of this were dealt

with above in the historical research survey chapter. In addition, and to the specific point

under discussion here, Otto Eissfeldt posited that Josh 24 is directly connected to Judg

1:1—2:5 based on a continuous L source that portrays the person Joshua as a

contemporary of Moses, rather than as a successor as does J and E.[16] According to

Eissfeldt, subsequent deuteronomistic revisions made the book transitions between

Joshua and Judges as, first, Josh 24:1—Judg 2:5, then Josh 23 plus Judg 2:6–9.

> The first of these two editions preserved the material of Josh 24 plus Judg 1; 2:1a,
> 5b, deriving predominantly from E and L and was content to add a few
> Deuteronomistic expressions, of which that in Judg 2:1b–5a, is particularly
> interesting. It traces back the incompleteness of the conquest, quite neutrally
> related by L in Judg 1, to the sin of Israel, and in this way makes the divergent
> section serve the Deuteronomistic bias . . . entirely ignor[ing] that there is material
> in Judg 1 which completely contradicts the presentation of Josh 13–24. . . . The
> other editor replaced the farewell speech of Joshua in Josh 24:1–27, by one of his
> own, 23, and to this attached immediately the dismissal of the people and the
> death of Joshua (Judg 2:6–9).[17]

---

[16] Eissfeldt, *Old Testament Introduction*, 254. He saw Joshua as dying shortly after Moses and only leading the one campaign against Jericho in the older L source.

[17] Eissfeldt, *Old Testament Introduction*, 255. Cf. Rudolph's assertion (*Elohist*, 242) that "ist Jos 23, Jdc 2:6–10, 13, 20–22, 3:1a, 3, 4, 6 der einheitliche deuteronomische Abschluß des Josuabuchs" (Josh 23, Judg 2:6–10, 13, 20–22, 3:1a, 3, 4, 6 is the coherent Deuteronomic conclusion of the book of Joshua).

The two editions were then later merged on the analogy of what occurred with the book of Deuteronomy, where he was of the opinion that the introductory and concluding historical framework speeches by Moses are later additions.[18] We know that Julius Wellhausen had previously made the declaration that ch. 23 is a completely deuteronomistic creation and that there is the extension of a deuteronomistically revised source E with some additions from J through much of ch. 24, which theory he based on the work of Johannes Hollenberg.[19]

Martin Noth, as we have seen, altered the terms of understanding the relationship between chs. 23 and 24 by his denial of the extension of pentateuchal sources J, E, and P through the book of Joshua.[20] Perhaps the most compelling aspect of his case is the overall and extensive deuteronomistic nature of much of Joshua, Judges, First and Second Samuel, and First and Second Kings.[21] He viewed Josh 23 as an original deuteronomistic speech that brought the conquest of Josh 1–12 to an end,[22] and Josh 24:1–28 (as well as large portions of Josh 13–22) as a later addition.[23] He was somewhat more specific in the second edition of his commentary that "Literarisch bildet Jos 24 jetzt einem Anhang zu dem Dtn-istische Josuabuche, das mit Jos 23 feierlich abschliesst. Der literarische

[18] Eissfeldt, *Old Testament Introduction*, 231–32, 255–56.

[19] Wellhausen, *Composition des Hexateuchs*, 133–34; Hollenberg, "Deuteronomischen Beslandtheile," 481–89. Source E was said to contain the history from the patriarchs through to the distribution of the land. Of particular interest is Wellhausen's observation that the deuteronomistic addition in Josh 24, where "in Sept und Jud 2:6 unmittelbar auf verse 28 folgende verse 31 (wegen der Anschauung, dass die Generation Josuas noch bundestreu gewesen, dann aber der grosse Abfall erfolgt sei)" (133) (In the LXX and Judg 2:6 v. 31 [MT] immediately follows v. 28 [in Judges it follows 2:6] [because of the view that *Joshua's generation was still loyal to the covenant, but then the great apostasy occurred*]) (emphasis added). How the statement that "Israel served the LORD all the days of Joshua, and all the days of the elders whose days had extended beyond Joshua" is developed by the narrative contours of the MT Josh 24 and Judg 2 is an important part of this study.

[20] Noth, *Josua* (1938), vii–xv; *Josua* (1953), 7–16; *Deuteronomistic History*, 25–26.

[21] Noth, *Deuteronomistic History*, 17.

[22] Noth, *Deuteronomistic History*, 66.

[23] Noth, *Deuteronomistic History*, 23.

Grundbestand von Jos 24 ist vordtn.-istisch, wie schon die nachträglich hinzugekommene

dtn.-istische Bearbeitung zeigt."[24] He added that,

> Dtr muss jedenfalls den älteren literarischen Bestand von Jos 24, und zwar
> vermutlich in irgend einem Zusammenhang mit dem vordtn.-istischen Bestand in
> Jos 1–12, gekannt haben; den nach diesem Vorbild hat er sein eigenes
> Abschlusskapitel Jos 23 gestaltet. Dtr selbst aber hat Jos 24 offenbar nicht
> aufgenommen, sondern durch Jos 23 ersetzt, und so ist Jos 24 erst in einem
> sekundär dtn.-istischen Stadium anhangsweise hinzugekommen.[25]

Hartmut Rösel, however, pointed out a problematic nature of Noth's thesis, which is

exactly how a traditionally older ch. 24 could at once serve as a model for the

deuteronomistic speech of ch. 23, and then would only be added back into its context

between Josh 23 and Judg 2 at a point following the creation of the Deuteronomistic

History.[26] Noth did, however in fact, at one point repudiate the idea that the

Deuteronomist had used ch. 24 as a template for ch. 23, based on the independence of ch.

24 and its lack of knowledge of the conquest traditions that are described in Josh 2–11.[27]

Rösel adopted a supposedly more economical explanation by postulating that two

parallel narrative strands are what account for the duplications of the assembly and

speech at Josh 23–24, Joshua's death at Josh 24:29–30 and Judg 2:8–9, and the two

introductions to the book of Judges (Judg 1:1–2:5; 2:6–9).[28] His explanation that the older

transition is to be found between Josh 24 and Judg 1:1—2:5, does not escape the

---

[24] Noth, *Josua* (1953), 139. (Literally, Josh 24 now forms an appendix to the deuteronomistic book of Joshua, which solemnly concludes with Josh 23. The basic literary content of Josh 24 is pre-deuteronomistic, as the later addition of the deuteronomistic adaptation demonstrates.)

[25] Noth, *Josua* (1953), 139. (In any case, the Deuteronomist must have known the older literary stock from Josh 24, probably in some connection with the pre-deuteronomistic stock in Josh 1–12; he designed his own final chapter, Josh 23, based on this model. However, the Deuteronomist himself apparently did not include Josh 24, but replaced it with Josh 23, and so Josh 24 was only added as an appendix in a secondary deuteronomistic stage.)

[26] Rösel, "Überleitungen," 342n3.

[27] Noth, *Deuteronomistic History*, 23n1. This ambivalence was noted by Rösel ("Nomistische Redaktion," 187n8).

[28] Rösel, "Überleitungen," 343. He maintained that position in his 2011 commentary (*Joshua*, 355).

recurring difficulty of why a later editor/composer would include an older transition in the middle of the newer one. *If* one accepts that there are those two editorial transitions between the books as they now stand, *then* it is more likely that Josh 24–Judg 1 would be the later one.

In view of this problem Richard Nelson, following Chris Brekelmans, has aptly observed that

> Chapter 23 works well as a summary to the book of Joshua, limiting its review to the occupation of the land. Chapter 24, in contrast, seems designed as a conclusion for the Hexateuch as a whole. It is less focused on the issue of land and operates with a wider horizon, one that includes patriarchs, exodus, and wilderness. Perhaps 23:16, which pulls together the themes of serving other gods, covenant, and the possibility of perishing from the land, served as the topical attachment point for chapter 24, which focuses on these same matters.[29]

In addition, Thomas Römer stated that

> Die Einfügung von Jos 24 nach 23 . . . bedeutete offensichtlich eine klare Trennung des Josuabuches vom Richterbuch. Der durch Jos 23 und Jdc 2:6ff. geschaffene dtr Übergang wurde bewusst unterbrochen. Dem Richterbuch wurde durch Jdc 1 eine neue Einleitung gegeben, die das Josuabuch korrigiert, aber im Grunde auch ersetzt. Jdc 1:1 imitiert Jos 1:1. Der Haupteinschnitt liegt nun nicht zwischen Dtn und Jos sondern zwischen Jos und Jdc.[30]

His overall proposition was that "Josh 23 is the Dtr conclusion of the period of the conquest . . . Josh 24, on the other hand, is a post-Dtr text . . . and arises from the attempt to produce a Hexateuch in place of a Pentateuch during the Persian period."[31]

---

[29] Nelson, *Joshua*, 268; Cf. Brekelmans, "Joshua 24," 4–6. Brekelmans states: "Josh. xxiv presupposes that the Pentateuch and the book of Joshua at a certain moment were brought together into one great literary work" (5). *If* Josh 23 is the earlier conclusion to the book and thought of as part of an original deuteronomistic composition, and *then* Josh 24 was inserted in order to make a distinctive break between the books of Joshua and Judges, any redaction-critical investigation would *then* need to explain a pre-deuteronomistic Joshua narrative of a complete conquest that was subsequently used by the Deuteronomist who added a more nuanced view of only partial success in Josh 23 (among other passages).

[30] Römer, "Doppelt Ende des Josuabuches," 546. (The insertion of Josh 24 after 23 . . . obviously meant a clear separation of the Book of Joshua from the Book of Judges. The deuteronomistic transition created by Josh 23 and Judg 2:6–10 was deliberately interrupted. The book of Judges was given a new introduction by Judg 1, which corrects but essentially replaces the book of Joshua. Judg 1:1 imitates Josh 1:1. The main break is not between Deuteronomy and Joshua but between Joshua and Judges.)

[31] Römer, "Doppelt Ende des Josuabuches," 548.

So whereas this study is primarily interested in reading the transition from Joshua to Judges as an integrated narrative, it is useful to understand as background some of the complex historical processes that may have played a part in its composition. The concepts of the integration of that/those book(s) into a Deuteronomistic History *and then later* a Hexateuch are, as we can see, not mutually exclusive.[32] The realization is crucial that it is highly probable that Josh 24 serves, not as a replacement or model for Josh 23, but rather, as an editorial culmination that serves to round out the book of Joshua as part of a Hexateuch. There still remains the question of how the product we have in the MT (i.e., the book of Joshua followed directly by the book of Judges to open the Former Prophets) is to be read and understood as a literary artifact.

3.1.4 Some Overall Narrative Considerations for the Book of Joshua

A succinct summary of the book of Joshua was made by Nelson that it

> describes the invasion, conquest, and division of the land of Canaan by Israel, pictured as a unified national group organized into twelve tribes and under the resolute leadership of Joshua, successor to Moses. Although the book is clearly the product of multilayered tradition and a process of literary growth, the final canonical form can be understood as a self-contained and coherent literary whole. The subject matter falls into neat halves, covering military conquest in chapters 1–12 and then in chapters 13–24, settlement and life in the land.[33]

Nevertheless, the narrative arc of the book of Joshua noticeably extends back into various parts of the Pentateuch, and forward through the so-called Deuteronomistic History. It contains the—at least partial—fulfilment of the LORD's promise for a future

---

[32] John Goldingay wrote about the book of Joshua as a whole: "Following the Torah and initiating the Former Prophets, Joshua faces both ways narratively and theologically; it occupies a pivotal place in the sequence of works from Genesis through Kings" (*Joshua*, 7–8).
[33] Nelson, *Joshua*, 1.

giving of the land, made to the ancestors of the Israelites as found in the Pentateuch.[34]

That narrative arc, back into the Pentateuch, also sets up the possibility of the loss of the

land if certain conditions are not met, and which is of vital interest to the implied author

of Joshua and the following history found in the Former Prophets.[35] For Noth, the

Deuteronomist "did not write his history to provide entertainment in hours of leisure or to

satisfy a curiosity about national history, but intended it to teach the true meaning of the

history of Israel from the occupation to the destruction of the old order."[36] There is then,

a particular kind of implied reader in view—one invested in the meaning of the story.

So then, the notices of the conditional nature of remaining in the land anticipate

the divine judgement inherent in certain kinds of disobedience. Throughout the book of

Judges, the disobedience of going after other gods is punished with the repeated

oppression of the Israelites by their surrounding enemies. This cycle of disobedience,

oppression, and deliverance continues throughout the judges-period until the threatening

notice at 1 Sam 12:24–25 in Samuel's speech.[37] Loss of the land is not explicitly warned

there, but the hint of it is ominous. The possibility of the loss of the land due to sin is

raised again by Solomon at the dedication of the temple in 1 Kgs 8:46. In the LORD's

response to Solomon, that possibility is confirmed at 1 Kgs 9:6–7.[38] In the days of Jehu,

"the LORD began to trim off parts of Israel" (2 Kgs 10:32, NRSV). In the days of Pekah,

---

[34] Cf. Gen 12:7; 15:7–21; 17:8; 26:3–4; 28:4, 13; 35:12; 48:4; 50:24; Exod 3:8, 17; 6:4, 8; 13:5, 11; 32:13; 33:1; Lev 20:24; Num 14:23; 32:11; Deut 1:8; 6:3, 10; 9:5; 10:11; 11:9, 21; 30:20; 31:20, 21, 23; 34:4.

[35] See Lev 26:1–45; Num 33:50–56; Deut 4:25–31, 40; 6:13–19; 7:1–5; 11:16–17; 16:20; 28:15–68; 30:17–18 for the conditional nature of ongoing possession of the land.

[36] Noth, *Deuteronomistic History*, 134.

[37] "Only fear the LORD, and serve him faithfully with all your heart; for consider what great things he has done for you. But if you still do wickedly, you shall be swept away, both you and your king" (NRSV).

[38] "If you turn aside . . . go and serve other gods and worship them, then I will cut Israel off from the land that I have given them" (NRSV).

Tiglath-Pileser, king of Assyria, captured a number of Israelite cities and took people

captive (2 Kgs 15:29). "In the ninth year of Hoshea the king of Assyria captured Samaria;

he carried the Israelites away to Assyria . . . This occurred because the people of Israel

had sinned against the LORD their God . . . (and) they served idols" (2 Kgs 17:6–12,

NRSV). Finally, in 2 Kgs 25, it is recorded that Nebuchadnezzar sacked Jerusalem and

carried the remaining Judeans into exile in Babylon. Thus, the conditions having been

fulfilled multiple times over, the punishment was exacted.

Within the book of Joshua itself there are some important themes and activities

intoned. Nelson observed that "Yahweh's gift of the land is the core plot action of

Joshua, constituting an arc of promise and fulfillment."[39] However, the tension in the

book between the complete taking of the land (Josh 1:2–6; 2:9, 24; 10:40–42; 11:16–17,

23; 12:7–24; 18:1; 21:43, thus emphasized more in the first half of the book), and the

much land that remains to be taken or peoples driven out (13:1–6, 13; 15:63; 16:10:

17:12–13, 16, so developed more in the second half of the book), needs some unravelling

for the reader. Chapters 23 and 24, each in its own way, attempt to deal with the

ambiguity, but there is an "overall move from optimism to pessimism."[40] In addition to

the allocation and possession of the land, there are a number of other related theological

themes that are well developed in the book of Joshua, including, conquest, the enemy, the

ban, and obedience.[41]

---

[39] Nelson, *Joshua*, 15.

[40] Nelson, *Joshua*, 14.

[41] Nelson, *Joshua*, 16–20. There is also the idea, well developed in the first half of the book, that the inhabitants of the land are fearful (cf. Josh 2:9–10a, 11a, 24; 5:1; 6:1, 27; 9:1–3; 10:1–2; 11:1–2).

A story is not a story without characters, and the main characters that drive the action throughout the book of Joshua are Joshua the leader (protagonist), the LORD the God of Israel (helper), the Israelites themselves (there seems to be something of an expectation that the implied reader will relate in some manner to this group), and a collection of inhabitants of the land that are, for the most part (Rahab and the Gibeonites excepted), considered the enemy (antagonists). Moses, the former leader—and servant of the LORD—lurks in the background throughout the book (his name appears 58 times), and the land serves as an important prop to the narrative momentum. One of the more intriguing features of the portrayal of Joshua is that the narrator carefully describes what Joshua does and says, but just as carefully refrains from describing any of his internal thoughts or attitudes. Aside from his meticulous inclination toward obedience to the LORD, we learn very little else about the inner character of this Joshua, after whom the book is named.

Some of the key inflection points in the narrative framework of the book of Joshua can be outlined as follows. Josh 1:1, וַיְהִי אַחֲרֵי מוֹת מֹשֶׁה עֶבֶד יְהוָה וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֶל־יְהוֹשֻׁעַ בִּן־נוּן מְשָׁרֵת מֹשֶׁה לֵאמֹר "after the death of Moses, servant of the LORD, the LORD spoke to Joshua, son of Nun, who had served Moses, saying . . .," makes the direct narrative connection to the death of Moses described at Deut 34:5–8 and the transition of leadership from Moses to Joshua that is anticipated at Deut 34:9. This same formula (וַיְהִי אַחֲרֵי מוֹת "after the death of") marks other important transitions in the more extensive Hebrew Bible narrative of the Primary History, such as from Abraham to Isaac (Gen 25:11), from Joshua to the judges-period (Judg 1:1), and from Saul to David and Ish-bosheth (2 Sam 1:1). In addition, the notice that Moses was *the servant of the LORD*—

first noted in Deut 34:5 and fourteen times in Joshua—sets up for the next major

transition at the book-seam of Joshua–Judges (Josh 24:29; Judg 2:8) where Joshua is first,

and solely there in those corresponding passages, referred to as *the servant of the LORD*.

So, even as much as Josh 1:1 marks a transition point, it also serves to integrate the book

of Joshua into the broader story found in the Pentateuch and Deuteronomistic History.[42]

The speech of the LORD to Joshua found in Josh 1:2–9, and just introduced by

the extended quotation formula of Josh 1:1, begins the process of exalting Joshua as the

new leader in ever expanding contexts (cf. Josh 3:7 where וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֶל־יְהוֹשֻׁעַ הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה אָחֵל

אֲגַדֶּלְךָ בְּעֵינֵי כָּל־יִשְׂרָאֵל "the LORD said to Joshua: 'this day I will begin to exalt you in the

eyes of all Israel,'" and Josh 6:27 וַיְהִי יְהוָה אֶת־יְהוֹשֻׁעַ וַיְהִי שָׁמְעוֹ בְּכָל־הָאָרֶץ "the LORD was

with Joshua, his name was in all the land"). The LORD promises Joshua possession of

the land for the people (כָּל־מָקוֹם אֲשֶׁר תִּדְרֹךְ כַּף־רַגְלְכֶם בּוֹ לָכֶם נְתַתִּיו "every place on which the

sole of your foot treads, to you [plural] I have given it" [Josh 1:3a]) and the defeat of all

their enemies (לֹא־יִתְיַצֵּב אִישׁ לְפָנֶיךָ כֹּל יְמֵי חַיֶּיךָ "no one shall stand before you all the days of

your life" [Josh 1:5a]). The LORD promises to remain with him, and encourages him to

remain committed and obedient. In Josh 11:15–23 there is the summary notice that all

that the LORD had commanded Moses and Joshua had been fulfilled—Joshua had

accomplished the taking of the whole land and וַיִּתְּנָהּ יְהוֹשֻׁעַ לְנַחֲלָה לְיִשְׂרָאֵל "Joshua gave it as

an inheritance to Israel" (Josh 11:23). This brings the combat phase to a triumphant

conclusion, and the following exposition of all the accomplishments of Moses and Joshua

in Josh 12 brings a satisfying closure to the stories. There is a similar summary at Josh

---

[42] Some other seemingly important connections to the Pentateuchal literature are Josh 1:12–18; 22:1–9 (cf. Num 32; 34:14–15; Deut 3:12–20; 29:8) on the Transjordanian tribes, Josh 8:30–35 (cf. Deut 27) on building the altar on Mt. Ebal (see Tov, "Sequence Differences," 411–13), Josh 20 (cf. Num 35:9–34; Deut 4:41–43; 19:1–10) on Cities of Refuge, and Josh 21:1–42 (cf. Num 35:1–8) on Levitical cities.

21:43–45 that ends the allotment of the land to the remaining tribes and serves as something of a culminating point in the narrative.[43]

But there is an abrupt temporal dislocation at Josh 13:1a where יְהוֹשֻׁעַ זָקֵן בָּא בַּיָּמִים "Joshua had grown old, advanced in days." This is the same announcement that is found at Josh 23:1b.[44] The only possible anticipation given in the text for this announcement at Josh 13:1 is the notice at Josh 11:18 that יָמִים רַבִּים עָשָׂה יְהוֹשֻׁעַ אֶת־כָּל־הַמְּלָכִים הָאֵלֶּה מִלְחָמָה "many days Joshua made war with all these kings." The bracketing of Josh 13:1—23:1 by this announcement of Joshua's old age has the stark effect of loosening chs. 13–22 from their temporal moorings. There is no way to pin down exactly when the events described in them take place. This has an unsettling effect on the reader, in that the interpretation practically forced upon the reader is that all the events of Josh 13:1—24:28 take place in a short span of time just prior to Joshua's death. So, with the initial complete conquest described as having taken place immediately and quickly, the question is, what were the Israelites doing in the intervening time period? Even more jarring are the words of the LORD at Josh 13:1bδ that וְהָאָרֶץ נִשְׁאֲרָה הַרְבֵּה־מְאֹד לְרִשְׁתָּהּ "yet very much land is remaining to possess," when at Josh 11:23 the reader is informed that וַיִּקַּח יְהוֹשֻׁעַ אֶת־כָּל־הָאָרֶץ "Joshua took the whole land." The narrative framework of the second half of the book, and the concluding speeches of Joshua, struggle to reconcile those discrepancies.

---

[43] See Rösel for the importance of Josh 21:43–45 as a compositional hinge point for Joshua, especially at Josh 13:1; 23:1 and the transition to Judges ("Überleitungen," 345–50; "Nomistische Redaktion," 186).

[44] "The literary reasons for considering chs. 13–19 to be secondary are that 13:1a anticipates 23:1b, and the apportionment of the land is just an elaborate expansion on the Deuteronomistic remark in 11:23" (Peckham, "Significance of the Book of Joshua," 219n2).

The foregoing outline of critical issues, such as, situating the problem of the book-seam within views on the structure of Joshua, determining the complex compositional history of the book (especially with respect to Josh 23–24), understanding the characterization of the person Joshua, and describing important aspects of the book's narrative arc, will greatly inform the following analysis of the conclusion to Joshua. The next section will provide the analysis of the narrative framework and embedded direct speech of Josh 23–24.

3.2 Analysis of the Conclusions to the Book of Joshua (Chapters 23–24)

3.2.1 Joshua 23:1–16—The Final Words of Joshua

3.2.1.1 The Narrative Setting

Joshua 23 is clearly its own episode, introduced with a temporal clause in Josh 23:1—וַיְהִי מִיָּמִים רַבִּים אַחֲרֵי אֲשֶׁר־הֵנִיחַ יְהוָה לְיִשְׂרָאֵל מִכָּל־אֹיְבֵיהֶם מִסָּבִיב "it was many days afterward when the LORD had given rest to Israel from all of their surrounding enemies"—and definitively closed by the new (or at least actual) geographical—and implicitly new temporal—setting in 24:1, וַיֶּאֱסֹף יְהוֹשֻׁעַ אֶת־כָּל־שִׁבְטֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל שְׁכֶמָה "Joshua gathered all the tribes of Israel to Shechem," which opens a new episode. After providing the temporal setting, and the circumstantial notice that יְהוֹשֻׁעַ זָקֵן בָּא בַּיָּמִים "Joshua had grown old, advanced in days" (*qatal* twice) in Josh 23:1, the main storyline commences in v. 2 with two *wayyiqtol* clauses וַיִּקְרָא יְהוֹשֻׁעַ לְכָל־יִשְׂרָאֵל "Joshua called out all Israel" and וַיֹּאמֶר אֲלֵהֶם "he said to them." The remainder of Josh 23 is a speech by Joshua exhorting the people to

follow the LORD. This entire speech is, grammatically, the direct object of the quotation

formula וַיֹּאמֶר אֲלֵהֶם "he said to them." This speech is also thoroughly Deuteronomistic.[45]

In Josh 1 the LORD spoke first to Joshua and then Joshua commanded the people

concerning the possession of the land. Here in Josh 23, following the occupation of the

land (i.e., אֲשֶׁר־הֵנִיחַ יְהוָה לְיִשְׂרָאֵל "when the LORD had given rest to Israel" [Josh 23:1]),

Joshua again addresses the collected people. He provides them—and particularly those

with some form of authority, לִזְקֵנָיו וּלְרָאשָׁיו וּלְשֹׁפְטָיו וּלְשֹׁטְרָיו "to its elders, and to its chiefs,

and to its judges, and to its officers" (Josh 23:2)—with instruction. The speeches in Josh

1 and Josh 23 mark transition points in the history, the beginning and the end of the

conquest, and the ideological emphasis in them is unmistakable; "If you transgress the

covenant of the LORD your God, which He enjoined on you, and go and serve other gods

and bow down to them, then the anger of the LORD will be kindled against you, and you

shall perish quickly from the good land that he has given to you" (Josh 23:16, NRSV).

According to Noth, the history continues directly from here at the end of Josh 23

to the judges-period beginning in Judg 2:6. The judges-period ends with the speech by

Samuel in 1 Sam 12, which itself also marks the transition to the era of the kings.[46]

---

[45] Cross, "Themes of the Book of Kings," 274; Soggin, *Joshua*, 218. The importance for the reading strategy of the deuteronomistic character of certain portions of Joshua and Judges was discussed briefly above in the section on The Double Conclusion to the Book of Joshua.

[46] Noth, *Deuteronomistic History*, 19. A few pages later (23–24) Noth recognized the more ancient traditions that constitute ch. 24, but affirmed that it was incorporated later. In fact, as described by Römer,

> Noth selbst hat bekannterweise seine Position zu dieser Frage des Öfteren geändert: in der ersten Auflage seines Kommentars nahm er an, dass Jos 24 die Vorlage des Dtr gewesen sei, um Jos 23 zu komponieren. Dtr hätte dann seine Quelle "anhangsweise" hinter der von ihm verfassten Abschiedsrede stehen lassen (xiii). In den *Überlieferungsgeschichtlichen Studien* hingegen erklärt er, dass diese Annahme "in Wirklichkeit auf überaus schwachen Füssen" stehe. Jos 24 sei als "überlieferungsgeschichtlich selbständige(s)" Stück dem Dtr unbekannt gewesen und erst nachträglich "unter starker Bearbeitung im Stile von Dtr" in den Zusammenhang zwischen Jos und Jdc eingefügt worden (9 Anm. 1). In der zweiten Auflage des Josua-Kommentars kehrte er zur Idee zurück, dass dem Dtr der "Kern von c. 24 vorgelegen haben muss," jedoch meinte er nun, dass Dtr dieses Stück zwar "als Vorbild für das von ihm verfasste Abschlusskapitel 23 benutzte,"

Again, the ideology of a conditional hold on the land by the people and their leaders is prominent there; "Only fear the LORD, and serve him . . . But if you still do wickedly, you shall be swept away, both you and your king" (1 Sam 12:24–25, NRSV). Alberto Soggin clearly stated the once widely acknowledged result of historical criticism that ch. 23

> gives the conclusion of the Deuteronomic edition of the narrative of the conquest. 23:1 takes up 21:43–45 and 22:1–6, while 23:16 is continued by 24:28 // Judg 2:6. Thus there is an interruption which is due to two major interpolations: 22:7–34, placed in that position, as we have seen, by a Deuteronomic redactor . . . and secondly, chapter 24 and Judg 1 (+2:1–5?).[47]

The circumstantial notice in Josh 23:1b, וִיהוֹשֻׁעַ זָקֵן בָּא בַּיָּמִים "and now Joshua had grown old, advanced in days," serves an important function in the construction of the narrative arc of the entire book of Joshua. It is directly and intimately linked by the coordinating conjunction with the temporal clause in Josh 23:1a וַיְהִי מִיָּמִים רַבִּים אַחֲרֵי אֲשֶׁר־ הֵנִיחַ יְהוָה לְיִשְׂרָאֵל מִכָּל־אֹיְבֵיהֶם מִסָּבִיב "it was many days afterward when the LORD had given rest to Israel from all of their surrounding enemies," which opens this episode. It is also a duplication of Josh 13:1a, which itself is directly and intimately connected with the following Josh 13:1b, וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֵלָיו אַתָּה זָקַנְתָּה בָּאתָ בַיָּמִים וְהָאָרֶץ נִשְׁאֲרָה הַרְבֵּה־מְאֹד לְרִשְׁתָּהּ "the

---

jedoch seine Vorlage "nicht in sein Werk aufnahm" (16). Jos 24 sei "erst in einem sekundär dtn.-istischen Stadium anhangsweise hinzugekommen" (139) ("Doppelte Ende des Josuabuches," 525–26).

(Noth himself is known to have changed his position on this question several times: in the first edition of his commentary he assumed that Josh 24 was the Dtr's template for composing Josh 23. The Dtr would then have included his source "appendices" behind the farewell speech he wrote [xiii]. In the *Überlieferungsgeschichtlichen Studien*, however, he explains that this assumption is "in reality extremely weak." Josh 24 was unknown to the Dtr as a "traditionally independent" piece and was only inserted later "with strong editing in the style of the Dtr" into the connection between Josh and Judg [9n1]. In the second edition of his *Josua* commentary he returned to the idea that the "core of chapter 24 must have been available" to the Dtr, but he now says that the Dtr used this piece "as a model for the final chapter he wrote, 23," but "did not include its template in his work" [16]. Joshua 24 was "only added in appendices in a secondary Deuteronomistic stage" [139]).

[47] Soggin, *Joshua*, 217. See also Boling, *Joshua*, 526; Dozeman, *Joshua 13–24*, 320–21. There are a number of recent detractors from this position, who either saw ch. 24 as a completely later creation (e.g., Römer, "Doppelt Ende des Josuabuches") or as the earlier ending to the book of Joshua (e.g., Rösel, "Überleitungen," and *Joshua*, 355).

LORD said to him: 'you have grown old, advanced in days, *and very much land remains to possess*,'" the first part of which is a repetition in direct speech of what was just narrated in Josh 13:1a. The description at Josh 13:1bδ that "*very much land remains to possess*" is at odds with the proximately preceding (to Josh 13:1, only the deuteronomistic summary intervening) notice at Josh 11:23 that יִּקַּח יְהוֹשֻׁעַ אֶת־כָּל־הָאָרֶץ כְּכֹל Joshua אֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר יְהוָה אֶל־מֹשֶׁה וַיִּתְּנָהּ יְהוֹשֻׁעַ לְנַחֲלָה לְיִשְׂרָאֵל כְּמַחְלְקֹתָם לְשִׁבְטֵיהֶם וְהָאָרֶץ שָׁקְטָה מִמִּלְחָמָה *took the whole land* in accordance with all that the LORD had spoken to Moses. Joshua distributed it as a possession for Israel in accordance with their tribal allotments, and the land was at peace from war." The resumptive repetition of Josh 13:1a in Josh 23:1b[48] juxtaposes these two narrative portions temporally; they are—story-wise—either simultaneous or directly sequential in time. This juxtaposition is strengthened by the notice at Josh 23:1a, אֲשֶׁר־הֵנִיחַ יְהוָה לְיִשְׂרָאֵל "when the LORD had given rest to Israel" that is very similar to the complete conquest, allotment of the land, and peace described at Josh 11:23.[49] However, the notion in Josh 11:23 that the whole land was taken and at rest, reinforced by the notice at Josh 23:1 that Israel was at rest (cf. also, Josh 21:43–45), remains at odds with the description at Josh 13:1 that there was still very much land remaining to possess. There is very little indication of how much narrative time passed between Josh 11:23 and 13:1, and there is no clear narration of how the situation could have changed so much, but the speech in ch. 23 will pick up on the persistence of the nations still in the land beginning in v. 4.

---

[48] Josh 23:1 "incorporates the chapter editorially into the larger narrative via resumptive repetition of Josh 13:1" (Butler, *Joshua 13–24*, 275).

[49] Frevel views Josh 11:23 as one of "the various endings of the book of Joshua" ("Untying Tangles," 281).

The quotation formula of Josh 23:2, וַיֹּאמֶר אֲלֵהֶם "he said to them," is of the type

that does not specifically identify the speaker, other than through the third-person

masculine singular form of the verb, and refers to the addressees by preposition and third-

person masculine plural pronominal suffix. This would be unusual if this was the

initiation of a *dialogue*, or if the speaker and addressees were not well defined by the

context.[50] Neither of those conditions strongly apply here as Joshua was clearly the one

who summoned all Israel earlier in the verse, he is giving a speech that countenances no

immediate verbal response, and even though "all Israel" is strictly speaking a singular

proper noun, it is a collective sometimes referred to in the plural (e.g., Josh 23:1, לְיִשְׂרָאֵל

מִכָּל־אֹיְבֵיהֶם "to Israel from all *their* enemies"). Nonetheless, there remains a bit of

ambiguity concerning the exact addressees due to the epexegetical לִזְקֵנָיו וּלְרָאשָׁיו וּלְשֹׁפְטָיו

וּלְשֹׁטְרָיו "to its elders, and to its chiefs, and to its judges, and to its officers" (Josh 23:2)—

all masculine plurals.

It is beneficial at this point to begin to tentatively identify thematic characters. In

the circumstantial notice that opens v. 1 and provides the setting for the following speech,

the LORD (by name) is the subject and Israel (by name) the object of the first *qatal* verb,

and the surrounding enemies are the object of a prepositional phrase. In the attendant

circumstance in the second half of v. 1, Joshua is the subject (named once) of the two

remaining *qatal* verbs. In v. 2, where the main storyline asserts itself, Joshua is the

subject of the two *wayyiqtol* verbs (named once), and all Israel (along with the various

leaders) is the explicit direct object of the first verb and the indirect object of the second

by preposition plus pronominal suffix. The direct object of the second *wayyiqtol* verb is

---

[50] Longacre, *Joseph* (2003), 160.

the entirety of the following speech. So, to this point Joshua makes a bid for primary

thematic character, with the LORD and Israel as secondary thematic characters, and the

surrounding enemies as less important participants. We shall see that this scheme does

not hold up throughout the speech of Josh 23:2b–16.

3.2.1.2 The Speech

A number of distinct kinds of direct speech are reported in Josh 23:2b–16, each with their

own predominant clause types and verbal constellations carrying the main line of the

speech. For the main events of the past that are recounted in direct speech, the *qatal* form

is mostly used,[51] unless it is being told as a story by the speaking character acting as a

narrator (see e.g., Josh 24) where *wayyiqtol* is used. For activities deemed to be future

from the speaker's perspective, *yiqtol* and *weqatal* sequences predominate.[52] Expository

speech uses participle and verbless clauses,[53] and hortatory speech predominantly uses

imperative, jussive, or cohortative forms to signify the main line of the reported speech.[54]

The main thing to recognize concerning direct speech as a whole in this instance—

embedded as it is in a sequential narrative—is that it remains close to the main storyline

and so carries the force of the storyline in considerable measure, even though it has its

own means of foregrounding and backgrounding within the direct speech unit (i.e., the

monologue in this case) through different verbal constellations.[55] This is a result of the

---

[51] Heller, *Narrative Structure*, 458–59.
[52] Heller, *Narrative Structure*, 462.
[53] Heller, *Narrative Structure*, 465.
[54] Heller, *Narrative Structure*, 468. Heller also noted that "in Hortatory Discourse the foundational forms lend their volitional force to their accompanying *(We)YIQTOL* and *WeQATAL* clauses. In all cases, the accompanying forms also take on hortatory force very similar, if not identical, to their imperative, cohortative, and jussive counterparts" (469).
[55] Longacre, *Joseph* (2003), 82.

fact that the direct speech unit is, in a grammatical sense, the direct object of the *wayyiqtol* quotation formula.

A *discourse type* framework for the speech in Josh 23 may be outlined as follows. Generally speaking: Josh 23:2bβ–4 is historical, dealing with the past (main line of reported speech carried by *qatal*); Josh 23:5–8 is predictive, dealing with the future (*yiqtol* plus *weqatal* sequence), and might be considered verging on hortatory;[56] Josh 23:9 recaps from the past in a short narrative (*wayyiqtol*); Josh 23:10–11 is a new sequence of predictive speech (*yiqtol* plus *weqatal*) that brings the speech to a peak; Josh 23:12–13 is mainly conditional—and emphatically—predictive (infinitive absolute plus *yiqtol* and *weqatal* sequences) with a decidedly hortatory spirit, which serves to sustain the peak; and Josh 23:14–16 is mainly expository (participle, stative [*we*]*qatal*), turning predictive (*wəhāyâ*, *yiqtol*, *weqatal*), and serving as something of a denouement.

The speech opens at Josh 23:2bβ with אֲנִי זָקַנְתִּי בָּאתִי בַּיָּמִים "I have grown old, advanced in days," which is a replication of what the narrator had just said in Josh 23:1, what the narrator had said about him at Josh 13:1, and what the LORD had said to him in direct reported speech also at Josh 13:1. This admission on the part of Joshua links those two narrative framework pieces together temporally even more strongly than the simple

---

[56] Nelson considered vv. 6–8 as an "exhortation to exclusive loyalty in regard to alien gods," and vv. 11–13 as an "exhortation to love Yahweh and conditional threat in regard to alien nations" (*Joshua*, 256). Of course there are many other possible ways of organizing this chapter/speech. Jochen Nentel organized it thusly; "Jos 23 erweist sich damit in allen Elementen als Abschiedsrede: Versammlung der Zuhörer V. 2a; Konstatierung der Todesnähe V. 1b, 2b, 14a; geschichtlicher Rückblick V. 3, 4, 9, 14bβ–15a; Paränese V. 6–8, 11, 14bα; prophetischer Ausblick auf die Zukunft V. (4), 5, 10, 12–13, 15–16" (Bericht des Todes Jos 24:29–31) (*Trägerschaft und Intentionen*, 131). (Josh 23 proves to be a farewell speech in all its elements: assembly of the listeners, v. 2a; determination of proximity to death, vv. 1b, 2b, 14a; historical review, vv. 3, 4, 9, 14bβ–15a; paraenesis, vv. 6–8, 11, 14bα; prophetic outlook on the future vv. [4], 5, 10, 12–13, 15–16; and [report of death, Josh 24:29–31].) Römer uses the first five elements of this scheme, upon which he hangs his *Grundtext*—"(a) v. 2a; (b) v. 1, 2b, 14a; (c) v. 3, 9; (d) 11; (e) 14b–16a." ("Doppelte Ende des Josuabuches," 533n46).

resumptive repetition just mentioned above in the discussion of the narrative setting to ch. 23. Joshua also continues as the subject by means of an independent pronoun, this time of the two *qatal* verbs, now signifying the main event line of a past occurrence with continuing effect at the time of the speech.

The main line of the speech continues at v. 3—recounting the past—with a pronoun plus *qatal* verb[57] and a change in subject, וְאַתֶּם רְאִיתֶם "and you yourselves (plural, i.e., the collective "all Israel" from v. 2) have seen." The object of the seeing is the extended description of past events in the relative clause, אֵת כָּל־אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם לְכָל־הַגּוֹיִם הָאֵלֶּה "all that the LORD your God has done to all these nations," governed by a *qatal* verb, whose subject "the LORD your God" vies for prominence. The x-plus-verb sequence here seems to function as a contextualizing element on "simultaneous or previous action."[58] At least some of the addressees were actually there to see the events in the past. It is this very same subject, "the LORD your God," who becomes the subject of the participial purpose clause that closes out this verse, כִּי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם הוּא הַנִּלְחָם לָכֶם "because (it is) the LORD your God who was fighting for you."

Josh 23:4 opens with the *imperative* רְאוּ "consider,"[59] the same verb (ראה "see") and (implied) subject (all Israel) combination that opened the previous verse where the subject was made explicit by a pronoun. The historical nature of the speech continues, nonetheless, with Joshua turning himself into the subject of the main line of the speech where he states, הִפַּלְתִּי לָכֶם אֶת־הַגּוֹיִם הַנִּשְׁאָרִים הָאֵלֶּה בְּנַחֲלָה לְשִׁבְטֵיכֶם "I have allotted to you

---

[57] This sequence of (pro)noun plus *qatal* highlights the referent of the pronoun somewhat and "presents an action as a participant-oriented action. The noun is highlighted and the verb is demoted" (Longacre, "*Weqatal* Forms in Biblical Hebrew Prose," 67). Van der Merwe considered the *we-x-qatal* form to have use as a focal marking of the constituent, i.e., "you *yourself*" ("Discourse Linguistics and Biblical Hebrew Grammar," 33–34).

[58] Van der Merwe, "Discourse Linguistics and Biblical Hebrew Grammar," 33.

[59] Clines, *Concise Dictionary of Classical Hebrew*, 408.

(plural) these remaining nations as an inheritance to your (plural) tribes." It is not clear

what is meant by making these remaining nations an inheritance, rather than just their

land.[60] The second half of the verse continues with an attendant circumstance, whose

interpretation is somewhat obscured by what appears to be a textual issue. The exact

nature of the textual issue is not obvious, but as the MT reads, וְכָל־הַגּוֹיִם אֲשֶׁר הִכְרַתִּי

"and/now all the nations that I had cut down" presents as a parenthesis within מִן־הַיַּרְדֵּן

"from the Jordan" . . . וְהַיָּם הַגָּדוֹל מְבוֹא הַשָּׁמֶשׁ "(to) the Great Sea at the setting of the sun."[61]

It appears as if there could be a displacement here of וְכָל־הַגּוֹיִם אֲשֶׁר הִכְרַתִּי from its former

place in front of מִן־הַיַּרְדֵּן.[62] Within the first four verses of this chapter the three main

characters—Joshua, the LORD your God, and all Israel—all bid for prominence in their

own ways.

The minor participant of v. 1—the surrounding *enemies*—has increased somewhat

in importance by v. 4, becoming "(all) these/those/the (remaining) *nations*." The shift

from *enemies* (a military term pertinent to the conquest) to *nations* has "a strong

religious-ideological flavour. It denotes the foreign elements that endanger the religion of

Israel, hence its very existence, in subsequent periods. This conception is characteristic of

the book of Deuteronomy."[63] Thus, the Deuteronomistic outlook of this speech is

---

[60] Römer noted that this is the only place where the word נחל has persons as its object ("Doppelte Ende des Josuabuches," 531). Perhaps more clarity comes from the notice in v. 5 that they shall posses their land.

[61] Many commentators have recognized the problems presented by Josh 23:4b (see e.g., Boling, *Joshua*, 523; Butler, *Joshua 13–24*, 266–67; Dozeman, *Joshua 13–24*, 318–19; Nelson, *Joshua*, 254; Noth, *Josua* (1938), 104; Noth, *Josua* (1953), 134; Rösel, *Joshua*, 356–57; Soggin, *Joshua*, 217). *BHK*, 360 and *BHS*, 394 notes on this verse indicate that the parenthetical notice וְכָל־הַגּוֹיִם אֲשֶׁר הִכְרַתִּי was probably added, and that מִן־הַיַּרְדֵּן demands the complement עַד "to" to come before הַיָּם "the sea."

[62] So *BHK*, "Librum Josuae," 360nCp23,4[a-a] (Noth, ed.).

[63] Rösel, *Joshua*, 356. Cf., e.g., Deut 18:9 כִּי אַתָּה בָּא אֶל־הָאָרֶץ אֲשֶׁר־יְהֹוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ נֹתֵן לָךְ לֹא־תִלְמַד לַעֲשׂוֹת כְּתוֹעֲבֹת הַגּוֹיִם הָהֵם "When you come into the land that the LORD your God is giving you, you must not learn to imitate the abhorrent practices of those nations" (NRSV).

becoming more evident. Additionally, the nations take on various other characteristics as described by Thomas Dozeman.

> The profile of the nations in Josh 23 is abstract: The term does not specify any particular group or specific place; it does not even include a reference to the stereotyped list of the indigenous nations that appear elsewhere in Joshua—the Hittites, Amorites, Canaanites, Perizzites, Hivites, and Jebusites (e.g., 3:10, 9:1, 11:3, 12:8, 24:11). The nations are described as "enemies," which has also characterized many of the conquered peoples in the land (e.g., 7:8, 12; 10:19; 22:8). Although the nations lack specific identity, they are strong (23:9). In spite of this, Yahweh (23:3) and Joshua (23:4) were able partially to defeat them, leaving survivors (23:12) in the land (23:4). The resulting danger is the temptation for Israel to mix with the nations (23:7) and even to intermarry with them (23:12). Such action would prevent Yahweh from completing the expulsion of the nations (23:13), underscoring the conditional nature of the divine gift of the land.[64]

The mention of *remaining nations* is ominous. It begins to anticipate the possibility of future setbacks and is an essential element of the warnings to come.

Josh 23:5 takes on a future orientation through the use of a different verbal constellation to carry the main line of predictive direct speech—*yiqtol* and sequential *weqatal*.[65] The subject of the first verb is put up front in a pivotal manner, וַיהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם הוּא יֶהְדֳּפֵם "now (concerning) the LORD your God, it is (the LORD your God) who will push them back." The LORD your God continues as the subject of the first *weqatal* verb of the following verb sequence, וְהוֹרִישׁ אֹתָם "(the LORD your God) will drive them out," with all Israel the implied subject of the second, וִירִשְׁתֶּם אֶת־אַרְצָם "you (plural) will take possession of their land." This series of anticipated actions, signified by *yiqtol* and sequential *weqatal* is concluded by a retrospective *qatal* comparison clause,[66] כַּאֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם לָכֶם "just as the LORD your God has spoken to you." So, the subject of two

---

[64] Dozeman, *Joshua 13–24*, 324.
[65] Heller, *Narrative Structure*, 462.
[66] Niccacci, *Syntax of the Verb*, 74; Williams, *Hebrew Syntax*, 46.

out of the three main speech line clauses and one subsidiary clause in this verse is the LORD your God.

Verse 6 maintains a non-sequential use of the *qatal* verb form—a stative, thus primarily denoting the present (albeit that the state may have come into being in the past and has a durative effect that continues to the present)[67]—with a simple coordinating conjunction וְ "and," plus two infinitives and a participial description of the object of the infinitives, וַחֲזַקְתֶּם מְאֹד לִשְׁמֹר וְלַעֲשׂוֹת אֵת כָּל־הַכָּתוּב בְּסֵפֶר תּוֹרַת מֹשֶׁה "and you are firmly resolved[68] to keep and to do all that is written in the book of the instruction of Moses." This combination of that specific verb and the infinitives sustains the future cast of this off-the-main-line section of the speech. The last half of v. 6 continues with a negation plus a third infinitive, לְבִלְתִּי סוּר־מִמֶּנּוּ יָמִין וּשְׂמֹאול "without turning from it (to the) right or (to the) left." The series of infinitives continues in Josh 23:7, negated like the one before it לְבִלְתִּי־בוֹא בַּגּוֹיִם הָאֵלֶּה הַנִּשְׁאָרִים הָאֵלֶּה אִתְּכֶם "without associating with these nations that are remaining among you."[69] All Israel is the plural subject of the initial *qatal* stative verb in v. 6 and continues as subject of the actions through to the end of v. 8.

At the midpoint of v. 7 there is a prepositional phrase, וּבְשֵׁם אֱלֹהֵיהֶם "and by the name of their gods," which introduces a series of four *yiqtol* verb clauses, each negated with לֹא "not." This makes it explicitly predictive and future oriented; it also suggests a

---

[67] Eskhult, *Studies in Verbal Aspect*, 42; Joüon, *Grammaire de l'Hébreu Biblique*, 294 (see also Joüon and Muraoka, *Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*, 331).

[68] Clines, *Concise Dictionary of Classical Hebrew*, 112; Koehler and Baumgartner, *Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros*, 1:286.

[69] I have smoothed out the translation here by making a relative clause. There is perhaps a textual issue with הָאֵלֶּה אִתְּכֶם where this extra is lacking in v. 4 but found also in v. 12. Boling, through a comparison with LXX and Syriac, believed MT to contain a conflation of variants ("Conflate Readings," 296–97).

prohibitive[70] understanding (so in a sense hortatory)[71] like that found in the Ten Commandments. The prepositional phrase seems to govern the following negated *yiqtol* clauses, but each in a slightly different way to signify the same object for each of the following verbs. In the first one, לֹא־תַזְכִּירוּ "you shall not call to mind (the name of their gods)," the preposition בְ acts more like the direct object marker אֶת.[72] The second clause, וְלֹא תַשְׁבִּיעוּ "neither shall you swear (*by* [the name of (?)] their gods)," uses בְ in a more usual instrumental sense.[73] The third clause more specifically restricts the object to אֱלֹהֵיהֶם "their gods" by the use of the object suffix on the verb, וְלֹא תַעַבְדוּם "and you shall not serve them," and the fourth restricts the object to אֱלֹהֵיהֶם "their gods" by the use of an independent pronoun with preposition, וְלֹא תִשְׁתַּחֲווּ לָהֶם "and you shall not bow down to them." Deuteronomy 5:9 uses the exact same phraseology as these last two clauses, aside from having the subject—all Israel—in the singular rather than plural.

The future-leaning outlook, and off-the-main-line standpoint, of this section concludes by moving from prohibitions to a *yiqtol* admonition on the main speech line, כִּי אִם־בַּיהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם תִּדְבָּקוּ "but rather you shall cleave to the LORD your God," in Josh 23:8. There is a comparison clause in the second half of the verse that reflects on the past up to the point of the speech: כַּאֲשֶׁר עֲשִׂיתֶם עַד הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה "just as you have done until this day." All Israel is again the subject of the *yiqtol* (main line of the speech) and *qatal* (subsidiary) verbs used in this verse.

---

[70] "The imperfect with לֹא represents a more emphatic form of prohibition." (*GKC*, 317).

[71] Heller indicated negated *yiqtol* as a primary clause type for hortatory discourse (*Narrative Structure*, 475).

[72] "Occasionally also with verbs of *speaking*, *thinking*, *mentioning*, *knowing*, to denote the object of the action" (BDB, 90); Waltke and O'Connor, *IBHS*, 198–99.

[73] BDB, 89–90; Waltke and O'Connor, *IBHS*, 197. It is unclear if שֵׁם should be considered as part of the object of בְ in this specific instance.

In v. 9 the decisive element of past history is emphatically presented, and begins to bring the speech to a peak,[74] with an unusual foregrounding *wayyiqtol*,[75] וַיּוֹרֶשׁ יְהֹוָה "the LORD drove out . . ." גּוֹיִם גְּדֹלִים וַעֲצוּמִים "great and mighty nations," creating some tense/aspect *turbulence*. Note that *the LORD* becomes the subject at this momentous point and this is the first time that the name is shortened from *the LORD your God*. The objects—nations—are characterized as great and mighty, yet *the LORD* drove them out!

The next clause begins at Josh 23:9b by bringing the object (all Israel) into view using an independent pronoun before a negated *qatal* verb,[76] even though the following preposition has a pronominal suffix indicating this same object once again—וְאַתֶּם לֹא־עָמַד אִישׁ בִּפְנֵיכֶם עַד הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה "now (as for) *you*, no one could stand in *your* presence up until this day." The new subject—no one—is particularized by the use of אִישׁ, but still represents all of those great and mighty nations driven out by the LORD. In v. 10 the previous object turns into the subject—all Israel continues to be implied—and it also is particularized by the use of אִישׁ, where אִישׁ־אֶחָד מִכֶּם יִרְדָּף־אָלֶף "*each* one of you (plural) will chase out a thousand." This *yiqtol* main line clause is future looking, followed with the participial purpose clause that is identical to the one in Josh 23:3, כִּי יְהֹוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם הוּא הַנִּלְחָם לָכֶם "because it is the LORD your God who is fighting for you," and a retrospective

---

[74] It was assumed at the beginning by Longacre that there would an expectation that there should be differences in the style and syntax of the peak, and especially that it would be somehow different than the remainder. See Longacre, "Flood Narrative" (1976), 237. He also wrote of the peak that it "essentially is a zone of turbulence in regard to the flow of the discourse in its preceding and following parts. . . . Thus the characteristic storyline tense/aspect may be substituted for by another tense/aspect" (*Grammar of Discourse* [1996], 38).

[75] Buth, "Functional Grammar," 85–88. Elizabeth Robar understood a number of *wayyiqtol* occurrences in direct speech as resultative perfects ("*Wayyiqtol* as an Unlikely Preterite," 26–28).

[76] "It is well to remind ourselves here that an on-the-line preterite cannot be negated, but must give way to an off-the-line perfect" (Longacre, *Joseph* [2003], 68).

qatal comparison clause, כַּאֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר לָכֶם "just as (the LORD your God) has spoken to you" similar to the one found at Josh 23:5.

The main clause that begins Josh 23:11 continues the future orientation with parenesis, which extends from the beginning of v. 11 to the end of v. 13,[77] with the sequential *weqatal* (i.e., main predictive speech line) plus infinitive וְנִשְׁמַרְתֶּם מְאֹד לְנַפְשֹׁתֵיכֶם לְאַהֲבָה אֶת־יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם "be firmly on guard for your lives to love the LORD your God."[78] Verse 12 introduces the purpose with כִּי ׀ "because," which is followed by a lengthy conditional.[79] The protasis constitutes the remainder of the verse, אִם־שׁוֹב תָּשׁוּבוּ וּדְבַקְתֶּם בְּיֶתֶר הַגּוֹיִם הָאֵלֶּה הַנִּשְׁאָרִים הָאֵלֶּה אִתְּכֶם וְהִתְחַתַּנְתֶּם בָּהֶם וּבָאתֶם בָּהֶם וְהֵם בָּכֶם "if you indeed turn, cleave to the remnant of these nations that are remaining among you, intermarry with them, associate with them, and they with you." These clauses are governed by the infinitive reinforced *yiqtol* (turn)—so imperfective, future looking, in a not-*necessarily* strictly predictive sense—with the following three sequential *weqatal* verbs (cleave, intermarry, associate) sustaining the imperfective viewpoint.

There are a number of verbal links in these two verses back to earlier portions of the speech. The first linkage is back to v. 6 with the verb שׁמר (*qal*: keep; *niphal*: be on guard) where it was used *with emphasis* (i.e., "you are firmly resolved") concerning all Israel's assured future relationship of obedience to the written instruction of Moses. Here in v. 11 it is used in a reflexive manner, again *with emphasis* ("be firmly on guard"), concerning their future relationship with the LORD their God—they are to love the

---

[77] Römer, "Doppelte Ende des Josuabuches," 532.

[78] It should be recognized that the form of the opening to this verse is similar to the opening of v. 6 with (*we*)*qatal*/*weqatal* and מְאֹד. The difference in interpretation presented here is due to the stative nature of the verb in v. 6. Both instances have a hortatory flavour, and are thus intrinsically somewhat future-looking, but they are to be distinguished as off the main line in v. 6 and on the main line here in v. 11.

[79] The כִּי and אִם are separated by *paseq* in this case in order to clearly distinguish that they are not to be taken together. (Cf. v. 8 where כִּי אִם has its common adversative force in the context of a negative.)

LORD their God. Taken with the possibility indicated by the conditional of Josh 23:12–

13, this becomes a prescription for future action. The second connection is from v. 12 to

v. 8 with דבק (cleave). In v. 8 all Israel was cautioned to cleave to the LORD their God

into the future just as they had in the past, whereas in v. 12 they are warned as a

proscription not to cleave to the remnant of those nations that were remaining among

them. Elements of this notice of "these nations that are remaining among you" have been

a constant refrain in the background of the speech up to this point: "all these nations"

(Josh 23:3); "these remaining nations" and "all the nations" (Josh 23:4); three times as

the referent of pronominal suffixes (Josh 23:5); word for word in its entirety, "these

nations that are remaining among you," as well as once directly by pronominal suffix and

twice obliquely by reference to "their gods" (Josh 23:7); "great and mighty nations" (Josh

23:9); and a couple more oblique references, "no one" and "a thousand" (Josh 23:9–10).

Finally, in v. 7 all Israel is expected not to בוא "associate" with the nations, just as in v.

12. The Deuteronomistic phraseology of this speech continues to set the reader up for the

eventual fulfilment of prophetic utterances in later parts of the history.[80]

Joshua 23:13 constitutes the apodosis of the conditional statement. It begins with

an emphasizing infinitive paired with a volitional use of a *yiqtol*[81] and a relative particle,

יָדֹועַ תֵּדְעוּ כִּי "know for sure *that*." The melancholy tone set by the mere possibility of

accommodation with these nations becomes an explicit threat. All of the elements of

Moshe Weinfeld's deuteronomic phraseology concerning the inheritance and possession

of the land, and the dispossession of the nations from it, are at least partially represented

---

[80] E.g., 2 Kgs 17.

[81] "A *non-perfective of injunction* expresses the speaker's will in a positive request or command" (Waltke and O'Connor, *IBHS*, 509).

in this speech.[82] The implications of disloyalty to the LORD their God[83] come to a head

here with the projection of the distinct possibility that לֹא יוסיף יהוה אלהיכם להוריש את־הגוים

האלה מלפניכם והיו לכם לפח ולמוקש ולשטט בצדיכם ולצננים בעיניכם "the LORD your God will no

longer drive out (ירש) these nations from your presence, but they will be a trap and a

snare to you, and a whip in your sides, and pricks in your eyes."[84] This statement finds

something like performative fulfilment in the messenger's speech at Judg 2:3, לֹא־אגרש

אותם מפניכם והיו לכם לצדים ואלהיהם יהיו לכם למוקש "I will not drive them out (גרש) from your

presence, but they will be at your sides and their gods will be a snare to you." In Judg 2:3

the first person singular subject "I" implied by the verb גרש "drive out"[85] is מַלְאַךְ־יְהוָה "the

messenger of the LORD" (cf. Judg 2:1), so יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם "the LORD your God" of Josh

23:13 can be considered a closely aligned referent.[86] Likewise, יוֹשְׁבֵי הָאָרֶץ הַזֹּאת "the

inhabitants of this land" of Judg 2:2 are the implied object of לֹא־אֲגָרֵשׁ אוֹתָם "I will not

drive *them* out" of Judg 2:3, and which are closely aligned with הַגּוֹיִם הָאֵלֶּה "these nations"

of Josh 23:13. (For the importance of plot and characterization here, see the final

paragraph of the analysis of Judg 2:1–5 in the following chapter.) The exhortative

character of this portion of the speech elevates in intensity; the interests at stake could not

be more important. Nelson described them thus:

> The theological importance of the land to Israel's sense of identity can hardly be
> overestimated. Canaan is Yahweh's land (22:19, 32) and it is a good land (5:6, 12;
> 23:13, 15, 16). Yahweh's gift of the land is the core plot action of Joshua,

---

[82] Weinfeld wrote of ten distinct phrases containing the various elements of inheritance, possession, dispossessing these larger and mightier nations, giving of rest, and the good land (*Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*, 341–43).

[83] Disloyalty is exemplified by failing to love the LORD or cleave to the LORD, failing to keep and do all that is written in this Torah, turning away (right or left), and cleaving to the nations (Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*, 333–41).

[84] Use of the same words or referent in both Josh 23:13 and Judg 2:3 is indicated with underlining.

[85] Weinfeld stated that this verb, "which is very common in JE in the context of conquest, never occurs in D" (*Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*, 343).

[86] See the analysis of Judg 2:3 in the following chapter.

constituting an arc of promise and fulfillment that begins in 1:2–6. This promise had originally been made to Israel's ancestors (1:6; 5:6; 21:43–44), and its realization is referred to persistently (2:9, 24; 3:10; 5:12; 10:40–42; 11:16–17, 23; 12:7–8; 14:15b; 21:43–45; 23:4–5; 24:13, 28). Because it was none other than Yahweh the Divine Warrior who granted the land, Israel had an inalienable right to it, unless Yahweh himself should choose otherwise (23:13, 15–16; 24:20). For exilic and post-exilic readers, the land represented both fulfilled promise and defaulted legacy, simultaneously a sign of Yahweh's fidelity and Israel's infidelity. The land was the center of ethnic identity and the object of both regret and hope.[87]

However, great as these stakes are, more is at stake—life itself.

Joshua 23:13 ends with a dire warning of the most menacing result possible, עַד־

אֲבָדְכֶם מֵעַל הָאֲדָמָה הַטּוֹבָה הַזֹּאת אֲשֶׁר נָתַן לָכֶם יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם "until you perish from upon this good

ground that the LORD your God has given to you." The peak that was initiated with the

narrative statement in v. 9 that "the LORD drove out from your presence great and

mighty nations," has been sustained in considerable measure through to the end of v. 13.

It is worth noting that the description of punishments for apostasy in Josh 23:13 that

closes off the peak of this speech, contains a number of verbal parallels to what

constitutes the peak of the divine messenger speech at Judg 2:2b–3 as just explained

above.[88]

Joshua 23:14–16 brings this speech to a close with a restatement of much that has

already been spoken. It resolves the situation prevailing at the time of the speech using

different words and motifs. It is easy to see how Römer would be drawn to, and could

find his *Grundtext* for Josh 23 in, vv. 1–3, 9, 11, and especially 14–16a[89]—these are the

---

[87] Nelson, *Joshua*, 15–16.

[88] Longacre lightly touched on the distinctiveness of the peak in an expository or hortative speech in *Grammar of Discourse* (1996), 48–50. The example he used is a *lengthy and complex conditional sentence*. He states "that we have a surface Peak marked not simply with a sentence slightly longer than any previous sentence . . . but with a sentence whose structural complexity is unparalleled by any previous sentence" (50). The long conditional sentence of Josh 23:12–13 is the most complex of the entire speech.

[89] Römer, "Doppelte Ende des Josuabuches," 533n46.

portions of the chapter that contain much of the main story/speech line, even though there are otherwise important elements of the speech's main line in vv. 5 and 8. Having large portions of the complete peak of vv. 9 through 13 as unoriginal additions, however, diminishes the practicality of such a *Grundtext* to describe how the received text might actually function now. What such a text does, nevertheless, is point out that in spite of the change in the kind of language and motifs used in the ending to the speech, there is really not much new information added in vv. 14–16. The main change in prognosis comes at the start of v. 16 where the previously mentioned *possibility* of apostasy in v. 12 becomes a decided and *inevitable* prediction. It finds a form of fulfilment in Judg 2:11–15.

This closing is set in the present of the time of the speech, *re*flecting on the past again in an expository manner until v. 15 where it starts to make a shift to *re*-predicting the future. Joshua *re*sets (i.e., *re*-temporalizes) this summary at the beginning of v. 14 with וְהִנֵּה אָנֹכִי הוֹלֵךְ הַיּוֹם בְּדֶרֶךְ כָּל־הָאָרֶץ "so now at this time I am going the way of all the earth." The participle marks this activity as set in the present of the speech and on the main expository line,[90] and הִנֵּה (particle of immediacy)[91] reinforces this notion of present occurrence or activity with a sense of urgency.

The orientation to the present time of the speech continues with וִידַעְתֶּם בְּכָל־לְבַבְכֶם וּבְכָל־נַפְשְׁכֶם "you know, in all your hearts and in all your souls," a stative *(we)qatal* clause[92] with prepositional phrase. The following relative clause with negated[93] *qatal*

---

[90] Heller, *Narrative Structure*, 468.

[91] Lambdin, *Introduction to Biblical Hebrew*, 168. "The clearest and most basic use of הִנֵּה is as a predicator of existence. It differs from יֵשׁ in that it emphasizes the immediacy, the here-and-nowness, of the situation."

[92] Longacre stated that "clauses with stative/denominative perfects rank" above participials in expository discourse (*Joseph* [2003], 111).

[93] Longacre indicated that negation is an excellent means to carry the main line of expository discourse (*Joseph* [2003], 111–12).

begins the retrospective outlook with כִּי לֹא־נָפַל דָּבָר אֶחָד "that not a single thing has failed."

This sentiment is repeated at the end of v. 14 almost verbatim, לֹא־נָפַל מִמֶּנּוּ דָּבָר אֶחָד "not a

single thing *of it* has failed." In between these nearly identical statements is a

parenthetical interjection that appears off the main expository line of the speech[94]—מִכֹּל

הַדְּבָרִים הַטּוֹבִים אֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם עֲלֵיכֶם הַכֹּל בָּאוּ לָכֶם "of all the good things that the LORD

your God had spoken concerning you, all have happened to you." The macro-syntactic

marker,[95] וְהָיָה "however, it will come to pass (that),"[96] which begins v. 15, starts to

anticipate the future orientation and predictive outlook of the second half of the verse.

The verse continues with a comparison from the past (*qatal*), extended with a relative

clause כַּאֲשֶׁר־בָּא עֲלֵיכֶם כָּל־הַדָּבָר הַטּוֹב אֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם אֲלֵיכֶם "just as has happened to you

all the good things that the LORD your God had spoken concerning you." The

comparison is to a future (*yiqtol*) with a described result, כֵּן יָבִיא יְהוָה עֲלֵיכֶם אֵת כָּל־הַדָּבָר הָרָע

עַד־הַשְׁמִידוֹ אוֹתְכֶם מֵעַל הָאֲדָמָה הַטּוֹבָה הַזֹּאת אֲשֶׁר נָתַן לָכֶם יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם "so also the LORD[97] will

make happen to you all the bad things until (the LORD) destroys you from upon this

good ground that the LORD your God has given to you."

    Joshua 23:16 is sometimes translated as a conditional sentence,[98] and the grammar

of the preposition בְּ with infinitive construct as the protasis (if . . .) and following *weqatal*

---

[94] Niccacci, "Analysis of Biblical Narrative," 177. His Table 1 indicates that in direct speech, the main line of communication regarding the past is carried by *qatal*. This accords with Heller, *Narrative Structure*, 462, where *qatal* indicates "basic past" and *wayyiqtol* indicates "continuative past."

[95] See Waltke and O'Connor, *IBHS*, 54 and n24.

[96] "Very frequently the announcement of a future event is attached by means of וְהָיָה" (*GKC*, 335). See also Joüon, *Grammaire de l'Hébreu Biblique*, 293; Joüon and Muraoka, *Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*, 330, where they stated that it very frequently indicates a future action.

[97] Note the shortened form, "the LORD," here (cf. v. 9), and once again in v. 16.

[98] So NRSV; Noth, *Josua* (1938), 104; Noth, *Josua* (1953), 134; Soggin, *Joshua*, 216; Nelson, *Joshua*, 254–55.

as the apodosis (then . . .) is initially appropriate to that reading.[99] However, there is an entire series of five *weqatal* verbs following, not all of which can cogently function as the apodosis. It is better to read the first clause, with Trent Butler, as a temporal clause.[100] This gives the reading of, בְּעָבְרְכֶם אֶת־בְּרִית יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם אֲשֶׁר צִוָּה אֶתְכֶם "when you transgress the covenant of the LORD your God that (the LORD your God) has commanded you," as a predicted, or even predetermined, outcome. Aside from the two retrospectives in *qatal* of the LORD their God having commanded them the covenant and giving them the good land (where all Israel is an object), all Israel ("you" plural) is the subject of the infinitive and all the sequential *weqatal* verbs. The futuristic tone is strong, even relentless in this series. The question, nonetheless, is: how are these sequences coordinated?

It seems best to view וַהֲלַכְתֶּם וַעֲבַדְתֶּם אֱלֹהִים אֲחֵרִים וְהִשְׁתַּחֲוִיתֶם לָהֶם "(when) you will go and serve other gods, ([and] when) you will bow down to them" as an epexegetical explanation of what constitutes the envisioned transgression. This then would make וְחָרָה אַף־יְהוָה בָּכֶם וַאֲבַדְתֶּם מְהֵרָה מֵעַל הָאָרֶץ הַטּוֹבָה אֲשֶׁר נָתַן לָכֶם "(then) the anger of the LORD will burn against you, (and) you will perish quickly from upon the good land that (the LORD [your God]) has given to you" the result of the transgression. This provides a solid rhetorical ending to Joshua's speech.

The textual issue of Josh 23:16b as lacking in the LXX has the potential to complicate this understanding by suggesting that the result may have originally been expressed in v. 15b, making v. 16a an attendant circumstance.[101] If this is the LXX

---

[99] *GKC*, 494. Later grammars generally do not consider this usage, giving instead options for temporal or causal clause introduction (Waltke and O'Connor, *IBHS*, 604; Van der Merwe, et al., *Biblical Hebrew Reference Grammar*, 175; Joüon and Muraoka, *Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*, 601).

[100] Butler, *Joshua 13–24*, 267n16a. So also NASB; Boling, *Joshua*, 520; Rösel, *Joshua*, 354; Dozeman, *Joshua 13–24*, 318. See also *GKC*, 347, for בְּ plus infinitive construct as a temporal clause.

[101] See e.g., the translations of NETS; Auld, *Joshua*, 79. Römer based the end of his *Grundtext* on this elision ("Doppelte Ende des Josuabuches," 532–33).

simply eliminating a redundancy,[102] then it seems to create a bigger problem than it hopes

to solve. The ending of v. 16 in the Greek, καὶ πορευθέντες λατρεύσητε θεοῖς ἑτέροις καὶ

προσκυνήσητε αὐτοῖς, is to some extent vague, as represented by the translation provided

by A. Graeme Auld: "and going you may offer service to other gods and prostrate

yourselves to them."[103] This rather literal translation almost sounds like a reward, and

would be of course, with this meaning, bordering on nonsensical as a finale to the speech.

The loss of v. 16b in the Old Greek could be due to haplography in the Hebrew.[104] Butler,

tended to believe that the MT provides the "original," but indicates a possibility "that the

original writer intended an unconditional threat (by ending with v. 15) . . . though it is not

impossible to understand v 16a as an interpretation of v 15b, which then, itself, was

interpreted through v 16b."[105] In any event, the MT as it stands is intelligible and seems

to carry the main predictive speech line through the *yiqtol* of v. 15 and the sequential

weqatal clauses of v. 16.

If the discourse framework and analysis provided above is valid, then the

following main lines—narrative story and reported speech—of the chapter have been

delineated in accordance with the following outline summary.

1. Joshua 23:1–2bα. Narrative Framework (Aperture,[106] including Quotation

   Formula). ". . . Joshua called out all Israel . . . He said to them:"

2. Joshua 23:2bβ–4. Historical Speech (Stage). "I have grown old, advanced in days,

   and you yourselves have seen all that the LORD your God has done to all these

---

[102] Rösel, *Joshua*, 358–59.

[103] Auld, *Joshua*, 79.

[104] So Nelson, *Joshua*, 255.

[105] Butler, *Joshua 13–24*, 267n16b.

[106] These labels for notional and surface structure features (in parentheses) legitimately only apply to narrative, but do correlate usefully to expository or hortatory speech by analogy. For a discussion on this correlation see Longacre, *Grammar of Discourse* (1996), 33–38.

nations . . . I have allotted to you these remaining nations . . . all the nations that I had cut down . . .”

3. Joshua 23:5–8. Predictive Speech (Incitement). “. . . the LORD your God . . . will push them back . . . will drive them out . . . you will take possession of their land . . . you shall cleave to the LORD your God . . .”

4. Joshua 23:9. Narrative Speech (Peak Initiation/Anticipation through Tense/Aspect Turbulence). “The LORD drove out . . . great and mighty nations . . .”

5. Joshua 23:10–13. Predictive/Hortatory Speech (Peak—Point of Confrontation).[107] “Each one of you will chase out a thousand . . . be firmly on guard for your lives . . . if you indeed turn, cleave to the remnant of these nations . . . intermarry with them, associate with them . . . know for sure that the LORD your God will no longer drive out these nations . . .”

6. Joshua 23:14–16. Expository/Predictive Speech (Denouement). “So now at this time I am going the way of all the earth. You know . . . that not a single thing has failed . . . not a single thing of it has failed . . . so also the LORD will make happen to you all the bad things . . . you will go and serve other gods, ([and] when) you will bow down to them, (then) the anger of the LORD will burn against you (and) you will perish quickly.”

---

[107] Whereas plot is the organizing principle of narrative by which it gains coherence, a climax or peak foregrounds a specific section of the narrative into prominence. Forms of discourse other than narrative, such as expository or hortatory speech in this case, will have different structures for maintaining coherence, and different methods of signalling the peak or persuasive culmination of the speech. The slowing down of forward movement through changes of style or verb tenses that increase the complexity of the discourse, rhetorical underlining, concentration of participants, heightened vividness, and change of pace are often signs of a discourse peak (Longacre, *Grammar of Discourse* [1996], 33; “Flood Narrative” [1979], 113).

This summary of the main line of the speech, set within the discourse framework of discourse types, reveals that there is a certain kind of *emplotment* to be found within this speech. So with this observation we can see that the speech does come to something of a peak at Josh 23:10–13—prepared for by the tense/aspect turbulence of the lone preterite *wayyiqtol* of the narrative speech in v. 9—by means of rhetorical underlining (i.e., the abundant repetitions of elements found in the speech), and the heightened vividness and change of pace brought to bear by the lengthy and complex conditional sentence.[108]

We can also see that the elements of Longacre's hortatory and persuasive speech (i.e., behavioural speech projecting toward the future)[109] are active in this speech. Joshua appeals to his own authority and credibility, and to the previous experience his audience has had with him (Josh 23:4). He indicates the problematic situation of his listeners by pointing out the potential, once he is gone, of the remaining nations to lure them into disobedience against the commands of the covenant of the LORD their God (Josh 23:12, 16). Joshua uses the imperative verb form only once, רְאוּ "consider" (Josh 23:4), but there is a strong sense of necessity built into the language of many of his warnings (Josh 23:6, 8, 11, 13). He poses the solutions to their problem as resistance to any contamination through association with these nations (Josh 23:7) and to בַּיהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם תִּדְבָּקוּ "cleave to the LORD (their) God" in obedience (Josh 23:8). Argumentation, motivation through threats and promises, and appeals to their positive experiences with the LORD up to that point, are found widely throughout the speech.[110]

---

[108] See Longacre, *Grammar of Discourse* (1996), 39–45 for the importance of these features in marking the peak in discourse in general.

[109] Longacre and Hwang, *Holistic Discourse Analysis*, 37; Longacre, *Grammar of Discourse* (1996), 34n2.

[110] On the overall rhetoric used by the speaker, Joshua's speech here contains, in some measure, all of the artistically persuasive elements of Aristotelian deliberative rhetoric. In Cicero's explanation of the important aspects of these elements as he adopted them, he singles out these as key: "ut probemus vera esse

One other notable feature of the analysis of this speech is the discovery of a previously overlooked character. It is striking that each time *the nations* (aside from the two mentions in v. 4, but twice even when simply referred to by pronoun) turn up on the main line of the speech, that the prepositional phrase *in/from your presence* is directly juxtaposed. It is found in v. 3, twice in v. 5, twice in v. 9, and in v. 13. The phrase is an indirect, yet distinct, reference to the character *all Israel present*, and *their presence* seems to serve as an interest-generating counterpoint to *the nations*.

With respect to characterization within the speech as a whole, Joshua pulls back from the position of primary thematic character that started to emerge at the beginning of the chapter; he only reemerges as the subject of the main line of the speech in vv. 4 (twice) and 14 (once). The LORD their God and all Israel become much more prominent throughout the bulk of the speech. The LORD is the subject of main speech line verbs nine times, and Israel is the subject of main speech line verbs twelve times. Therefore, we can posit that all Israel and the LORD their God are the primary thematic characters of this episode. Joshua becomes a secondary thematic character, while the nations remain an important but minor character. As mentioned above, *the presence* of the Israelites takes on a character-like role in correlation to these nations a number of times in the prepositional phrases "in" or "from your presence." There are also a number of other more minor characters or props, the most important being the good ground that the LORD their God had given to them, the anger of the LORD, and the gods of the nations.

---

ea quae defendimus, ut conciliemus eos nobis qui audiunt, ut animos eorum ad quemcumque causa postulabit motum vovemus" (proving that our contentions are true [i.e., *logos*], winning over our audience [i.e., *ethos*], and inducing their minds to feel any emotion the case may demand [i.e., *pathos*]) (*How to Win an Argument*, 17, 149 from *De or*. 2.114–117). Joshua, the character, has used the evidence of past events, his own reliability as their leader, and the fear-inducing threat of forthcoming dangers in an attempt to convince the Israelites to pursue a good path and positive outcome.

The means of foregrounding and backgrounding in Joshua's farewell speech are complex, based on the verbal constellations appropriate to the various discourse types used by the writer. Historical, predictive, narrative, hortatory, and expository reported direct speech are combined in a creative fashion that generates expectations of both the listening characters and the listening/reading audience. The emphasis on covenantal loyalty and the threats against breach of the covenant give this speech a decidedly deuteronomistic tenor.

3.2.2 Joshua 24:1–28—The Assembly at Shechem

It was mentioned above that Josh 24:29 opens the final episode of the book by the common means of a temporal clause. Thus, the episode that Josh 24:28 closes is much longer, at 28 verses, than the preceding or succeeding ones, having its start at Josh 24:1. It is marked as a new episode by the shift in geographical setting specifically to Shechem, but the time of the event is textlinguistically indeterminate (cf. the specific time of Joshua's old age and Israel's rest, and the indeterminate geographical setting of the preceding episode). It is not made explicit whether this assembly is the same one recounted in Josh 23—where Joshua is already advanced in years—or whether it occurred at some other time (e.g., at the time of Josh 8:30–35).[111]

---

[111] Soggin treats Josh 8:30–35 directly following 24:1–27 "because the theme of these two passages is exactly the same" (*Joshua*, 229). Boling suggested that Josh 8:30–35 may have been a liturgical "incipit" for the depiction of the Shechem covenant ceremony events of Josh 24 that was put into its place in the existing narrative between the battle of Ai and the Gibeonite deception in order to intentionally situate the events of Josh 24 early in the subjugation of Canaan rather than about the time of Joshua's farewell speech in Josh 23 (*Joshua*, 246). The MT has the gathering of foreign kings to do battle at Josh 9:1–2, after the Shechem valley ceremony, whereas the LXX has the Shechem valley ceremony at Josh 9:2a–f, after the gathering of the kings for battle. Tov suggested that Josh 8:30–35 sits only loosely in its context, particularly as it begins with the rather generic temporal marker אָז "then," and interrupts the sequence from the conclusion of the battle of Ai (Josh 8:29) to the gathering of the kings for a subsequent

Joshua 24:1–28 is a more complex episode than Joshua 23. It begins with the previously mentioned new geographical setting of Shechem and then immediately launches on the main storyline with וַיֶּאֱסֹף יְהוֹשֻׁעַ אֶת־כָּל־שִׁבְטֵי "Joshua gathered all the tribes . . ." וַיִּקְרָא לְזִקְנֵי "he called to the elders . . ." וַיִּתְיַצְּבוּ "they took their stand . . ." and then וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוֹשֻׁעַ אֶל־כָּל־הָעָם "Joshua said to all the people" (Josh 24:1–2). The type of quotation formula found in the final *wayyiqtol* clause here, where the speaker and the addressee are both named in full, "functions in *dialogue initiation* where it also reflects the basic need for participant identification and tracking."[112] Immediately following the quotation formula at the beginning of Josh 24:2 there is a second quotation formula, this time not articulated by the narrator, but by Joshua as the opening to his speech—כֹּה־אָמַר יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל "this is what the LORD the God of Israel has said." In accordance with the observation above that for the main events of the past recounted in a speech, the *qatal* form is most often used, this second quotation formula uses it. (The reader can assume that the contents of the speech were given to Joshua by God at some point before the actual delivery to the people.) Joshua then launches into a speech that runs from Josh 24:2aγ through to the end of v. 15. This speech is characterized by two distinct forms of address. The first portion for the most part, up until the end of v. 13, is in the form of a history lesson—that is, a *narrative speech*—that uses the same form of discourse that a narrator would use, including the use of *wayyiqtol* to carry the main storyline. There are three places, nonetheless, where direct address occurs in the form of *historical speech* (Josh 24:4bβ, 5b, 10a).

---

battle ("Sequence Differences," 411–13). In 4Q47, the ceremony seems to happen directly following the crossing of the Jordan River, near the beginning of Josh 5.

[112] Longacre, *Joseph* (2003), 159.

The scene is set using the perfective *qatal* verb form, בְּעֵבֶר הַנָּהָר יָשְׁבוּ אֲבוֹתֵיכֶם

מֵעוֹלָם"Your fathers had dwelt beyond the River long ago," and a description specifying

the fathers, תֶּרַח אֲבִי אַבְרָהָם וַאֲבִי נָחוֹר "Terah the father of Abraham and the father of Nahor"

(Josh 24:2). The embedded storyline then picks up with narrative preterites in *wayyiqtol*,

וַיַּעַבְדוּ אֱלֹהִים אֲחֵרִים "They served other gods" . . . וָאֶקַּח אֶת־אֲבִיכֶם אֶת־אַבְרָהָם "I (the LORD the

God of Israel) took your father Abraham" . . . וָאוֹלֵךְ אוֹתוֹ בְּכָל־אֶרֶץ "I led him into all the

land" . . . וָאַרְבֶּה אֶת־זַרְעוֹ "I multiplied his offspring," וָאֶתֶּן־לוֹ אֶת־יִצְחָק "I gave Isaac to him,"

וָאֶתֵּן לְעֵשָׂו אֶת־הַר שֵׂעִיר "I gave Jacob and Esau to Isaac," וָאֶתֵּן לְיִצְחָק אֶת־יַעֲקֹב וְאֶת־עֵשָׂו "I gave

the hill country of Seir to Esau" (Josh 24:2b–4bα). Verse 4 ends with an adversative

clause in *qatal*—off the embedded narrative storyline—וְיַעֲקֹב וּבָנָיו יָרְדוּ מִצְרָיִם "but Jacob

and his children had gone down to Egypt." While this clause is not on the main storyline,

it is not unimportant. Joshua has, in essence, momentarily turned from his storytelling

mode to a mode of direct address, which puts this clause on its own main line of

historical speech.

The storyline picks up again with וָאֶשְׁלַח אֶת־מֹשֶׁה וְאֶת־אַהֲרֹן "I sent Moses and

Aaron,"וָאֶגֹּף אֶת־מִצְרַיִם "I struck Egypt" (Josh 24:5), but is again interrupted by another

adversative clause on its own main line of *historical speech*, וְאַחַר הוֹצֵאתִי אֶתְכֶם "but I had

brought *you* out afterward." (Josh 24:5b). This time the direct address refers specifically

to the listening audience. The notice sits a bit awkwardly here, for when the storyline

immediately continues it repeats essentially this same idea—only with a different object,

your fathers instead of *you*—and in this manner makes an equivalence between *the*

fathers and the *listening audience*. Recall from the double quotation formulas introducing

this speech that it is actually the LORD's words to the people through Joshua.

The storyline continues unabated, וָאוֹצִיא אֶת־אֲבוֹתֵיכֶם "I brought *your fathers* out"

. . . וַתָּבֹאוּ הַיָּמָּה "*you* came to the sea," וַיִּרְדְּפוּ מִצְרַיִם אַחֲרֵי אֲבוֹתֵיכֶם "Egypt pursued *your*

fathers" (Josh 24:6) . . . וַיִּצְעֲקוּ אֶל־יְהוָה "*they* cried out to the LORD," וַיָּשֶׂם מַאֲפֵל בֵּינֵיכֶם וּבֵין

הַמִּצְרִים "(The LORD) put darkness between *you* and the Egyptians," וַיָּבֵא עָלָיו אֶת־הַיָּם

"(The LORD) brought the sea upon it (Egypt)," וַיְכַסֵּהוּ "it (the sea) covered it (Egypt),"

וַתֵּשְׁבוּ בַמִּדְבָּר . . . "*your* eyes saw what I did" וַתִּרְאֶינָה עֵינֵיכֶם אֵת אֲשֶׁר־עָשִׂיתִי "*you* dwelt in the

wilderness" (Josh 24:7) . . . וָאָבִיא אֶתְכֶם אֶל־אֶרֶץ הָאֱמֹרִי "I brought *you* to the land of the

Amorite" . . . וַיִּלָּחֲמוּ אִתְּכֶם "they fought with *you*," וָאֶתֵּן אוֹתָם בְּיֶדְכֶם "I gave them into *your*

hand," וַתִּירְשׁוּ אֶת־אַרְצָם "*you* inherited their land," וָאַשְׁמִידֵם מִפְּנֵיכֶם "I destroyed them *in your*

presence" (Josh 24:8), וַיָּקָם בָּלָק "Balak rose up" . . . וַיִּלָּחֶם בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל "he fought against

Israel," וַיִּשְׁלַח וַיִּקְרָא לְבִלְעָם "he sent and called for Balaam" . . . לְקַלֵּל אֶתְכֶם "to curse (לְ plus

infinitive)[113] *you*" (Josh 24:9).

At this point, a third adversative in direct *historical speech* interrupts with וְלֹא

אָבִיתִי לִשְׁמֹעַ לְבִלְעָם "but I was not willing to listen to Balaam" (Josh 24:10a), this time with

a *negated qatal* plus infinitive, and so really a subsidiary line of historical speech. The

main storyline continues, וָאַצִּל "he (Balaam) actually[114] blessed *you*," וַיְבָרֶךְ בָּרוֹךְ אֶתְכֶם

אֶתְכֶם "I rescued *you*" (Josh 24:10b) . . . וַתַּעַבְרוּ אֶת־הַיַּרְדֵּן "*you* crossed the Jordan," וַתָּבֹאוּ

אֶל־יְרִיחוֹ "*you* came to Jericho," וַיִּלָּחֲמוּ בָכֶם "they (the lords of Jericho, etc.) fought against

you" . . . וָאֶשְׁלַח . . . אֶת־הַצִּרְעָה "I gave them into *your* hand" (Josh 24:11), וָאֶתֵּן אוֹתָם בְּיֶדְכֶם "I

sent . . . the hornet" . . . וַתְּגָרֶשׁ אוֹתָם "it (the hornet) drove them (the two kings) out" (Josh

---

[113] See Van der Merwe, et al., *Biblical Hebrew Reference Grammar*, 174, 351–52, on this kind of adjunct of purpose for לְ plus infinitive construct.
[114] See Butler, *Joshua 13–24*, 292 for this translation of the infinitive. It accords with the affirmation role in "strong contrast to what precedes" (Waltke and O'Connor, *IBHS*, 585), which was for Balaam לְקַלֵּל אֶתְכֶם "to curse you (i.e., Israel)" (Josh 24:9).

"*you* dwelt וַתֵּשְׁבוּ בָהֶם "and cities" . . . וְעָרִים . . . "I gave *you* land" וָאֶתֵּן לָכֶם אֶרֶץ . . . (24:12)
in them (the cities)" (Josh 24:13).

We can see that the use of the *wayyiqtol* verb form carries the embedded storyline
throughout this passage, and that there is a relative sparseness to the subsidiary material.
The two interjections of main line historical speech highlight important points in the story
where, first, *Jacob* had gone down to Egypt, and second, where the LORD had brought
the listening audience out of Egypt. A notable observation about this passage is this shift
in participant reference from *the fathers* to *the people being addressed*. It is anticipated in
v. 6 and comes to full fruition in v. 7. It draws the Israelites in the story that are present
for the speech into the embedded story of the speech itself in a powerful way. It even
draws in the implied readers in a subtle way to set them up for the hortatory finale to the
speech in vv. 14–15.

This finale to the speech is marked as hortatory by the repeated use of the
imperative to carry the main line of exhortation[115]—יְראוּ אֶת־יְהוָה וְעִבְדוּ אֹתוֹ "Fear the
LORD and serve him" . . . הָסִירוּ אֶת־אֱלֹהִים "get rid of the (other) gods" . . . עִבְדוּ אֶת־יְהוָה
"serve the LORD" . . . בַּחֲרוּ לָכֶם הַיּוֹם אֶת־מִי תַעֲבֹדוּן "choose for yourselves today whom you
will serve" (Josh 24:14–15). The speech of Joshua ends with a motivation clause by the
credible and authoritative speaker typical of exhortation;[116] וְאָנֹכִי וּבֵיתִי נַעֲבֹד אֶת־יְהוָה "but I
and my house will serve the LORD" (Josh 24:15). The LORD is the primary thematic
participant in this speech/story, with the fathers and then the hearers ("you" plural)
taking, in turn, the role of secondary thematic participant.

---

[115] Longacre, *Joseph* (2003), 121.

[116] Longacre and Hwang, *Holistic Discourse Analysis*, 171.

At this point the speech turns into a dialogue with the main narrative storyline being picked up again with וַיַּעַן הָעָם וַיֹּאמֶר "the people answered and said" (Josh 24:16). The dialogue is inescapably artificial in that it would be incredible for the entire assembly of the people to respond to Joshua in unison. Most likely the reader is expected to understand a single representative, or group of representatives, making the answer. The utterance of the people starts with a denial using negation, infinitives, nominal constructions, and participles— חָלִילָה לָּנוּ מֵעֲזֹב אֶת־יְהוָה לַעֲבֹד אֱלֹהִים אֲחֵרִים כִּי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ הוּא הַמַּעֲלֶה אֹתָנוּ וְאֶת־אֲבוֹתֵינוּ מֵאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם מִבֵּית עֲבָדִים "by no means would we forsake the LORD to serve other gods, for the LORD our God, he is the one who brought us and our fathers up from the land of Egypt, from the house of servitude" (Josh 24:16aβ–17a)—signifying that an expository segment is in play here.[117] The retrospective nature of the text is muted to this point, but part way through v. 17 there is a relative *qatal* verb clause, אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה לְעֵינֵינוּ אֶת־הָאֹתוֹת הַגְּדֹלוֹת הָאֵלֶּה "who had done for our eyes these great signs," immediately followed with a narrative speech, *wayyiqtol* clause, וַיִּשְׁמְרֵנוּ "(the LORD) kept us." The people are essentially beginning to tell the story back to Joshua, including the regular use of the *wayyiqtol* narrative tense as v. 18 continues with וַיְגָרֶשׁ יְהוָה אֶת־כָּל־הָעַמִּים "the LORD drove all the peoples out," but their speech turns predictive and future oriented toward the end of the verse when they state with an on-line *yiqtol*, גַּם־אֲנַחְנוּ נַעֲבֹד אֶת־יְהוָה "we too will serve the LORD."

Verse 19 moves from this embedded speech in the mouths of the people and reverts to the main storyline as the narrator provides the full quotation formula— וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוֹשֻׁעַ אֶל־הָעָם "Joshua said to the people"—so that Joshua responds to the people's first

---

[117] Heller, *Narrative Structure*, 468.

response with a strong denial that they will be able to serve the LORD (Josh 24:19–20).

The repeated full quotation formulas with both speaker and addressee identified with nouns, dialogue medial, is a sign of dramatic import in its redirection of the dialogue.[118] The predictive main speech line is now carried by future oriented *yiqtol* and *weqatal* sequences—הוּא לֹא־יִשָּׂא . . . "you will be unable to serve the LORD" לֹא תוּכְלוּ לַעֲבֹד אֶת־יְהוָה כִּי תַעַזְבוּ לְפִשְׁעֲכֶם וּלְחַטֹּאותֵיכֶם "who will not abide your rebellion or your sins" (Josh 24:19). אֶת־יְהוָה וַעֲבַדְתֶּם אֱלֹהֵי נֵכָר וְשָׁב וְהֵרַע לָכֶם וְכִלָּה אֶתְכֶם "When you will forsake the LORD and will serve foreign gods, (the LORD) will turn and will harm you, and will put an end to you" (Josh 24:20). There is an assurance and a sense of finality in these words of Joshua.

Nevertheless, the people, in turn, offer up a second denial to Joshua's words and an assertion—in fact, a counter-prediction in *yiqtol* that לֹא כִּי אֶת־יְהוָה נַעֲבֹד "no, rather, we will serve the LORD"—after another full main storyline quotation formula, וַיֹּאמֶר הָעָם אֶל־יְהוֹשֻׁעַ "the people said to Joshua" (Josh 24:21). Again the narrator provides a full quotation formula in v. 22 with *wayyiqtol*, וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוֹשֻׁעַ אֶל־הָעָם "Joshua said to the people," where the following direct utterance of Joshua, telling the people that they will be witnesses against themselves in a mostly nominal *exposition* on the choice they have just made, is interrupted by the *wayyiqtol* clause interjection, וַיֹּאמְרוּ עֵדִים "they said: 'witnesses!'"[119] Neither the narrator nor Joshua seem to take much notice of the interruption as Joshua carries on to the hortatory part of his speech—two imperatives used—without additional quotation formula, הָסִירוּ אֶת־אֱלֹהֵי הַנֵּכָר "get rid of the foreign gods" . . . וְהַטּוּ אֶת־לְבַבְכֶם אֶל־יְהוָה "and incline your heart to the LORD" (Josh 24:23). One

---

[118] Longacre, *Joseph* (2003), 162.

[119] This is the first time in the series of quotation formulas in Josh 24 where the addressee is not identified in anyway, where the speaker is not identified with a noun, and where the people are referred to in the plural rather than in the singular as a collective. Participant reference remains clear here, nonetheless.

last time the people assert their intent to serve the LORD after a full quotation formula—

וַיֹּאמְרוּ הָעָם אֶל־יְהוֹשֻׁעַ "the people said to Joshua"—on the main storyline (Josh 24:24). The

object of this quotation formula is a short set of predictive speech *yiqtol* clauses, אֶת־יְהוָה

אֱלֹהֵינוּ נַעֲבֹד "the LORD our God we will serve, וּבְקוֹלוֹ נִשְׁמָע "and to the voice of (the

LORD) we will harken." The objects of these two clauses each come in front of the verb,

which is not the normal word order, and which provides some kind of emphasis to the

fronted component.[120] Alviero Niccacci also specifies that (*waw-*)x-*yiqtol* clauses in

reported speech are foregrounding clauses (i.e., on the main speech line in these two

instances).[121]

The dialogue is put on pause at vv. 25–26 where the main storyline resumes with

וַיִּכְרֹת יְהוֹשֻׁעַ בְּרִית "Joshua made a covenant" . . . וַיָּשֶׂם "he set (לוֹ 'for it' [i.e., the people,[122]

as a background descriptor off the main line])" . . . חֹק וּמִשְׁפָּט "statutes and regulations"

. . . וַיִּכְתֹּב יְהוֹשֻׁעַ אֶת־הַדְּבָרִים הָאֵלֶּה "Joshua wrote these words" . . . וַיִּקַּח אֶבֶן "he took a stone" .

. . וַיְקִימֶהָ "he stood it up." Then Joshua speaks one more time following a full quotation

formula—וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוֹשֻׁעַ אֶל־כָּל־הָעָם "Joshua said to *all* the people" (Josh 24:27)—where a

more inclusive description of the addressee (*all*) is to be noted. Joshua's final response

that the stone would be a witness is given a sense of immediate reality—*here-and-now-*

ness—by the initial use of הִנֵּה,[123] and is then given an ongoing future perspective through

---

[120] Niccacci, *Syntax of the Verb*, 166–67.
[121] Niccacci, *Syntax of the Verb*, 167–68.
[122] עָם "people" is grammatically masculine singular (collective), so the most obvious referent. Nonetheless, יוֹם הַהוּא "that day" is a possible referent as it also is masculine singular. בְּרִית "covenant" is ruled out as it is feminine.
[123] Lambdin, *Introduction to Biblical Hebrew*, 168. "The clearest and most basic use of הִנֵּה is as a predicator of existence. It differs from יֵשׁ in that it emphasizes the immediacy, the here-and-now-ness, of the situation."

a pair of היה (be) forms, first in *yiqtol* and then in *weqatal*[124]—הָאֶבֶן הַזֹּאת תִּהְיֶה־בָּנוּ לְעֵדָה

"this here stone will now be our witness" . . . וְהָיְתָה בָכֶם לְעֵדָה פֶּן־תְּכַחֲשׁוּן בֵּאלֹהֵיכֶם. "it will be a

witness against you in case you deny your God." It can do this because of what has just

happened: כִּי־הִיא שָׁמְעָה אֵת כָּל־אִמְרֵי יְהוָה אֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר עִמָּנוּ "because it has heard (*qatal*) all the

words that the LORD has spoken (*qatal*) to us." The episode is concluded in Josh 24:28

with the geographic dislocation between the participants—a change of scene—when

וַיְשַׁלַּח יְהוֹשֻׁעַ אֶת־הָעָם "Joshua sent the people away."

Joshua 24 makes wide-ranging connections back through the book of Joshua and

with other pentateuchal material as indicated by Nicolai Winther-Nielsen.

> In conclusion, both the monologue and the dialogue of the covenant episode
> summarize central discourse themes from all of Joshua. The speeches reiterate the
> glorious events of the conquest and prolong this line of action back to patriarchal
> beginnings. Past history is retold to admonish the people to diligent service of
> God and to warn them against disastrous revolting. Blessing and curse is united
> within the solemn confirmation through covenant and witness.[125]

Those connections serve to highlight the function of Josh 24 as a conclusion, not simply

to the book of Joshua, but to the Hexateuch as a whole.

3.2.3 Joshua 24:29–33—Finale to the Book of Joshua

Joshua 24:28–33 constitute the last six verses in the book of Joshua and shall be

compared in some detail with their close parallels in Judg 2 below. However, Josh 24:29

begins with a temporal *wayəhî* clause that signals the termination of the previous episode

---

[124] Longacre usually relegated *yiqtol* and *weqatal* היה clauses as well-off-the-main-line, setting material, in predictive speech (*Joseph* [2003], 106). This would be the case, only if they are being used in their usual sense as temporal or discourse markers. In this verse, the occurrences of היה are used as finite verbs that govern the timeframe of the following infinitives, and so are to be treated as a normal *yiqtol-weqatal* sequence.

[125] Winther-Nielsen, *Functional Discourse Grammar*, 315.

at the end of v. 28—which began at Josh 24:1—and the beginning of another with v. 29

where the main storyline picks up with the death of Joshua some time after he sent the

people away at the end of the previous episode.[126] Verses 29–31 certainly bring the *book*

of Joshua to an overall fitting conclusion with the notices of Joshua's death and burial,

and that Israel served the LORD during his lifetime and for some time afterward. These

events are all marked as being on the main storyline by the *wayyiqtol* verb form; וַיָּמָת

יְהוֹשֻׁעַ "Joshua died" (Josh 24:28) . . . וַיִּקְבְּרוּ אֹתוֹ "they buried him" (Josh 24:30) . . . וַיַּעֲבֹד

יִשְׂרָאֵל אֶת־יְהוָה "Israel served the LORD" (Josh 24:31). Yet there are still two more verses

that recount the burial of Joseph's bones and the death and burial of Eleazar the priest

(Josh 24:32–33). The only element of this portion that is on the main storyline is the final

main clause, וַיִּקְבְּרוּ אֹתוֹ "they buried him (Eleazer)" (Josh 24:33).

There is a substantial duplication of material in Josh 24:28–31 and Judg 2:6–9,

but there are also some divergences. The following tables (Table 2 and Table 3) provide a

comparison of these two passages *with the differences underlined*. Adjoining verses are

also provided (in italics for the translations to distinguish them) to provide a linkage to

the contextual setting of each instance of this near-duplicate passage. The parallels are

not exact in all places, but the following correspondences are evident: Josh 24:28–31 is

reflective of Judg 2:6, 8–9, and 7, in that order; Judg 2:6–9 is reflective of Josh 24:28, 31,

and 29–30, in that order;[127] Judg 2:10 is not represented in Josh 24; and Josh 24:32–33 is

not represented in Judg 2. A more detailed comparison shall be provided at section 4.2.7,

---

[126] "The disjunction must be understood as applying before the clause with וַיְהִי" (Lambdin, *Introduction to Biblical Hebrew*, 164–65).

[127] The direct object marker referring to (the body of) Joshua is morphologically defective in Josh 24:30 and *plene* in Judg 2:9. This textual issue is of no consequence to the narrative.

Episode 7 (Judg 2:6–10)—A Recapitulation Concerning Joshua, in the following analysis

of Judges.

In Josh 24:31 and Judg 2:7 I have rendered the three suffixal (*qatal*) verbs as past

perfectives, not because they need to be,[128] but because they can be, justifiably and

consistently, and it helps to distinguish them from the main storyline of the narrative

carried by the prefixal preterite (*wayyiqtol*) verbs in this instance. I have attempted to

follow this manner of translating *qatal* verbs, where appropriate, throughout the study.

The marking of the opening to Josh 24:29 with a temporal clause, signifying the

closing of one episode and the start of another is a critical observation. There is no such

marking in the parallel text in Judg 2:8 where it is simply a part of a continuing main

storyline that runs from Judg 2:6 through to 2:10; "Joshua sent the people away . . . the

Israelites went . . . the people served the LORD . . . Joshua died . . . they buried him . . .

another generation rose up." (Judg 2:1–5 and 2:11–15 each have their own ways of

announcing the beginning and end of new episodes that will be noted in the following

chapter on the analysis of Judges.) Joshua's sending away of the people concludes the

previous episode in the book of Joshua (Josh 24:28); in Judges, Joshua's sending away of

the people opens a new episode (Judg 2:6). In the book of Joshua, Joshua first dies (Josh

24:29) and *then* the people of Israel are described as serving the LORD (Josh 24:31); in

Judges, the people are described as serving the LORD (Judg 2:7) and *then* Joshua dies

(Judg 2:8), followed by the death of that generation and the rise of a generation "who had

---

[128] Waltke and O'Connor stated that "Traditionally the perfect has been characterized as a tense. In fact, however, it represents a state flowing from an earlier situation, and it therefore seems better to think of it as a nuance that may be related to aspect. . . . Similarly, when the perfect sense is relevant Hebrew employs the perfective form and allows other contextual considerations to indicate that a resulting state attended the situation" (*IBHS*, 484).

not known the LORD, nor the work that (the LORD) had done for Israel" (Judg 2:10).

The death of Joshua in the book of Joshua, and the notice that Israel served the LORD all

of his days (Josh 24:31), serve as a fitting conclusion to the book of Joshua—Israel is in

possession of the land.

Hebrew	English
ויאמרו העם אל־יהושע את־יהוה אלהינו נעבד ובקולו נשמע	*Josh 24:24 The people said to Joshua: "The LORD our God, we will serve, and to the voice (of the LORD our God), we will harken."*
ויכרת יהושע ברית לעם ביום ההוא וישם לו חק ומשפט בשכם	*Josh 24:25 Joshua made a covenant with the people on that day. He set for it (the people) statutes and regulations in Shechem.*
ויכתב יהושע את־הדברים האלה בספר תורת אלהים ויקח אבן גדולה ויקימה שם תחת האלה אשר במקדש יהוה	*Josh 24:26 Joshua wrote these words in the book of the Instruction of God. He took a large stone. He stood it up there beneath the tree that is by the sanctuary of the LORD.*
ויאמר יהושע אל־כל־העם הנה האבן הזאת תהיה־בנו לעדה כי־היא שמעה את כל־אמרי יהוה אשר דבר עמנו והיתה בכם לעדה פן־תכחשון באלהיכם	*Josh 24:27 Joshua said to all the people: "This here stone shall be our witness because it has heard all the words of the LORD that (the LORD) has spoken among us. It will be a witness against you in case you deny your God."*
וישלח יהושע את־העם איש לנחלתו	Josh 24:28 Joshua sent the people away, each to his/its inheritance.
ויהי אחרי הדברים <u>האלה</u> וימת יהושע בן־נון עבד יהוה בן־מאה ועשר שנים	Josh. 24:29 <u>So then after these things</u> Joshua the son of Nun, the servant of the LORD, died at the age of 110 years.
ויקברו <u>אתו</u> בגבול נחלתו בתמנת־<u>סרח אשר</u> בהר־אפרים מצפון להר־געש	Josh 24:30 They buried <u>him</u> within the territory of his inheritance, in Timnath-<u>serah, which (is)</u> in the hill country of Ephraim, north of Mount Gaash.
ויעבד <u>ישראל</u> את־יהוה כל ימי יהושע וכל ימי הזקנים אשר האריכו ימים אחרי יהושע <u>ואשר ידעו</u> את כל־מעשה יהוה אשר עשה לישראל	Josh 24:31 <u>Israel</u> served the LORD all the days of Joshua, and all the days of the elders whose days had extended beyond Joshua <u>and</u> who had <u>observed</u> all the work that the LORD had done on behalf of Israel.
ואת־עצמות יוסף אשר־העלו בני־ישראל ממצרים קברו בשכם בחלקת השדה אשר קנה יעקב מאת בני־חמור אבי־שכם במאה קשיטה ויהיו לבני־יוסף לנחלה	*Josh 24:32 And the bones of Joseph that the Israelites had brought up from Egypt, they had also buried, by Shechem on the portion of the field that Jacob had purchased from the sons of Hamor, the father of Shechem, for 100 coins, and they were an inheritance of the descendants of Joseph.*
ואלעזר בן־אהרן מת ויקברו אתו בגבעת פינחס בנו אשר נתן־לו בהר אפרים	*Josh 24:33 And Eleazar the son of Aaron died. They buried him in Gibeah of Phinehas his son, which was given to him in the hill country of Ephraim.*

Table 2. Text and Translation of Joshua 24:24–33

ויעל מלאך־יהוה מן־הגלגל אל־הבכים ויאמר אעלה אתכם ממצרים ואביא אתכם אל־הארץ אשר נשבעתי לאבתיכם ואמר לא־אפר בריתי אתכם לעולם	*Judg 2:1 The messenger of the LORD went up from Gilgal to Bochim. He said: "I brought you up from Egypt. I brought you into the land that I had sworn to your fathers. I said, 'I will not ever break my covenant with you,*
ואתם לא־תכרתו ברית ליושבי הארץ הזאת מזבחותיהם תתצון ולא־שמעתם בקלי מה־זאת עשיתם	*Judg 2:2 and you shall not make a covenant with those who dwell in this land. You shall break down their altars.' But you did not harken to my voice. What is this you have done?*
וגם אמרתי לא־אגרש אותם מפניכם והיו לכם לצדים ואלהיהם יהיו לכם למוקש	*Judg 2:3 And so, I say, I will not drive them out from your presence, but they will be at your sides and their gods will be a snare to you."*
ויהי כדבר מלאך יהוה את־הדברים האלה אל־כל־בני ישראל וישאו העם את־קולם ויבכו	*Judg 2:4 When the messenger of the LORD spoke these words to all the people of Israel, the people raised their voices and they wept.*
ויקראו שם־המקום ההוא בכים ויזבחו־שם ליהוה	*Judg 2:5 They called the name of that place Bochim. They sacrificed there to the LORD*
וישלח יהושע את־העם <u>וילכו בני־יישראל</u> איש לנחלתו <u>לרשת את־הארץ</u>	Judg 2:6 Joshua sent the people away. <u>The Israelites went</u>, each to their (singular) inheritance, <u>to take possession of the land</u>.
ויעבדו <u>העם</u> את־יהוה כל ימי יהושע וכל ימי הזקנים אשר האריכו ימים אחרי יהושע אשר <u>ראו</u> את כל־מעשה יהוה <u>הגדול</u> אשר עשה לישראל	Judg 2:7 <u>The people</u> served the LORD all the days of Joshua, and all the days of the elders whose days had extended beyond Joshua, who had <u>seen</u> all the <u>great</u> work that the LORD had done on behalf of Israel.
וימת יהושע בן־נון עבד יהוה בן־מאה ועשר שנים	Judg 2:8 Joshua the son of Nun, the servant of the LORD, died at the age of 110 years.
ויקברו <u>אותו</u> בגבול נחלתו בתמנת־<u>חרס</u> בהר אפרים מצפון להר־געש	Judg 2:9 They buried <u>him</u> in the territory of his inheritance in Timnath-<u>heres</u>, in the hill country of Ephraim, north of Mount Gaash.
וגם כל־הדור ההוא נאספו אל־אבותיו ויקם דור אחר אחריהם אשר לא־ידעו את־יהוה וגם את־המעשה אשר עשה לישראל	*Judg 2:10 Likewise, all that generation were gathered to their* (literally its) *fathers. Another generation rose up after them who had not known the LORD, nor the work that (the LORD) had done for Israel.*

Table 3. Text and Translation of Judges 2:1–10

3.3 Conclusions

As part of a contextual overview of the book of Joshua we pointed out that there is indeed a narrative framework that carries the main storyline forward in time from the death of Moses (Josh 1:1) until the death of Moses' successor Joshua (Josh 24:29). There are also lengthy sections of exposition and persuasive direct speech embedded within that narrative framework. Those various components of the inherited text exhibit some discrepancies and multiple perspectives, and sometimes there is temporal uncertainty in the narrative frame. The book of Joshua also makes many far-ranging connections back into the Pentateuch and forward into the remainder of the Deuteronomistic History, particularly with respect to the promise of land and the requirements for its continued retention. These features point to a historical process of composition and editing; nevertheless, a reader can make good sense of it.

In his opening remarks on the Deuteronomist as an author of Joshua, Brian Peckham wrote that

> The examination of Joshua as a literary work might begin with the form of the whole and the form of its parts and the relation between them. It will be noticed that it is a literary work that belongs to a series, a book attached by literal repetition to the books that precede and follow. It becomes obvious, then, that the books are about people and eras, real people or types, and epochs that follow each other but also clearly overlap. The parts of the book, similarly, are phases in a single career and periods in the era that follow each other and backtrack to earlier times.[129]

The first half of the book consists of a series of intertwined stories that take the reader through the preparation and combat phases of the occupation of the land under the leadership of Joshua. It is summarized in the list of conquered kings alongside the previous exploits of the people under the leadership of Moses in the Transjordan. There

---

[129] Peckham, "Significance of the Book of Joshua," 229.

are a few weak connections between this section and the introduction to the book of

Judges that will be explored in the following chapter.

The second half of Joshua deals with the distribution of the land among the tribes

of Israel and continuing life in the land. The introduction of a new perspective at Josh

13:1bδ that there remains very much land to possess, over against the complete taking of

the land described at Josh 11:23, generates considerable ambiguity in the book's second

half. There is a shortcoming of some sort introduced—but never quite explicitly defined

until Josh 24:23 (i.e., the foreign gods among them)—which derails the possession of the

land by all Israel specifically within the narrative frame. The comparison of the links

between the second half of Joshua and the introduction to Judges in the next chapter will

demonstrate an increasing culpability expressed in Judges—an unwillingness rather than

inability—to drive out the inhabitants of the land. Culpability of the people of Israel is

much more muted in Joshua, but the second half of the book tends to be increasingly

pessimistic in this respect compared to the first half.

One of the central assumptions developed in this study is that the double

conclusion to the book of Joshua in chs. 23 and 24 is important to understanding how the

book-seam between Joshua and Judges functions in the context of the MT. Many of the

historical elements of the composition process remain obscure to interpreters, but that

need not derail literary investigation. The question of a Hexateuch or Deuteronomistic

History, furthermore, needs not be an either/or circumstance. There has been some

evidence presented that ch. 23 belongs at home in some form of Deuteronomistic History,

and that much of ch. 24 may have later helped incorporate the book of Joshua—much as

we have it now—into a Hexateuch.[130] There are elements of integration, and signs of

separation, in the ending of the book of Joshua as it exists. And because the relatively

large portion of direct speech found in Josh 23–24 is found in a continuing narrative

framework, Longacre's discourse analysis method is entirely suitable in its role in this

study as a controlled narrative approach.

It is stated here again for emphasis that the marking of the opening to Josh 24:29

with a temporal clause, signifying the closing of the previous episode and the start of

another is a *critical observation*. Based on this observation, a key finding of this study is

that the marking of the opening to the final episode of the book of Joshua, Josh 24:29,

with a temporal clause, signifying the closing of one episode and the start of another,

functions quite differently than its parallel in Judg 2:8. The death of Joshua in the book of

Joshua, and the notice that Israel served the LORD all of his days (Josh 24:31), serve as a

fitting conclusion *to the book of Joshua*. In the book of Judges, the notice that the people

served the LORD all the days of Joshua, is moved to a position before the recounting of

the death of Joshua, to Judg 2:7, so that immediately upon the death of Joshua's

generation (Judg 2:10) the apostasy occurs.

---

[130] Rösel made a number of negative comments on the existence of a Hexateuch based on his examination of connections between Joshua and Numbers as follows:

> 1. Such a theory is very hypothetical, but even the temporary existence of a Hexateuch is of little heuristic value.
> 2. This solution also seems superfluous as well as awkward: if the Pentateuch existed at the beginning and also at the final (present) stage, the theory of a Hexateuch seems to be an unnecessary detour.
> 3. The present existence of the Pentateuch is a fact, not a theory. This fact must be taken very seriously in any attempt to reconstruct the development of the Bible.
> 4. The assumption of the existence of a late Hexateuch requires the detection of the same late editor in the Pentateuch as well as in the book of Joshua, probably also including the end of Deuteronomy. But this is not the case ("Existence of a Hexateuch," 567).

CHAPTER 4: ANALYSIS OF JUDGES 1:1—3:11

This chapter provides the literary analysis of the double introduction to the book of

Judges. It begins with a brief sketch of scholarly thought on the overall structure, themes

and motifs of Judges, with particular attention to its beginning, which is the focus of

study for the chapter. Diachronic and synchronic considerations are advanced as bases

for the discourse analysis. That analysis of the narrative introduction to Judges proceeds

episode by episode through Judg 1, and then through the remainder of Judg 2:1—3:11

after an excursus that deals with the parallels to Judg 1 found in the historical traditions

of Joshua. It concludes with some key observations on the episodic character, the value of

tracking thematic characters, and time in the narrative of the introduction to Judges, all

key components of Robert Longacre's approach. The purpose of gathering those

observations as a conclusion to the chapter is to summarize and validate the main

contours of Longacre's discourse analysis as a narrative approach in its application to the

selected texts in Joshua–Judges. Comparisons of the differences in perspectives between

the books of Joshua and Judges are provided at those points in the analysis where they are

found, and their relevance to the transition from Joshua to Judges is discussed

throughout, but the main summary of those observations and findings with respect to the

book-seam will be carried over to the following concluding chapter.

4.1 Introducing the Introduction(s) to the Book of Judges

Because this section under analysis opens the entire unified story of the book of Judges, it is not necessarily going to be a regular kind of narrative. It will undoubtedly have elements intended to guide the reader at later points in the book and will be *introductory* in character, as that can be defined. Whereas an introduction is integral to the entire work, it does nevertheless come at the beginning, and not in the middle or at the end— inevitably it will be different in some fashion. In interpreting *Aristotle's Poetics*, Paul Ricoeur wrote that

> an action (i.e., that which is represented or imitated in the narrative emplotment) is whole and complete if it has a beginning, a middle, and an end; that is, if the beginning introduces the middle, if the middle with its reversals and recognition scenes leads to the end, and if the end concludes the middle. Then the configuration wins out over the episodic form, concordance overcomes discordance.[1]

So narratives gain completeness when the individual episodes are put together in a certain order, like the picture that emerges with the proper completion of a puzzle. Ricouer's insight into that axiom of classical rhetoric is not overly profound, but it is important to keep in mind when the transition from the ending of Joshua to the opening of Judges is investigated. Some key characteristics of the introduction to the book of Judges are examined below.

The finished work of Judges has several themes and motifs interwoven throughout the entirety of the book in an intricate, nuanced, and highly imaginative manner.[2] Two basic kinds of traditions seem to have been brought together, as proposed

---

[1] Ricoeur, *Time and Narrative*, 2:20.
[2] See Amit, *Book of Judges*; Bal, *Death and Dissymmetry*; Gros Louis, "Book of Judges"; Klein, *Triumph of Irony*; Polzin, *Moses and the Deuteronomist*; Webb, *Integrated Reading*.

by Martin Noth: tribal hero stories and short judge-lists.[3] Robert Boling also recognized

the complex tradition history of Judges and the relative antiquity of its sources. He

provided one view of its composition history that begins with a tenth-century cycle of

stories about judges, which gained something like its current form at the hands of an

eighth-century *pragmatic* compiler, even if perhaps this collection included some events

from the time of the figure of Joshua through to Eli and Samuel.[4] This work, he

speculated, was framed by a *deuteronomic* editor during the seventh century, and then

again in the sixth century by a *deuteronomistic* hand. The initial pragmatic collection he

named "life under the judges" and is organized into three sections: "the epic prologue"

(Judg 2:6—3:6); "phase one" (Judg 3:7—10:5); and "phase two" (Judg 10:17—15:20).[5]

According to Boling the deuteronomic editor presumably added the "judgement

speeches" (Judg 2:1–5; 6:7–10; and 10:6–16) and a series of supplements (Judg 16:1—

18:31), and the later deuteronomistic redaction added the "preview of the disintegrating

nation" (Judg 1:1–36) and the "postview of a reunified people" (Judg 19:1—21:25).[6] This

scheme will, of course, not find favour with everyone, but more importantly for this

study, this view implies a certain lack of authorial unity in Judg 1:1—3:11, the section

under analysis. It may be considered representative, for the purposes of this study, of the

traditional scholarly approaches of source and redaction criticism that dissect the received

---

[3] Noth, *Deuteronomistic History*, 69–70.

[4] Boling, *Judges*, 36.

[5] Boling, *Judges*, 30. The entire scheme noted comes directly from the chart found on that page. Boling's actual view of "the epic prologue" was not as homogeneous as he indicated by this scheme, as he went on to distinguish Judg 3:5–6 as deuteronomic from the time of Josiah and Judg 2:18–19; 3:2 as deuteronomistic and exilic, as well as alluding to other sections stemming from these later periods (76, 79).

[6] Boling, *Judges*, 36. According to Noth, the Deuteronomist's hand is most clearly seen in the summary speeches (retrospective and anticipatory) by historical personages (e.g., Joshua, Samuel, Solomon) or "summarizing reflections upon history" by the Deuteronomist (*Deuteronomistic History*, 18–19). There are other similar deuteronomistic notices in Judg 2:11, 14–16, 18–19; 3:7–11, 12–15a, 30b; 4:1a, 2–3a, 4b; 5:31b; 6:1; 8:27b–28, 30–35; and 13:1.

text, and that can distract an interpreter away from pursuing a wholistic or integrated narrative reading.[7]

On top of this, scholars are divided over what they believe truly constitutes the *introduction* to the book as it now stands. A number of scholars with a historical-critical orientation have assigned Judg 1:1—2:5 as the introduction.[8] The basis for understanding Judg 1:1—2:5 as the introduction is that it represents a *recounting* of the seizing of the land by the Israelites, followed directly in Judg 2:6 with the narrative picking up where it left off at the end of the book of Joshua, albeit with a modest recapitulation. Barnabas Lindars was in this camp but had, nonetheless, stated that "it has been carefully composed to achieve the two purposes of bringing Judah into the history and preparing the reader for the situation presupposed in the following stories."[9] In particular, Judg 2:1–5 "makes a literary inclusion with the oracle mentioned in 1:1–2."[10] That implies that a definite artistic and authorial impulse may be attributed to the responsible redactor.

On the other hand, some scholars have viewed Judg 1:1—3:6 as the proper introduction, defined from *a more literary perspective*. Robert Polzin thought that the introduction displays layers of redaction, but that it gains unification by means of the recapitulation of the central message of Joshua—partial occupation of the land—(Judg 1:1–36), an explanation of the partial failure (Judg 2:1–5), and a cyclical preview of the period of the judges that demonstrates a recurring punishment and mercy pattern (Judg

---

[7] Reinhard Kratz, bringing together diachronic and synchronic approaches, has stated that "The redaction puts (the individual narratives) in a succession with a consecutive chronology and explains the distress by the sin of the Israelites. It is the framework scheme which first brings together what are timeless legends and thus completely unconnected episodes into a single epoch in the history of Israel" (*Composition*, 188).

[8] Moore, *Judges*, xiii–xv; Soggin, *Judges*, 4; Martin, *Judges*, 1–9.

[9] Lindars, *Judges 1–5*, 5–6.

[10] Lindars, *Judges 1–5*, 6.

2:6—3:6).[11] According to Barry Webb, the introduction prepares the reader for the remainder of the book in a manner similar to the overture to an orchestral composition. Two major subjects are treated—there is the coming to terms with the Canaanites in the period, described literarily, prior to the rise of the judges (Judg 1:1—2:5), and the apostasy of Israel throughout the period of the judges (Judg 2:6—3:6), which find their convergence in the divine speech (Judg 2:20–22).[12] Extensive formal patterning enhances the introductory material's coherence on a number of different levels. Specifically, it "contain[s] motifs which will recur at significant points in the rest of the book,"[13] and provide plot and theme orientation for the reader. Lillian Klein saw an even more extended introduction (Judg 1:1—3:11) as an *exposition* of the book that establishes a major judge paradigm for the main narrative segment of the book. Coherence is gained by the establishment of two points of view—the LORD's (Judg 2:1—3:11), who sees failure and wickedness, and the Israelites' (Judg 1:3–36), who are more-or-less successful according to the narrator—between which an ironic interplay develops throughout the remainder of the book.[14] In spite of the variety of findings, the great value of these literary studies is that they, each in their own way, attempted to demonstrate the coherence of Judges as a discrete book.

Even among these few literary analyses there was disagreement on both the extent of the introduction (3:6 or 3:11?) and the emphases of its various sections (primarily retrospective or prospective?). With some regard to these *more literary perspectives*, I shall provisionally consider the extended introduction of Judg 1:1—3:11 as a special kind

---

[11] Polzin, *Moses and the Deuteronomist*, 147–55.
[12] Webb, *Integrated Reading*, 116–18.
[13] Webb, *Integrated Reading*, 119.
[14] Klein, *Triumph of Irony*, 35–36.

of introductory—or opening—*story to the bigger story* of the book of Judges. The following analysis shall establish the basis for this choice, that Judg 3:7–11 is transitional in nature in that it is a strictly unembellished paradigm of the proleptic summary announcement of 2:11–19, which sketches only the basic pattern that the following variations of the judge-stories will mimic to a greater or lesser extent.

Marking off the introductory narrative section as a single piece (nonetheless highly likely composite in and of itself from a composition historical perspective)[15] distinct from its surrounding (i.e., the book of Joshua and the main cycle of so-called judge stories) is the first task to be carried out. To delineate the beginning would, at first, seem to offer little difficulty as it is the beginning of the book of Judges, but וַיְהִי אַחֲרֵי מוֹת יְהוֹשֻׁעַ "So then after the death of Joshua" assumes a certain knowledge of the character Joshua by the reader. That the character Joshua and temporal *wayəhî* "so then" connection between Josh 24:29 and Judg 1:1 "forges a link between the two texts"[16] across the canonical boundary, does not necessarily mean that it cannot represent a unique narrative beginning.[17] That Judges finds itself in a canonical collection of books immediately following a book that has this person as a main character, and which recounts that individual's death, must not be allowed to obscure the idea that the implied author of this narrative is expecting—is in fact placing a certain demand on—the reader to know something (but perhaps not everything) about that character Joshua. In

---

[15] We have seen during the history of research above that there has often been a tendency to attribute a double introduction to Judges, just as there is a double ending to Joshua.

[16] Frolov, "Rethinking Judges," 33, who also wrote there: "As far as syntax is concerned, Judg 1:1–26 properly belongs, in defiance of the canonical division, with Joshua rather than the balance of Judges." For Tammi Schneider, "According to the conventions of Hebrew narrative, the first word, *wayĕhî*, signals the resumption or continuation of an ongoing narrative" (*Judges*, 2).

[17] See Kratz, "Literary Transition," 241–43 for a concise discussion of the problem of narrative continuity here. In essence, he saw Judg 1:1—2:5 as belonging to Joshua's generation and Judg 2:6–10 as a flashback.

particular, *the temporal situatedness of the events recounted thereafter* is being posited by means of its relation to an event that has happened concerning the character Joshua just introduced—his death. Characters that are introduced into narratives are usually developed in some way following their introduction. That is not so much the case with Joshua in the book of Judges.[18] Aside from dying (Judg 1:1; 2:8) and being buried (Judg 2:9), his only act is to dismiss the people (Judg 2:6). What is notable about the inclusion of the character Joshua is that at Judg 2:7 there is the notice that "the people served the LORD all the days of Joshua." The servitude of that generation to the LORD, and the apostasy of the following generation after the death of Joshua's generation is, of course, a major concern of the book of Judges. Also of interest is that unlike the transition from Deuteronomy to Joshua, where Joshua is noticeably established as the successor to Moses upon his death, there is no clear personal succession plan for the period of the judges following the death of Joshua.

One of the functions of the consistent use of the preterite form of the verb in narrative is to carry the described events of the story forward in a sequential and incremental manner—the temporal movement of the main storyline moves in one direction, and that is forward. This is usually the case, but not always precisely.[19] So, when the reader comes to Judg 2:6 and reads וַיְשַׁלַּח יְהוֹשֻׁעַ אֶת־הָעָם "Joshua sent the people away," there emerges a definite temporal disjunction because the narrative at this point moves to a time before that noted in Judg 1:1, that is, before the death of Joshua. The

---

[18] Cf. also Moses in Josh 1:1, Saul in 2 Sam 1:1, and to a certain extent David in 1 Kgs 1:1—2:11. These may be type-scenes that begin a story or book with a death notice, which is key to the emergence of a successor, but who is to be Joshua's successor?

[19] See section 2.3.8.1 "Characterizing *wayyiqtol* Use in Narrative" above for more discussion of this feature.

scene changes here where we see Joshua—alive again—dismissing the people ("Joshua

sent the people away") in Judg 2:6, in order that they might go and take possession of the

land (purpose clause). This is the clearest marker that a completely new *retrospective*

narrative section has begun at Judg 2:6 and thus brings closure to the previous section.

Lindars stated that "the editor inserted v. 6, which is a slightly expanded version of Josh

24:28. This is probably not intended to be the dismissal of the assembly at Bochim,

because Joshua does not figure in Judg 2:1–5, but is rather aimed at ultimately bringing

the narrative back around to the point in time reached at the *beginning* of the Prelude in

Judg 1:1."[20] This temporal move will be a key factor in the analysis below. The

compositional interrelationship between Judg 2:6–10 and its near-parallel in Josh 24:28–

31, 33 remains unclear—the direction of influence cannot be definitively described (see

the analysis below). What is clear is that the LORD, the people, and the leader of the

people each have a role to play—the LORD provides direction through the leader to the

people, and if the people are obedient, then they get to live on the land and are blessed by

the LORD. The discourse analysis will demonstrate that the rearrangement of the text in

Judg 2:6–10 vis-à-vis that in Josh 24:28–31, 33 highlights the speed and depth of the

apostasy, whereas Josh 24:28–31, 33 is more positive in not indicating the apostasy of the

next generation.

    We will see that Judg 1 is primarily narrative with some dialogue and some

exposition scattered throughout. It consists of several individual episodes, but they are all

tied to the effort of the tribes to take possession of the land. Lawson Younger made the

comparison of Judg 1 with Assyrian summary inscriptions that

---

[20] Lindars, *Judges 1–5*, 94.

use an expositional or representational time ratio, depicting relatively long periods in brief spans of reading time. The language tends to summarize the time represented and in so doing is generally nonspecific and nonconcrete. It describes a static world in general terms; in contrast, a *central* narration introduces scenes of dynamic action that bring about change and movements and complications.

An example that illustrates this is the Standard Inscription of Ashurnasirpal II. *It is geographically and ideologically arranged.*[21]

That geographic and ideologic arrangement is very similar to what we see in Judg 1.

Judges 2:1–5, however, is different in texture—more like Younger's "*central* narration" with "scenes of dynamic action"—as it recounts the confrontation of the people by the messenger of the LORD at Bochim. It has a narrative frame around the messenger's speech, and the temporal setting of Judg 2:1–5 is indistinct, but the unit Judg 2:1–5 is marked off as a distinct episode by a new thematic participant—the Messenger of the LORD. Even though this episode begins abruptly with two *wayyiqtol* clauses providing the opening of the narrative frame, the temporal connection with what precedes it narratively in the previous episode is not clear.

As we will see, up to that point the Judges narrative has been more episodic than plot-driven, and that character continues throughout the rest of the first two chapters and at least the first six verses of ch. 3. The episodic nature of Judg 1:1—3:11 reflects the introductory character of that part of the book. Once the reader arrives at Judg 3:7—or perhaps Judg 3:12, depending on whether one considers that the Othniel narrative is simply a pattern for the cycle of stories or one of the stories itself—many of the elements that will become important to plot (protagonist and antagonist characters, context, betrayals, and expectations) have already been introduced in a less tension-filled context.

---

[21] Younger, "Judges 1," 211. The emphasis is added.

The reader is then able to track those once the stories that follow Judg 3:11 begin to unfold.

The following analysis will provide interpretive comment pertinent to plot development, characterization, time and space, and point of view, which ought to inform perspectives on meaning (e.g., central message, orientation, explanation, demonstration, coherence, interplay, etc.). That textlinguistically informed commentary will constitute the controlled narrative approach (i.e., the discourse analysis) of this study. We will see that the episodic character of Judg 1 (Episodes 1–5), as delineated by the application of Robert Longacre's discourse analysis method, builds mildly in tension from the aperture to the entire introductory story of Judg 1:1—3:11 (i.e., the initial temporal clause of Judg 1:1a and the short dialogue between the Israelites and the LORD in Judg 1:1b–2), through its culmination of the narrator's exposition in Judg 1:28–36 (Episode 5), until the climactic pronouncement in Judg 2:1–5 (Episode 6). The story begins to unwind with the flashback to Joshua's dismissal of the people, his death, and the *essential* commentary on the distinct generations in Judg 2:6–10 (Episode 7) that sets up for the extended narration of Judg 2:11—3:6 (Episode 8), which again includes further exposition, and which anticipates through its explanations the cycle of stories that will follow in the main part of the book. The sparse narration of Judg 3:7–11 (Episode 9) provides a suitable conclusion to the story that introduces the bigger story inherent in the cycle that follows by being transitional and paradigmatically illustrative. I refrain from grouping the episodes under consideration into a larger structure beyond this brief sketch, primarily because the following application of the discourse analysis method will substantiate the episodic nature of the introduction to Judges as opposed to the highly plot-driven stories that

follow in the rest of the book. However, the analyses of the individual episodes below

will on occasion suggest a more complex organization with sub-episodes that is fully

accounted for by Longacre's approach. Episodes are the discourse equivalent of

grammatical paragraphs or dramatic scenes, and the introduction to Judges links them

together with more exposition and narration, and less building of plot tension than the

remainder of the book. Finally, the overall analysis that follows will offer general support

to the methodology of *doing* a literary narrative approach *through* discourse analysis, as a

restraint on the inherent subjectivity of narrative approaches in general.

4.2 Analysis of the Introduction to Judges

4.2.1 Episode 1 (Judges 1:1–8)—Judah (and Simeon?) Goes Up
Against Bezek and Jerusalem

4.2.1.1 Episode 1a (Judges 1:1–4)

This episode, as noted above, opens with a temporal clause that provides a minimum

setting for what follows. The main storyline then begins immediately with the notice

that וַיִּשְׁאֲלוּ בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל בַּיהוָה "the Israelites inquired of the LORD." Two of the three main

characters of the entire narrative section under examination (i.e., Judg 1:1—3:11) are

introduced here (the Israelites and the LORD), and the third (the inhabitants of the land

represented by the Canaanite) will be named in the following quotation, which gives the

substance of the people's inquiry: מִי יַעֲלֶה־לָּנוּ אֶל־הַכְּנַעֲנִי בַּתְּחִלָּה לְהִלָּחֶם בּוֹ "who shall go up

before us against the Canaanite in the first place to fight against him/it?" The distinctive

quotation formula provides a useful focus for main participant reference at the outset. It

includes the names of both the speaker and the addressee, a common manner of dialogue

initiation.[22] The response to the question, וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה יְהוּדָה יַעֲלֶה הִנֵּה נָתַתִּי אֶת־הָאָרֶץ בְּיָדוֹ "the LORD said: 'Judah shall go up, since[23] I have given the land into his/its hand,'" with only the speaker named in the quotation formula, "indicates that the speech is intended to be final and does not anticipate an answer or contradiction."[24] Thematic participants of the episode, the LORD (twice by name) and Judah (once by name and once by pronominal suffix), have asserted themselves already.

Judah is more firmly established as a thematic participant by being the subject of one main storyline verb in v. 3, וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוּדָה לְשִׁמְעוֹן אָחִיו עֲלֵה אִתִּי "Judah said to Simeon his brother: 'go up with me,'" and mentioned by pronominal reference four times. Simeon is the subject of the other main storyline *wayyiqtol* verb in this verse, וַיֵּלֶךְ אִתּוֹ שִׁמְעוֹן "Simeon went with him," but in v. 4 is subsumed by Judah as the subject of the first *wayyiqtol* preterite, וַיַּעַל יְהוּדָה "Judah went up." There is, however, some ambiguity concerning the referent of the proper nouns Judah and Simeon; the reader assumes at the outset that the tribes are in view, but the use of personal pronouns (e.g., אָחִיו "his brother," אִתִּי "with me," etc.) gives a sense of personification to them. This sense quickly fades by the end of v. 4. The mention of thematic participants once again a final time close to the end of an episode is typical of narrative,[25] and so the LORD is mentioned as well in וַיִּתֵּן יְהוָה אֶת־הַכְּנַעֲנִי וְהַפְּרִזִּי בְּיָדָם "the LORD gave the Canaanite and the Perizzite into their hand," with

---

[22] Longacre, *Joseph* (2003), 159.

[23] See Lambdin, *Introduction to Biblical Hebrew*, 170, for this use with a disjunctive clause. Waltke and O'Connor saw this very kind of use of the deictic particle הִנֵּה having the translation value "because." (*IBHS*, 635).

[24] Longacre, *Joseph* (2003), 169.

[25] See e.g., Gen 6:12 (God), Gen 6:22 (Noah), Gen 7:10 (Noah and the flood). Noah is well substantiated as thematic by being the subject of the main event line verb in Gen 7:7. The flood could be considered thematic because it is "introduced early in the paragraph . . . referred to several times successively . . . comes in for reiterated mention towards the end . . . [and] is *involved* with the main event line" (Longacre, "Flood Narrative" [1976], 259). (The emphasis is added.)

Judah and Simeon presumably (although not necessarily, because Judah could, in theory, now be viewed as a collective in the plural) indicated by the pronominal reference. Again, presumably, they are the subjects of the final mainline verb clause, וַיַּכּוּם בְּבֶזֶק עֲשֶׂרֶת אֲלָפִים אִישׁ "they struck them in Bezek, 10,000 individuals." It is noteworthy in this context that Simeon seemingly does not go against the Canaanite with Judah until Judg 1:17.

4.2.1.2 Episode 1b (Judges 1:5–8)

It is, in the final analysis, difficult to definitively distinguish that there is an end of one episode and the beginning of another here. There is a narrowing of the scene in view on to the specific person of the lord of Bezek that is a bit disjunctive, but (the people of) Judah continue to be thematic in these few verses, at least implicitly as subject of the *wayyiqtol* storyline verbs, even if they are not named explicitly until v. 8 where they are clearly in the plural. It is unclear if Simeon remains in view in this sub-episode. The LORD fades almost completely from view as a participant and the lord of Bezek also becomes thematic, so for these reasons I have distinguished between two sub-episodes even though there is no clear change in setting by using any typical temporal or circumstantial marker. The distinction is rather based here mainly on the change in thematic participants. This appears to be the embedding of one paragraph within another.[26]

---

[26] For the purposes of this study, I am generally using the words paragraph and episode (or sub-episode) synonymously, with the minor distinctions made above in the section on methodology that episodes refer to narrative units and paragraphs are grammatical units.

The pace of the narrative picks up in vv. 5 and 6, but so as to not outpace the reader there is some recapitulation found in these verses. This is one of the means at the disposal of the writer to make back-references in the telling of the story. Even though there is a repetition of story material, there is some new material added as well. We already know that Judah struck Bezek—Canaanite and Perizzite—and here we are told וַיִּמְצְאוּ אֶת־אֲדֹנִי בֶזֶק בְּבֶזֶק וַיִּלָּחֲמוּ בּוֹ וַיַּכּוּ אֶת־הַכְּנַעֲנִי וְאֶת־הַפְּרִזִּי "they found the lord of Bezek in Bezek, they fought against him, (and) they struck the Canaanite and the Perizzite." Judah is, at least in some sense, the subject of the verbs, and thus a candidate for thematic participant. The lord of Bezek is the subject of the next *wayyiqtol* verb and the object of four pronominal references in v. 6, וַיָּנָס אֲדֹנִי בֶזֶק וַיִּרְדְּפוּ אַחֲרָיו וַיֹּאחֲזוּ אֹתוֹ וַיְקַצְּצוּ אֶת־בְּהֹנוֹת יָדָיו וְרַגְלָיו "the lord of Bezek fled, they pursued after him, they caught him, (and) they cut off the thumbs/big toes of his hands and his feet," and so he is potentially thematic as well.

The lord of Bezek is the subject of the next *wayyiqtol* verb in the quotation formula, וַיֹּאמֶר אֲדֹנִי־בֶזֶק "the lord of Bezek said" (Judg 1:7), more evidence of him as thematic. The quotation of his speech is also the longest reported utterance so far in the story, שִׁבְעִים מְלָכִים בְּהֹנוֹת יְדֵיהֶם וְרַגְלֵיהֶם מְקֻצָּצִים הָיוּ מְלַקְּטִים תַּחַת שֻׁלְחָנִי כַּאֲשֶׁר עָשִׂיתִי כֵּן שִׁלַּם־לִי אֱלֹהִים "seventy kings, the thumbs/big toes of their hands and their feet having been cut off, (were) gleaning under my table. Just as I had done, so God has repaid to me." The repetition of this vivid image is memorable. The yet unspecified "they" are again the implicit subject of the next main storyline verb, וַיְבִיאֻהוּ יְרוּשָׁלַ͏ִם "They brought him to Jerusalem," with the lord of Bezek as the direct object, and he is the subject on the storyline with וַיָּמָת שָׁם "he died there." In this manner of multiple references he becomes confirmed as a thematic participant.

The Judahites are the explicit subjects of the final three preterites in this episode

(Judg 2:8) and are thus also confirmed as thematic participants, וַיִּלָּחֲמוּ בְנֵי־יְהוּדָה בִּירוּשָׁלַ͏ִם

וַיִּלְכְּדוּ אוֹתָהּ וַיַּכּוּהָ לְפִי־חָרֶב "the Judahites fought against Jerusalem, took it, (and) struck it

with the edge of the sword." At the end of this episode, we finally come to the first

circumstantial clause (idiomatic at that),[27] וְאֶת־הָעִיר שִׁלְּחוּ בָאֵשׁ "and they set the city on

fire," outside of direct reported speech, since the opening temporal clause of Judg 1:1.

Recall from above that initiation and closure of a narrative episode or sub-episode is

often done with a circumstantial clause off the main storyline.[28] It must be noted here that

the break between this and the next episode as described by this discourse analysis is not

reflected in some traditional readings where, following the three main manuscripts of the

Masoretic tradition,[29] some English translations (e.g., NASB, NRSV) make the paragraph

break between vv. 7 and 8. The KJV nevertheless, puts the break after v. 8.

4.2.2 Episode 2 (Judges 1:9–16)—Judah Goes Down Against Hebron and Debir

4.2.2.1 Episode 2a (Judges 1:9–13)

As noted above, the MT has a new line between vv. 7 and 8 representing an open section

division. *BHK*, *BHS*, and *BHQ* all have a *parashah petuchah* at this point signifying the

division. Jack Sasson marks off a major section in Judg 1:8–15, with a subdivision Judg

1:8–11 that he suggests could go with the previous section, but generally tends to use the

parashot as an ancient guide to interpretation from which he is free to deviate with

justification.[30] The justification I use to segment between vv. 8 and 9 is that: v. 8 is a

---

[27] Holladay, *Lexicon*, 372.
[28] Longacre, *Grammar of Discourse* (1996), 119.
[29] Fernández Marcos, *Judges*, 13*. The Leningrad, Aleppo, and Cairo Codices all agree on this.
[30] Sasson, *Judges 1–12*, 138–39.

circumstantial clause off the main storyline that can typically bring an episode to a conclusion; vv. 7 and 8 share the same explicit geographical setting of Jerusalem; and v. 9 is set in a different time and place, which typically signifies a new episode. The beginning of this episode is introduced by the temporal clause with the preposition אַחַר "after,"[31] and *qatal* (with the following infinitive signifying purpose), וְאַחַר יָרְדוּ בְּנֵי יְהוּדָה לְהִלָּחֵם בַּכְּנַעֲנִי "so[32] afterward, the Judahites had gone down to fight against the Canaanite" (Judg 1:9). This is followed up with a relative clause (participial), יוֹשֵׁב הָהָר וְהַנֶּגֶב וְהַשְּׁפֵלָה "the one dwelling in the hill country, and the Negeb, and the Shephelah." The verse sits only loosely in its literary context here as it is essentially a summary statement of all that occurs in Judg 1:4–21,[33] does not serve a specific recapitulative function as the geography does not entirely match, and it does serve a bit awkwardly as the aperture to a new episode where the Judahites go *down* (יָרְדוּ בְּנֵי יְהוּדָה) rather than *up* (וַיַּעַל יְהוּדָה) Judg 1:4). It does, however, provide a generalized circumstantial and temporal setting for the episode, well off the main narrative storyline due to the *qatal*, infinitive, and participle driving any action or state, and sets up a contrast between going up and going down.

There is no mention of Simeon again until v. 17, so that tribe fades from view as a participant in this sub-episode. Judah/Judahites establish(es) itself/themselves as thematic by being the subject of the first three main storyline *wayyiqtol* verbs—"Judah went . . . they struck . . . he/it went" (Judg 1:10–11). The main storyline of this sub-episode begins with the *wayyiqtol* clause at v. 10a, וַיֵּלֶךְ יְהוּדָה אֶל־הַכְּנַעֲנִי "Judah went against the

---

[31] Williams, *Hebrew Syntax*, 60.

[32] I understand the וְ that opens this episode to be pleonastic. See Williams (*Hebrew Syntax*, 71).

[33] Moore (*Judges*, 22), following Budde (*Richter und Samuel*, 6), indicates a likelihood that a redactor placed this general summary here after displacing vv. 19 and 21 to their current locations. If הָעֵמֶק (v. 19) is equivalent to הַשְּׁפֵלָה, then the redactor will have made the discrepancy as to whether Judah was successful or not in the Western area a little less obvious with the displacement of the verses and the use of different terms.

Canaanite." The verse continues off the main storyline with a relative (participial) clause,

הַיּוֹשֵׁב בְּחֶבְרוֹן "the one living in Hebron" (Judg 1:10aβ), and ends with a circumstantial

clause, וְשֵׁם־חֶבְרוֹן לְפָנִים קִרְיַת אַרְבַּע "and the name of Hebron (was) formerly Qiryat Arba"

(Judg 1:10aγ).[34] At v. 10b the Judahites (subject of the third-person plural *wayyiqtol* נכה)

strike down Sheshay, Ahiman, and Talmay. Verse 11 shows a similar structure to v. 10a

with only the following changes: the explicit subject of the main storyline verb וַיֵּלֶךְ "he/it

went" is replaced with the adverbial מִשָּׁם "from there"; and the participial relative

(singular) is changed to the indirect object (plural) אֶל־יוֹשְׁבֵי דְבִיר "against those who dwell

in Debir." Of course, we are now two verses into what is a very similar text to the

narrative found in Josh 15:13–20, except there it was Caleb who drove out Sheshay,

Ahiman, and Talmay (Josh 15:14) and went up against Debir (Josh 15:15).[35]

A new cast of characters comes into play at this point in the narrative, with Caleb,

Achsah, and Othniel, and it has often been thought that this story sets up Othniel's later

participation as someone with a connection to the previous generation of Joshua and

Caleb, and as the first of the deliverers in Judg 3:7–11.[36] This certainly serves the larger

literary purposes of the implied author, but for now it also adds interest to the story in a

way that engages the reader by introducing some plot ingredients such as antagonist,

protagonist, obstacle, and prize in a less perfunctory manner than up to this point in

Judges. Anticipation is elicited in the reader by Caleb's utterance: אֲשֶׁר־יַכֶּה אֶת־קִרְיַת־סֵפֶר

וּלְכָדָהּ וְנָתַתִּי לוֹ אֶת־עַכְסָה בִתִּי לְאִשָּׁה "whomever shall strike Qiryat Sepher and take it, I will

---

[34] This notice is also found in Josh 14:15.

[35] A portion of Josh 15:13 is given in Judg 1:20a and a portion of Josh 15:14 is given in Judg 1:20b. Josh 15:15–19 is very close to Judg 1:11–15. In Josh 14:6–15 we find a narrative concerning Caleb with an embedded speech by Caleb to Joshua. That narrative is itself embedded within an extended portion of exposition describing the tribal allotments.

[36] E.g., Block, *Judges, Ruth*, 93–97; Boling, *Judges*, 64; Lindars, *Judges 1–5*, 27; Polzin, *Moses and the Deuteronomist*, 154–56; Webb, *Integrated Reading*, 127–28; Webb, *Judges*, 103–4.

then give to him Achsah my daughter as a wife" (Judg 1:12). The *yiqtol–weqatal*

sequence of the direct speech has a future orientation and here it represents an irrealis that

offers suspense and a promise of attaining a highly desirable outcome should the obstacle

be overcome. Othniel successfully takes up the challenge, וַיִּלְכְּדָהּ עָתְנִיאֵל בֶּן־קְנַז "Othniel,

son of Kenaz, took it" (i.e., Qiryat Sepher), and Caleb in turn וַיִּתֶּן־לוֹ אֶת־עַכְסָה "gave to him

Achsah"—turning unreal into real and satisfying the reader's expectations. These two

wayyiqtol verbs carry the main storyline, but there are a few pronominal references in this

verse, and this sort of abbreviation sometimes creates ambiguity for the reader as to

whom exactly reference is being made. What Othniel took is clearly Qiryat Sepher; to

whom Caleb gives someone is Othniel; and who is given is Caleb's daughter Achsah.

What is not so clear is the referent of הַקָּטֹן מִמֶּנּוּ "the (one) younger than *him*." We are left,

in grammatical terms, to wonder if Kenaz is the younger brother of *Caleb*, making

Othniel Caleb's nephew as one reading of אֲחִי כָלֵב הַקָּטֹן מִמֶּנּוּ "the brother of Caleb, the

(one) younger than him" might have it; or is *Othniel himself* the younger brother of

Caleb?[37] This ambiguity could put Othniel into the generation of

Joshua/Caleb/Gershom/Eleazer, or alternatively, that of Jonathan/Phinehas (see the

discussion below on Judg 2:11–15).

4.2.2.2 Episode 2b (Judges 1:14–16)

There is no obvious narrative ending by means of a circumstantial notice, or other clear

marker, in the previous verse, so the temporal clause that opens this segment, וַיְהִי בְּבוֹאָהּ

"when she came" (Judg 1:14), does not really signal a new episode as much as it does a

---

[37] The genealogical material in 1 Chr 2:18–19 and 42–50, and 1 Chr 4:11–15 does not help to clarify the relationship between Caleb and Kenaz as brotherly, nor should it necessarily.

simple change of scene. Like between Episodes 1a and 1b, there is some continuity of

thematic participants. There is no indication how short or long a time, if any, has elapsed.

Verses 14–15 are connected to the previous scene by having the same participants

(Achsah, Caleb, and maybe Othniel). We know that it is Achsah who does the "urging"

or "inciting" (neither of these definitions seem to present themselves as the *clear* sense in

the context), וַתְּסִיתֵהוּ "she urged him,"[38] but it is not obvious at the outset whether the

pronominal suffix refers to Caleb or Othniel, and so a temporary gap in the reader's

understanding is produced even though it is filled later in the verse. The following

infinitive, לִשְׁאוֹל "to ask" or "by asking,"[39] does not help definitively to fill the gap as it

has at least those two senses that are possible in this context, but it seems advisable to

understand it as Achsah urges (main storyline *wayyiqtol*) Othniel לִשְׁאוֹל מֵאֵת־אָבִיהָ הַשָּׂדֶה "to

ask from her father the field." The main storyline continues in sequence with Achsah—

וַתִּצְנַח מֵעַל הַחֲמוֹר "she got down off the donkey"—clearly displeased. A main storyline

quotation formula introduces Caleb's question: מַה־לָּךְ "what do you want?" A main

storyline quotation formula introduces her complaint/request/demand: הָבָה־לִּי בְרָכָה כִּי אֶרֶץ

הַנֶּגֶב נְתַתָּנִי וְנָתַתָּה לִי גֻּלֹּת מָיִם "give to me a blessing because the land you have given to me is

desert. Give to me springs of water" (Judg 1:15). "Caleb" then יִתֶּן־לָהּ כָּלֵב "gave"

(*wayyiqtol*) them "to her."

---

[38] There is a discrepancy in Greek witnesses compared to the MT about whether Achsah or Othniel is the subject of the verb here, with Rahlfs B text explicitly inserting Othniel's name. Lindars noted concerning the LXX vis-à-vis the OG that "All the corrected texts make Othniel the subject (often inserting the name), but this is more likely to be the result of getting the right verb than care to reproduce the pronominal elements of the Hebrew accurately" (*Judges 1–5*, 29). Having Othniel as the subject, of course, smooths out the difficulty that Achsah herself finally does the asking. In any case, it seems advisable to understand that the story (i.e., the implied author) intends that the two of them likely conspired together in some way to make the request.

[39] Lambdin, *Introduction to Biblical Hebrew*, 129; *GKC*, 348 and 351.

This exchange between Achsah and Caleb in Judg 1:14–15 is a proper dialogue set in a narrative context. The dialogue consists of a question, a response, and a request. The form of the quotation formula introducing Caleb's question includes a noun (speaker) plus pronoun (addressee). That form indicates a rank-dominance on the part of the speaker and an "attempt to gain control of [the] dialogue."[40] Achsah's response comes with no nominal or pronominal reference to the speaker by the narrator other than what is implicit in the feminine singular form of the quotation formula, with the addressee (her father Caleb) referred to by pronoun suffix on the preposition. This specific form of quotation formula in the middle of a conversation indicates that Achsah is continuing the dialogue *as if with a peer*.[41] Achsah is indignant, and Caleb has been caught out trying to cheat her. The execution of the filling of the request is given in the non-dialogue, main storyline, response of giving by Caleb.[42]

Judges 1:16 seems to *start* to draw the episode to a typical close with some supportive material off the main storyline—וּבְנֵי קֵינִי "and the Kenites" . . . עָלוּ "had gone up" (noun plus *qatal*) . . . אֶת־בְּנֵי יְהוּדָה "with the Judahites." This relates the only "going up" in this episode, a theme that was so prominent in the first episode. The Judahites are mentioned here near the close of the episode, so they are established as thematic participants. However, the episode ends on the main storyline in a somewhat cryptic, non-typical, manner—וַיֵּלֶךְ וַיֵּשֶׁב אֶת־הָעָם "they went and dwelt with the people."[43] It is unclear who the subjects of the verbs are (the Kenites or the Judahites?), and it is unclear

---

[40] Longacre, *Joseph* (2003), 181.
[41] Longacre, *Joseph* (2003), 181.
[42] Longacre, *Joseph* (2003), 197.
[43] Longacre distinguished as special cases the use of preterite *wayyiqtol* verb clauses in the terminus or closure of *narrative sequence paragraphs* as one of being either summary or cataphoric, or relating in some manner to the setting (*Joseph* [2003], 86–87).

who "the people" are (the Judahites or the Canaanite?). In Judges "the people" more

often means Israelite people or armies rather than foreign people or armies.[44] This would

mean that the Kenites "went and dwelt with the (Judahites)." But the opposite occurs

often enough so that it is not conclusive,[45] and so, more gaps are opened in our

understanding. The unusual ending to this episode with this verse, in which

circumstantial material is followed by main storyline *wayyiqtol* verbs, suggests that it

may actually be the opening to the next episode as it begins with some typically

circumstantial material. This accords with the *parashah petuchah* between vv. 15 and 16,

but interrupts the thematic tie engendered between these two verses by the word נֶגֶב

(desert/south). I am ultimately inclined to see it as transitional, serving double duty to

close and open the episodes with the circumstantial clause in the first half of the verse,

and by anticipating the following episode by the cataphoric use of the *wayyiqtol* verb in

the terminus. The coordinating function of the initial *waw* of v. 16 is also difficult to

describe precisely (perhaps it is again pleonastic), which adds to the ambiguous nature of

the verse but would remove the contrast between a going up and a going down within the

episode.

4.2.3 Episode 3 (Judges 1:17–21)—Judah and Simeon (and Benjamin?) Take and Give Territory

Judah is explicitly the subject of the initial *wayyiqtol* clause, וַיֵּלֶךְ יְהוּדָה אֶת־שִׁמְעוֹן "Judah

went with Simeon" (Judg 1:17), and so we again see Judah and Simeon together. As

---

[44] Judges 2:4, 6, 7; 3:18; 7:1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8; 10:18; 11:11; 18:20; 20:2, 8, 16, 22, 26, 31; 21:2, 4, 9, 15.

[45] Judges 2:12 (plural); 4:13; 9:29, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 38, 42, 43, 45, 48, 49; 16:24, 30; 18:7. The Shechemites of Judg 9 have a somewhat ambiguous national attachment, so are included here as foreigners.

off the main storyline. He consigns the function of this level on his verbal rank scheme

for narrative to generally serve to mark episode opening and closing.[47] In its current

placement here leading directly into the *wayyiqtol* clause וַיֹּ֖רֶשׁ אֶת־הָהָ֑ר "he/it took

possession of the hill country," with the explanatory segment at Judg 1:19b, it seems

much closer to the main storyline than Longacre's arrangement would allow. It may be

necessary to modify Longacre's understanding of the function of *wayǝhî* clauses in

instances of this type.[48] Irrespective of how Judg 1:19a might be viewed from a

textlinguistic perspective, it does not diminish the problematic nature of Judg 1:19b in its

current context. The rationale provided for taking possession of the hill country in v. 19,

כִּ֣י לֹ֤א לְהוֹרִישׁ֙ אֶת־יֹשְׁבֵ֣י הָעֵ֔מֶק כִּי־רֶ֥כֶב בַּרְזֶ֖ל לָהֶֽם "for it was not possible to drive out[49] the

inhabitants of the plain/valley because they had iron chariots," conflicts with v. 18 where

they are said to have taken three cities in the West along with their territories. This takes

us back to the discussion of v. 9 where it was noted that it sat somewhat awkwardly in its

context and might have been added there in place of vv. 19 and 21, and which may have

been taken from there. That arrangement does have something to commend it as it would

provide a smoother narrative structure overall.

Verse 20 also seems a bit misplaced as it reaches back to events of the previous

episode to note that וַיִּתְּנ֤וּ לְכָלֵב֙ אֶת־חֶבְר֔וֹן כַּאֲשֶׁ֖ר דִּבֶּ֣ר מֹשֶׁ֑ה "they gave Hebron to Caleb just as

---

[47] Longacre, *Joseph* (2003), 78–79. His hierarchy for narrative is as follows, in rank order of distance from the main storyline: 1. storyline—*wayyiqtol*; 2. secondary—*qatal*, noun + *qatal*; 3. background—*hinnēh* + participle, participle, noun + participle; 4. setting and terminus—*wayǝhî*, *hāyâ*, nominal clause, *yēš*; 5. irrealis—any negation.

[48] Boda and Conway, following Heller (*Narrative Structure*, 56–57), indicate that "Clauses containing וַיְהִי and a temporal element are always initial; however, if there is no other finite verb, then וַיְהִי acts as a fully finite verb" (*Judges*, 57).

[49] On the use of the negative plus לְ plus infinitive as prohibitive, see *GKC*, 349. Cf. LXX Judg 1:19, ὅτι οὐκ ἐδύνατο κληρονομῆσαι (ἠδυνάσθησαν ἐξολεθρεῦσαι [LLX^B]) τοὺς κατοικοῦντας τὴν κοιλάδα "because it could not dispossess (destroy) the dwellers of the valley"; Josh 17:12 וְלֹ֤א יָכְלוּ֙ בְּנֵ֣י מְנַשֶּׁ֔ה לְהוֹרִ֖ישׁ אֶת־הֶעָרִ֑ים "yet the Manassehites had not been able to drive out these cities."

Moses had promised." It is unclear who the subject of the main storyline verb is—perhaps Judah, or perhaps Judah and Simeon together. The next clause, ‫וַיּוֹרֶשׁ מִשָּׁם אֶת־‬ ‫שְׁלֹשָׁה בְּנֵי הָעֲנָק‬ "he (Caleb?) drove out from there the three descendants of Anak," also provides a potential contradiction to v. 10 where it was Judah that was said to have driven them out, that is unless the subject of the verb here in v. 20 is Judah. That is a distinct possibility, and perhaps even a preferable understanding, as Judah has been a subject in both the singular and plural in a somewhat alternating fashion.

As already stated, Judg 1:21 has the appearance of having been dislocated from a position after v. 8. In its present location it provides a suitable ending to the episode in textlinguistic terms with the more circumstantial construction (which due to the *lôʾ qatal* form is very much off the storyline)—‫וְאֶת־הַיְבוּסִי יֹשֵׁב יְרוּשָׁלַם לֹא הוֹרִישׁוּ בְּנֵי בִנְיָמִן‬ "the Benjaminites had not driven out the Jebusites dwelling in Jerusalem"—and the final main storyline clause, ‫וַיֵּשֶׁב הַיְבוּסִי אֶת־בְּנֵי בִנְיָמִן בִּירוּשָׁלַם עַד הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה‬ "the Jebusites dwelt with the Benjaminites in Jerusalem until today." The Jebusites are fronted in both clauses, thus adding to the ominous nature of those statements. This verse is the first time that the tribe of Benjamin is mentioned, and it brings to notice another incongruity in that it was Judah that sacked Jerusalem in v. 8. The parallel participial relative clauses in vv. 17 and 21, ‫הַיְבוּסִי יֹשֵׁב יְרוּשָׁלַם‬ / ‫הַכְּנַעֲנִי יוֹשֵׁב צְפַת‬ "the Canaanite dwelling in Zephath / the Jebusites dwelling in Jerusalem," also serve to open and close the episode in its current form in a strictly literary bracketing fashion.

4.2.4 Episode 4 (Judges 1:22–27)—The House of Joseph Goes Up
Against Bethel

The new actor introduced in Judg 1:22 is the subject of the first two *wayyiqtol* verbs (cf.

also v. 23) and so the House of Joseph becomes the prime candidate for thematic

participant of a new episode.[50] There is an embedded story in this episode that provides a

heightened level of interest for the reader. The episode begins וַיַּעֲלוּ בֵית־יוֹסֵף גַּם־הֵם בֵּית־אֵל

"the House of Joseph went up also[51] to Bethel." Verse 22b presents an off-line nominal

construction that is comparable in sense to the *wayəhî* clause found in v. 19— וַיהוָה

עִמָּם"and the LORD (was) with them," but distinct in form and function in that it is even

more distant from the main storyline.[52] The main storyline begins to trace the embedded

story and describes how וַיָּתִירוּ בֵית־יוֹסֵף בְּבֵית־אֵל "the House of Joseph reconnoitred

Bethel," which is then followed by a nominal circumstantial clause similar to what was

seen in vv. 10 and 11—וְשֵׁם־הָעִיר לְפָנִים לוּז "and the name of the city beforehand (was)

Luz" (Judg 1:23).

Over the course of the next three verses a human-interest story develops so that

two participants, the reconnaissance patrol and the Luzite they accost, vie for

prominence. The patrol is first up as subject of the main storyline clause, וַיִּרְאוּ הַשֹּׁמְרִים

אִישׁ יוֹצֵא מִן־הָעִיר "the watchers saw a man coming out of the city" (Judg 1:24). Next, they

---

[50] Episodes often begin right on the main storyline without a setting introduced by a temporal or another circumstantial clause. See e.g., Gen 6:5; 6:13; 7:1; 8:1; 8:20; and 9:1. The *setûma* between vv. 21 and 22 supports the idea of a narrative shift at this point, which is also indicated by the new thematic participant, the House of Joseph. The use of גַּם־הֵם "they also" may suggest a parallel storyline rather than a strictly sequential one here.

[51] See Andersen for גַּם attached to a pronoun where he stated that "Even when Y is a free form, *gam* is sometimes attached to a pronoun in apposition with it, rather than to Y itself" (*Sentence in Biblical Hebrew*, 157).

[52] Boda and Conway saw this nominal circumstantial clause as a background inner paragraph comment (I am not convinced there is a difference in the meaning of what is being described here as an attendant circumstance) that may indicate a lack of reliance on the LORD here. They also noted the similarity with v. 19, but did not consider v. 22 as the opening of a new narrative episode (*Judges*, 136).

address him (*wayyiqtol*) with a demand—וַיֹּאמְרוּ לוֹ הַרְאֵנוּ נָא אֶת־מְבוֹא הָעִיר וְעָשִׂינוּ עִמְּךָ חָסֶד "they said to him: 'show us a way into the city and we will deal kindly with you.'" The direct speech consists of the imperative demand and the *weqatal* promise that are both future oriented and thus prescriptive/predictive. Longacre considered this kind of discourse to also be on the main event line.[53] So far, the watchers have, in this single verse, amassed four instances of being the subject of main event line verbs. They should be considered at least secondarily thematic participants on that basis.

It is worth repeating a few things about reported direct speech here. The first thing is that the constellation of verb forms often changes drastically. For the main events of the past that are being recounted in direct speech, the *qatal* form is mostly used. For activities deemed to be future from the speaker's perspective, *yiqtol* and *weqatal* sequences predominate. Direct speech is, in reality, not so far removed from the main storyline and so carries the force of the storyline in considerable measure, even though it has its own means of foregrounding and backgrounding within the direct speech unit through different verbal constellations. This correlates to the idea that the direct speech unit is, in a strictly grammatical sense, the direct object of the quotation formula.[54]

In Judg 1:25 the Luzite is the subject of the first main storyline clause of the verse, וַיַּרְאֵם אֶת־מְבוֹא הָעִיר "he showed them a way into the city." The patrol must have included a sizable force because then (with no indication, nor likely opportunity in the circumstances, that it was reinforced) וַיַּכּוּ אֶת־הָעִיר לְפִי־חָרֶב וְאֶת־הָאִישׁ וְאֶת־כָּל־מִשְׁפַּחְתּוֹ שִׁלֵּחוּ "they struck the city with the edge of the sword, and the man and all his family they let

---

[53] Longacre stated that "It is also the usual thing that the thematic participant becomes the subject of at least one clause on the main event line whether in the *waw* plus prefixal verbs of narrative, or the imperative or *waw* plus suffixal verbs of predictive/prescriptive discourse" ("Flood Story" [1976], 240).

[54] Longacre, *Joseph* (2003), 82.

go free." In v. 26 this otherwise unnamed man becomes the subject of the next three

preterite clauses—וַיֵּלֶךְ הָאִישׁ אֶרֶץ הַחִתִּים וַיִּבֶן עִיר וַיִּקְרָא שְׁמָהּ לוּז "the man went to the land of

the Hittites. He built a city. He called its name Luz." The man should also be considered

a secondarily thematic participant on that basis.

The episode starts to conclude in typical fashion with an off-line comment, וְלֹא־

הוֹרִישׁ מְנַשֶּׁה "Manasseh did not drive out" a lengthy list of Canaanite dwellers, but is

followed by a final on-the-main-event-line clause, וַיּוֹאֶל הַכְּנַעֲנִי לָשֶׁבֶת בָּאָרֶץ הַזֹּאת "the

Canaanite was intent to dwell in that land" (Judg 1:27).[55] Again, I understand this as

being a cataphoric use of a *wayyiqtol* clause in the terminus that anticipates the following

episode in the manner of what we saw in the terminus of Episode 2b above—the notice of

Manasseh here in the context of a transition from Episode 4 to Episode 5 preparing the

reader for the following list. It is curious that only a portion of the House of Joseph is

identified here by name, that being Manasseh. The switch in nomenclature jeopardizes

the pattern of an explicit mention of the thematic participant at some point later in the

episode after its two on-line-as-subject mentions toward the beginning, but that kind of

observation might be considered a bit pedantic in this case.

4.2.5 Episode 5 (Judges 1:28–36)—Israel Becomes Strong

The temporal clause that opens this episode offers a situation that quickly becomes

nothing short of ironic.[56] Israel is the subject of the first *wayyiqtol* finite verb, וַיְהִי כִּי־חָזַק

---

[55] Again the open division marked in the MT between vv. 26 and 27 (but specifically marked as closed in Cairo Codex) does not accord with the textlinguistic evidence that promotes a conclusion of the episode after v. 27.

[56] The divisions in the MT after vv. 28 (closed), 29 (open), 30, 32, and 33 (closed), appear to be based more on certain topics of the sections—Israel, Ephraim, Zebulun, Asher, Naphtali, and Dan—rather than the main storyline subjects determined textlinguistically—Israel, the Canaanite, the Canaanite, the Asherite, Naphtali, the Amorites, the Amorites, the hand of the House of Joseph.

יִשְׂרָאֵל וַיָּשֶׂם אֶת־הַכְּנַעֲנִי לָמַס "when Israel became strong *it put* the Canaanite to forced labour" (Judg 1:28). The immediately following concessive is ominous— וְהוֹרֵישׁ לֹא הוֹרִישׁוֹ "but did not drive it out completely." This episode is also of a quite different character, much more expository in presentation, than the others that make up Judg 1 so far. This is evident in the proliferation of *lô ʾ qatal* forms that, as negation, put these clauses at the farthest distance from the main storyline (see Judg 1:28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34).[57] The subjects of the verbal constructions are Israel itself and all the tribes listed in the episode (Israel, Ephraim, Zebulon, Asher / the Asherite, Naphtali, the Danites). What they all failed to do was to drive out the Canaanite / the dweller in the land. Instead, the main storyline describes the situation thus: וַיֵּשֶׁב הַכְּנַעֲנִי בְּקִרְבּוֹ בְּגָזֶר "the Canaanite dwelt in its midst in Gezer" (Judg 1:29); וַיֵּשֶׁב הַכְּנַעֲנִי בְּקִרְבּוֹ "the Canaanite dwelt in its midst" (Judg 1:30); וַיֵּשֶׁב הָאָשֵׁרִי בְּקֶרֶב הַכְּנַעֲנִי "the Asherite dwelt in the midst of the Canaanite" (Judg 1:32); וַיֵּשֶׁב בְּקֶרֶב הַכְּנַעֲנִי "he/it (Naphtali) dwelt in the midst of the Canaanite" (Judg 1:33); וַיִּלְחֲצוּ הָאֱמֹרִי אֶת־בְּנֵי־דָן הָהָרָה "the Amorite crowded the Danites into the hill country" (Judg 1:34); וַיּוֹאֶל הָאֱמֹרִי לָשֶׁבֶת בְּהַר־חֶרֶס "the Amorite was intent to dwell at Mount Heres" (Judg 1:35). Just as the Amorite crowded out the Danites into the highlands, so the Amorite and Canaanite crowd out the Israelites as thematic participants. What the Israelites were able to achieve *in all their strength* is to put the inhabitants to forced labour in three more

---

[57] Longacre allowed that there may be occasion for "a momentous negation that advances the narrative line" (*Joseph* [2003], 79), and Heller mentioned it specifically with respect to the *lô ʾ qatal* form (*Narrative Structure*, 24, 182n85, 279–80n34, 387n67), but he was careful not to extend the possibilities for this too much. "In most cases, the negation of the verbs אָבָה (be willing) and יָכֹל (be able) signal an instance of momentous negation, since the semantic meaning of those verbs, when they are negated, implies a type of action: 'not to be willing' ≈ 'to resist, refuse'; 'not to be able' ≈ 'to fail.' It is also clear that, in some instances, other verbs may also be employed for momentous negation" (437n14). The sense in this episode and the previous one is not one implying a type of action, but on the contrary, an explicit lack of action. It is the Canaanite and Amorite who, for the most part, are actively dwelling among and crowding the various Israelite tribes in the land.

instances after the first one noted above in v. 28. They all come in *hāyâ* constructions at vv. 30, 33, 35, so decidedly off the main narrative storyline. The circumstantial border notice ends the episode in typical fashion.

Longacre was reluctant to provide a cline for the verb ranking for expository material because he did not consider enough research had been done on it.[58] He did consider that it might be the inverse of narrative or predictive discourse,[59] and so nominal constructions, negation, participles, infinitives, and *hāyâ* constructions would all be prominent.[60] This episode, while having an expository character to a certain extent, is still nonetheless set within a narrative frame with *wayyiqtol* clauses. The expository material in Judg 3:1–5 is also similarly set in a narrative frame.

Excursus: Analysis of Historical Tradition Parallels with Judges 1 from Joshua

This excursus provides the analysis of parallels to Judg 1 found in Joshua. Justifications for the inclusion of the various parallels in this study are indicated, and the accompanying discourse analyses are compared to findings from Judg 1. A summary of key observations is provided at the end of the excursus.

Joshua 8:10–23 and 12:9, 16 // Judges 1:22–26—Sacking of Ai-Bethel

The inclusion of this parallel is based on the mention of Bethel in both Joshua and Judges. It is suggested "that confusion has arisen between the history of ʿAi and that of

---

[58] Longacre, *Joseph* (2003), 111.
[59] Longacre, *Joseph* (2003), 111.
[60] Heller has extended Longacre's study of expository material and finds primary clause forms to be verbless, *hāyâ* with verb, incomplete clauses (interjections, etc.), and participials. Secondary material would be signified by an object plus a *qatal* or *yiqtol* form (*Narrative Structure*, 468).

the near-by site of Bethel,"[61] Ai having been an Early Bronze Age site that was destroyed

almost a millennium earlier. William Foxwell Albright thought "that there has been a

shifting of scene from Bethel, which was actually destroyed by the Israelites in the

thirteenth century B.C., to the great neighboring ruin, ha-ʿAi."[62] If these two accounts are

actually parallels concerning the same locale, then very different narratives are presented

about an event there. The account in Josh 8 is embedded in the story about the initial

failure to take the city as punishment due to the sin of Achan. The story of the battles to

take Ai, however, actually have much more in common with the defeat and capture of the

town of Gibeah for its great sin in Judg 20 than it does with the taking of Bethel in Judg

1.[63] There is clearly some interdependence between the two stories in Josh 8 and Judg 20,

though the exact nature of it is unclear.[64] The complex compositional history of this

account in Josh 8 is evident when the MT is compared with the seemingly simplified

version of the LXX.[65] In the list of conquered kings, Josh 12:9 lists the king of Ai in

---

[61] Kenyon, *Archaeology*, 115.

[62] Albright, "Israelite Conquest," 16. Albright went on to state that

> To be sure, the narrative in Joshua applies to the site of et-Tell, not to that of Beitîn, so that the story cannot be based on first-hand tradition throughout, but must have aetiological elements. We may also suppose that it reflects a much older Canaanite tradition with regard to the fall of the Early-Bronze city, though we can hardly admit that the story as a whole survived the transformation of population that was effected by the Israelite conquest. On the other hand, Bethel was actually sacked and destroyed in the thirteenth century B.C., at the end of a long period of Canaanite occupation and before an equally long period of Israelite occupation. What was more natural than that this tradition, current for many generations among the Israelite inhabitants of Bethel, should have been attached to the impressive Canaanite ruins of et-Tell, whose destruction actually preceded the foundation of Bethel? ("Israelite Conquest," 17).

[63] Boling, *Joshua*, 236; Nelson, *Joshua*, 111. See Rösel, *Joshua*, 122–23 for an extensive comparison of the verbal relationship between Josh 8 and Judg 20.

[64] Boling stated that "Wellhausen's idea that Joshua 8 was the 'model' for Judges 19–20 is now generally turned around by critical scholars. But the similarities and differences cannot all be comprehended as a result of unilinear development or as a polemical challenge and response concerning the same events" (*Joshua*, 243).

[65] Dozeman, *Joshua 1–12*, 366–70. Nelson was of a different opinion, viewing the MT as expansionistic (*Joshua*, 110).

connection with Bethel (but cf. also Josh 12:16 where Bethel is mentioned separately, but not in the LXX).

This episode begins with a clause directly on the main storyline with Joshua as the subject of the introductory *wayyiqtol* (i.e., narrative preterite, main storyline) verb, וַיַּשְׁכֵּם יְהוֹשֻׁעַ "Joshua rose early," and a temporal expression indicating a new scene, בַּבֹּקֶר "in the morning." The storyline continues, וַיִּפְקֹד אֶת־הָעָם "he mustered the people" . . . וַיַּעַל "he went up" . . . הָעָי "to Ai." So two of the main actors in this episode have now been introduced in Josh 8:10, Joshua and the people (of Israel), and so also an important symbolic prop has been noted—the city of Ai. Ai is referred to by name, by pronoun, or as "the city" twenty-eight times in this episode.

The storyline continues, carried by *wayyiqtol* clauses, after the intervening circumstantial recapitulation הָעָם "the people" . . . עָלוּ "had gone up," וַיִּגְּשׁוּ וַיָּבֹאוּ נֶגֶד הָעִיר וַיַּחֲנוּ מִצְּפוֹן לָעַי "they approached, they arrived in front of the city, (and) they encamped to the north of Ai." The people of Israel begin to assert themselves as the primary thematic characters of this episode by being the subjects of all three main storyline verbs and one off-line verb here in Josh 8:11. We will see that they are mentioned twenty-eight times by various names—(all) the people, (all) Israel, the fighters, the ambushers, men—by pronoun, and by implication as unstated subjects of verbs. At Josh 8:12 the subject of the main storyline verbs is once again Joshua, by implication in the singular form of the verbs, וַיִּקַּח כַּחֲמֵשֶׁת אֲלָפִים אִישׁ וַיָּשֶׂם אוֹתָם אֹרֵב "he took about 5000 men (and) he set them in ambush." The lack of explicit subject here seems a bit awkward and perhaps is an indication of the composite nature of this story. In v. 13 the subject of the storyline *wayyiqtol* verb is once again the people of v. 11, וַיָּשִׂימוּ הָעָם אֶת־כָּל־הַמַּחֲנֶה "the people set

the whole camp," before reverting to Joshua—explicitly this time—with וַיֵּלֶךְ יְהוֹשֻׁעַ "Joshua went" . . . בְּתוֹךְ הָעֵמֶק "in the midst of the valley." With seventeen references to the character Joshua in this episode, he is secondarily thematic.

The point of view changes at Josh 8:14 with the *wayəhî* circumstantial notice—so off the main storyline—that וַיְהִי כִּרְאוֹת מֶלֶךְ־הָעַי "when the king of Ai saw (this)," the storyline shifts focus onto the men of Ai. They are the subjects of the next three storyline *wayyiqtol* verbs, וַיְמַהֲרוּ וַיַּשְׁכִּימוּ וַיֵּצְאוּ אַנְשֵׁי־הָעִיר לִקְרַאת־יִשְׂרָאֵל "the men of the city hurried, they rose early, (and) they went out to meet Israel." In v. 15 the subjects of the main storyline verbs once again become Joshua and all Israel, וַיִּנָּגְעוּ יְהוֹשֻׁעַ וְכָל־יִשְׂרָאֵל "Joshua and all Israel were beaten back" . . . וַיָּנֻסוּ "they fled," but the perspective remains that of the king of Ai as the *niphal* passive of the first *wayyiqtol* verb diminishes the apparent agency of Joshua and all Israel, even though the reader anticipates a better outcome through some foreknowledge of Joshua's plan. The main storyline continues in Josh 8:16–17, וַיִּזָּעֲקוּ כָּל־הָעָם "all the people were called out" . . . וַיִּרְדְּפוּ אַחֲרֵי יְהוֹשֻׁעַ וַיִּנָּתְקוּ מִן־הָעִיר "they chased after Joshua, they were drawn away from the city" . . . וַיַּעַזְבוּ אֶת־הָעִיר פְּתוּחָה "they left the city open, they chased after Israel." וַיִּרְדְּפוּ אַחֲרֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל With nineteen references to the people of Ai in this episode, they are also secondarily thematic.

The episode continues in v. 18 with the introduction of another character as a subject on the main storyline, not seen since the previous episode at Josh 8:1, 7, 8—the LORD. The first bit of direct reported speech also occurs after the quotation formula, וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֶל־יְהוֹשֻׁעַ "the LORD said to Joshua," נְטֵה בַּכִּידוֹן אֲשֶׁר־בְּיָדְךָ אֶל־הָעַי כִּי בְיָדְךָ אֶתְּנֶנָּה "stretch out the javelin that is in your hand toward Ai, for into your hand I will give it."[66]

---

[66] Robert Culley saw this notice as a key indicator of two different perspectives intertwined in the narrative.

As the quotation formula begins a *wayyiqtol* clause with the LORD as the subject, the entire quotation itself is the direct object of the main storyline verb. Joshua's immediate response that וַיֵּט יְהוֹשֻׁעַ בַּכִּידוֹן אֲשֶׁר־בְּיָדוֹ אֶל־הָעִיר "(he) stretched out the javelin that was in his hand toward the city," is also a *wayyiqtol* main storyline clause. Its verbal similarity to the immediately preceding command of the LORD reinforces "the now familiar pattern of command and obedience"[67] that is found throughout the book. The obedience of Joshua to the word of the LORD, and the people's obedience to the commands of Joshua, are key characteristics of the book of Joshua. The people's obedience to the command of Joshua is evident in their main storyline actions in v. 19, וַיָּרוּצוּ "they ran" . . . וַיָּבֹאוּ הָעִיר וַיִּלְכְּדוּהָ וַיְמַהֲרוּ וַיַּצִּיתוּ אֶת־הָעִיר בָּאֵשׁ "they entered the city, they captured it, they hurried, they set the city on fire," among the circumstantial clauses וְהָאוֹרֵב קָם מְהֵרָה מִמְּקוֹמוֹ "whereupon the ambushers rose quickly from their place" and כִּנְטוֹת יָדוֹ "when he stretched out his hand."

The focus of the storyline turns back to the men of Ai in Josh 8:20 when וַיִּפְנוּ אַנְשֵׁי הָעַי אַחֲרֵיהֶם וַיִּרְאוּ וְהִנֵּה "the men of Ai turned their backs, they looked, and lo (*hinneh*). . . ." Their confusion at the suddenly altered situation is described off the main storyline in a series of circumstantial statements depicting the smoke of the city going up and their inability to escape certain doom.[68] The circumstantial material continues through the first

---

Thus, at one level the story proceeds as if Israel is faced with a powerful enemy that can only be overcome if caught in a trap. On the other hand, the announcement at the beginning of the story makes clear that Yahweh has everything under control. The only indication of this in the story is the unexplained instruction to Joshua to raise his weapon. These two different perspectives may reflect stages in the growth of the story, but they remain side by side in the present form of the story without pulling it apart ("Stories of the Conquest," 40).

[67] Nelson, *Joshua*, 112.

[68] See Bar-Efrat (*Narrative Art*, 35) and Berlin (*Poetics*, 62) on the use of הִנֵּה (*hinneh*) to describe dawning awareness in narrative characters.

half of v. 21, this time depicting the scene from the point of view of Joshua and all Israel,

before returning to the main storyline with the *wayyiqtol* clauses, וַיָּשֻׁבוּ וַיַּכּוּ אֶת־אַנְשֵׁי הָעָי,

"they turned, they struck the men of Ai." The episode closes with the reiteration on the

storyline in v. 22 that וַיַּכּוּ אוֹתָם "they struck them," and the final notice of v. 23 that וַיַּקְרִבוּ

אֹתוֹ אֶל־יְהוֹשֻׁעַ "they brought (the king of Ai) to Joshua."

The taking of Bethel in Judg 1:22–27 is presented as more of a human-interest

story with all of the ambivalence inherent in deal-making between individuals seeking

gain or advantage. It is set in the time after the death of Joshua,[69] and it is the House of

Joseph taking the initiative in that case. In that instance the episode concludes in Judg

1:28 with the unhappy circumstance of Manasseh not driving out the Canaanites and the

Canaanites continuing to dwell in the land. Bethel assumes some importance in Judg

20:18, 23, 26 as the resting place of the Ark.[70] This connects back to Judg 2:1–5 at

Bochim (identified explicitly as Bethel in the LXX) and the transition to a new generation

in Judg 2:7 and 10.[71]

---

[69] Barnabas Lindars made some useful literary arguments against Albright's theory in that

there is really nothing in common between the two narratives, and if the Joshua account is
accepted and applied to Bethel, the Judges account must be abandoned. Moreover it should be
observed that, if the author of the Prelude is also responsible for Judges 20, he not only knew the
Ai story but also made use of it as the model for the stratagem against the Benjaminites at Gibeah.
From his point of view the capture of Ai belonged to the conquest under Joshua, whereas Bethel
was taken only after Joshua had died   (*Judges 1–5*, 51).

[70] Martin, *Judges*, 211–12.

[71] Lindars viewed these two verses as the opening to the original introduction of Judges (*Judges 1–5*, 94).

Joshua 10:1–5, 22–27; 12:10 // Judges 1:1–8—Adoni Zedek/Bezek

On the heals of the ruse by Gibeon that resulted in a treaty with Joshua and Israel at Josh

9, is the account of the battle of Gibeon, an episode that begins at Josh 10:1. We will deal

with the first five verses, where Adoni Zedek,[72] king of Jerusalem, is explicitly

mentioned multiple times, and is a counterpoint to the other thematic character of the

episode, Joshua. We will then skip down to the next episode concerning the execution of

the Amorite kings, specifically Josh 10:22–27, where the king of Jerusalem is explicitly

mentioned again. Lastly, we will recognize the mention of the king of Jerusalem at Josh

12:10, in the list there of conquered kings of the land.

The connection between these passages and Judg 1:1–7 is the mention of Adoni

Zedek/Bezek in the context of Jerusalem. As in the sacking of Ai/Bethel, the story in

Judges is quite different. In Judges, Judah (and Simeon) goes up against the Canaanite

and Perizzite;[73] in Joshua the coalition of five Amorite kings goes up against Gibeon. The

manner of the death of the king is also described quite differently. And of course, the

story in Joshua has Joshua as the protagonist, whereas the story in Judges takes place

after the death of Joshua.

The episode beginning is marked by a change in scene at Josh 10:1 with the

wayəhî temporal clause, וַיְהִי כִשְׁמֹעַ אֲדֹנִי־צֶדֶק מֶלֶךְ יְרוּשָׁלַם כִּי־לָכַד יְהוֹשֻׁעַ אֶת־הָעַי "and it was

when Adoni Zedek, king of Jerusalem, heard that Joshua had taken Ai." Both primary

thematic characters are introduced here. Joshua is the subject of the parenthetical first

---

[72] Soggin remarked that "LXX^B, here and in the verses that follow, has *ᵃdōnī-bezeq*, as in Judg 1:5ff.; Noth regards this latter reading as the original one, and thinks the former is a later attempt to adapt this tradition to that of Jerusalem. This view must be taken seriously, although there is no definite proof" (*Joshua*, 119).

[73] Canaanites and Perizzites, in the singular rather than the plural, reflect the idea of them as *collective* characters seen in the Hebrew text of Judg 1:3–5, which perhaps parallel Judah and Simeon that are similarly represented as individual persons in the text, standing in for the actual tribes.

main storyline *wayyiqtol* clause, וַיַּחֲרִימָהּ "he destroyed it." The thoughts and activities of

the king are foremost in the next four verses. Adoni Zedek is the subject of the next two

wayyiqtol storyline clauses, וַיִּירְאוּ מְאֹד "he feared much," and וַיִּשְׁלַח אֲדֹנִי־צֶדֶק "Adoni Zedek

sent" אֶל־הוֹהָם "to Hoham, etc." The quotation formula at the end of v. 3, לֵאמֹר "saying,"

introduces the recorded message to the other four kings. This message is in reported

direct speech and exhibits the requisite change of verb forms for reported direct speech

set in narrative.[74] The speech at Josh 10:4 is hortatory, with the main line of the speech

carried by imperatives and a cohortative[75]—עֲלוּ־אֵלַי וְעִזְרֻנִי וְנַכֶּה אֶת־גִּבְעוֹן "come up to me,

and help me, and let us strike Gibeon." The main storyline continues in v. 5 where וַיֵּאָסְפוּ

וַיַּעֲלוּ חֲמֵשֶׁת מַלְכֵי הָאֱמֹרִי "the five kings of the Amorites gathered and went up." Then וַיַּחֲנוּ

עַל־גִּבְעוֹן וַיִּלָּחֲמוּ עָלֶיהָ "they encamped against Gibeon, they fought against it." There was a

gathering of kings, including the Amorite ones, at Josh 9:1–2 where it is the setting for

the deception by the Gibeonites.[76] It is not clear exactly how the gathering at Josh 10:5 is

related to the one at Josh 9:1–2, but because the continuing narrative of Josh 10 includes

more than just the five kings of the Amorite coalition as subjected to conquest by Joshua

and Israel,[77] it serves to help frame the entire conquest of the southern Cisjordan after the

conquest of Jericho and Ai. The *completeness of the conquest* is emphasized at Josh

---

[74] Longacre, "Dynamics of Reported Dialogue," 125–26.

[75] Longacre, *Joseph* (2003), 121.

[76] The description of the building of the altar at Mount Ebal in Josh 8:30–35 comes after these two verses in the LXX, rather than before them as in the MT. See Tov ("Sequence Differences," 411–13) for its disconnection from its contexts and this dislocation as evidence of its late addition.

[77] Additional locations beyond the cities of the five kings reported struck by Joshua in Josh 10:28–43 are Makkedah, Libnah, Gezer, Debir, Kadesh-barnea, and Gaza. Of the cities of the five kings, Jerusalem and Jarmuth are not specifically reported as taken in this chapter, even though the kings are killed. Nonetheless, the kings of these places are recorded as defeated and their land possessed at Josh 12:10, 11.

10:42 where וְאֵת כָּל־הַמְּלָכִים הָאֵלֶּה וְאֶת־אַרְצָם לָכַד יְהוֹשֻׁעַ פַּעַם אֶחָת "Joshua had captured all these kings and their land at one time."

The execution of the five kings is recounted at Josh 10:22–27, beginning with the quotation formula, וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוֹשֻׁעַ "Joshua said," on the main storyline. The main speech line is once again carried by imperatives, פִּתְחוּ אֶת־פִּי הַמְּעָרָה וְהוֹצִיאוּ אֵלַי אֶת־חֲמֵשֶׁת הַמְּלָכִים הָאֵלֶּה "open the mouth of the cave and bring out to me these five kings," thus hortatory and mirroring the king's speech at Josh 10:4. The response is reported on the main storyline with similar vocabulary, but this time in *wayyiqtol* clauses, וַיַּעֲשׂוּ כֵן וַיֹּצִיאוּ אֵלָיו אֶת־חֲמֵשֶׁת הַמְּלָכִים הָאֵלֶּה "they did so, they brought out to him these five kings." When the main storyline picks up again part way through v. 24, Joshua is again the subject of the *wayyiqtol* clause, וַיִּקְרָא יְהוֹשֻׁעַ אֶל־כָּל־אִישׁ יִשְׂרָאֵל "Joshua called to all the men of Israel." This is immediately followed with an extended quotation formula on the main storyline, וַיֹּאמֶר אֶל־קְצִינֵי אַנְשֵׁי הַמִּלְחָמָה הֶהָלְכוּא אִתּוֹ "he said to the chief men of the battle who had gone with him." Joshua again is reported to speak with imperatives, קִרְבוּ שִׂימוּ אֶת־רַגְלֵיכֶם עַל־צַוְּארֵי הַמְּלָכִים הָאֵלֶּה "approach, place your feet on the necks of these kings." The response is again without hesitation in *wayyiqtol* clauses and using very similar vocabulary, וַיִּקְרְבוּ וַיָּשִׂימוּ אֶת־רַגְלֵיהֶם עַל־צַוְּארֵיהֶם "they approached, they placed their feet on their necks." The pattern of command and obedient execution of the command is conspicuous in this episode. The reported speech of Joshua concludes in Josh 10:25 with a final exhortation in a series of imperatives— אַל־תִּירְאוּ וְאַל־תֵּחָתּוּ חִזְקוּ וְאִמְצוּ כִּי כָכָה יַעֲשֶׂה יְהוָה לְכָל־אֹיְבֵיכֶם אֲשֶׁר אַתֶּם נִלְחָמִים אוֹתָם "do not be afraid and do not be dismayed, have courage and be strong, for this is what the LORD will do to all your enemies against whom you fight." Joshua 10:26–27 provides the manner of the kings' execution on the main storyline— וַיַּכֵּם יְהוֹשֻׁעַ

"Joshua struck them" . . . וַיְמִיתֵם "he killed them," and וַיִּתְלֵם "he hung them." Joshua is

said to later give the order and then וַיֹּרִידוּם "they took them down" . . . וַיַּשְׁלִכֶם אֶל־הַמְּעָרָה

"they cast them into the cave" . . . וַיָּשִׂמוּ אֲבָנִים גְּדֹלוֹת עַל־פִּי הַמְּעָרָה "they set large stones over

the mouth of the cave." The command-execution model comes into play here again.

We noted in the analysis of Judg 1:1–8 that the story of the lord of Bezek at Judg

1:5–8 is a sub-episode, embedded in the opening episode of the book that describes the

Israelites inquiring of the LORD after the death of Joshua, and Judah (and Simeon?)

going up against Bezek and Jerusalem. The speech given by Adoni Bezek in Judg 1:7 is

of a much different tone—somewhat contrite—than the one by Adoni Zedek/Bezek, the

king of Jerusalem, at Josh 10:4 where he expresses militancy against the Israelites. The

connection between the lord of Bezek and Jerusalem in Judg 1:7 is that the Judahites

brought him there and that is where he died—there is no account of the manner of his

death. The opening to the book of Judges reflects the command and obedient execution

depiction the reader has found in the book of Joshua, and Judah is put in a good light by

the implied author of Judges there. Nevertheless, there are the beginnings of cracks in this

representation as the execution of the LORD's command is not verbatim in this

instance—Judah requests help from his brother Simeon! And, the death of Adoni Bezek,

while reported, is not specifically attributed to the Judahites.

The list of conquered kings beginning at Josh 12:9–12a lists their cities, first in

the order that they were depicted as conquered in the narrative (i.e., Jericho, Ai/Bethel),

and then in the order that the kings are listed in Josh 10:3, 5, 23. This supports the idea

forwarded in the previous chapter of this study of Josh 12 being a summary of the

preceding conquest narrative.

Joshua 14:6–15 and 15:13–19 // Judges 1:9–16, 20—Allotment to Caleb

There is a bare narrative frame attached to the lists of Josh 12–13 at Josh 12:1, 6–7; 13:1–

2a, 6aβ–8, 12bβ–15, 22, 24, 29, 32–33.[78] The lists describe the kings defeated by Moses

and Joshua and their territory, the distribution of inheritances east of the Jordan River by

Moses, and *the land remaining to be possessed*. The contents of the lists are described

using participial, nominal, and *wayəhî* constructions throughout,[79] which categorizes

them as *expository*.[80] We have already noted above that Josh 13:1 is a key inflection point

in the overall narrative arc of the book, and that it connects narratively back to Josh 11:23

and forward to Josh 23:1. The importance of this was discussed in detail during the

analysis of Josh 23 in the previous chapter. At Josh 14:1–5 the narrative becomes more

extensive—it actually begins a new section of narrative—as it sets the *stage* for the

distribution of the land west of the Jordan River by Eleazar and Joshua.[81] This *stage* is off

---

[78] A. Graeme Auld thought that the LXX may reflect a *better* Hebrew *Vorlage* specifically for the transition between the command to Joshua to apportion the land to the nine and one-half tribes and the Transjordanian review at Josh 13:7, 8 where MT has עִמּוֹ "with *it*," requiring the pronominal suffix to refer to the two different halves of the tribe of Manasseh simultaneously. He also pointed out that the definite article on שֵׁבֶט in וַחֲצִי הַשֵּׁבֶט הַמְנַשֶּׁה "and the half-tribe of Manasseh" is not grammatically correct, and that the double notice of נָתַן לָהֶם מֹשֶׁה "Moses gave to them" is awkward ("Textual and Literary Studies," 413). Auld's detailed study of the distribution of the land in the second half of the book of Joshua posited that the narrative originally had Joshua distributing land to ten tribes west of the Jordan (Manasseh and Ephraim = Joseph [i.e., one tribe]) and Moses to two tribes to the east—he suggested deleting Josh 13:7aβ–b (to the nine tribes and the half-tribe of Manasseh) from a previous version of the text (*Joshua, Moses and the Land*, 59, 105).

[79] Exceptions to this rule are the *yiqtol* at Josh 13:3 where the listed regions of the Philistines "are counted" as Canaanite and the *qatal* verbs at Josh 13:10, 12a, 21 where the listed kings are described as "having reigned." Those exceptions are to be considered *backgrounded* exposition.

[80] Heller, *Narrative Structure*, 465.

[81] Auld commented on the confusing nature of the narrative framework in the second half of Joshua. "It is well known that the evaluation of our book's conception of land division is complicated not just because the second start at ch. 18 for the seven remaining tribes is nowhere anticipated in the earlier chapters, but also because the allocation in the earlier chapters is prepared for twice and quite differently at the beginning of ch. 13 and 11" ("Textual and Literary Studies," 413).

the main storyline, with a series of *x-qatal* clauses and a noun clause, until the final

wayyiqtol clause at Josh 14:5b, וַיַּחְלְקוּ אֶת־הָאָרֶץ "(the Israelites) apportioned the land."[82]

Surprisingly, the story of the apportionment of the land begins, not with the

apportioning of inheritances to the various remaining tribes, but a story about the *giving*

of an inheritance to an individual—Caleb (Josh 14:6–15; 15:13–19). In fact, the

apportioning of the land does not take place until Josh 18:1–10. An *allotment* for the tribe

of Judah is described in a boundary list—no narrative—at Josh 15:1–12 that interrupts

the narrative concerning Caleb's inheritance.[83] The *inheritance* of Judah then continues to

be described at Josh 15:20–62 in the form of a list of cities, framed at the end in Josh

15:63 by a bit of narrative that describes the resolve of the Jebusites to dwell in

Jerusalem. Joshua 16:1—17:18 describes the *allotment of inheritances* to Ephraim and

Manasseh, mostly in boundary or city list form with a few short narratives sprinkled in as

framing material. Joshua 18:1–10 finally recounts the story of the *apportionment of*

inheritances to the remaining seven tribes in a new setting (Shiloh), with Josh 18:11—

19:48 describing their extent with a combination of city and boundary lists. The story of

the apportionment of the land comes to a satisfying conclusion with the narrative frame

provided by the account of the people of Israel *giving an inheritance* to Joshua (Josh

19:49–50) and a summary statement (Josh 19:51). The giving of inheritances to the

individuals Caleb and Joshua bracket the entire section of Josh 14:1—19:51 on the

distribution of the land west of the Jordan River.

---

[82] Longacre describes the stage to the flood narrative in Gen 6:9–12 in terms similar to the stage here at Josh 14:1–5. It begins well off the main storyline with a noun clause and a series of *x-qatal* circumstantial clauses, and then goes to the main storyline with *wayyiqtol* clauses ("Flood Narrative" [1976], 241). The stage provides essential background and setting material for a following series of episodes that constitute a narrative.

[83] The list here is of a quite different character than the ones found in Josh 12–13, using a number of *weqatal* verbs to describe the paths of the boundaries.

The story of Caleb begins on the main storyline at Josh 14:6 when וַיִּגְּשׁוּ בְנֵי־יְהוּדָה אֶל־יְהוֹשֻׁעַ "the Judahites approached Joshua." Caleb—presumably a leader of the delegation—then gives a speech to Joshua introduced with the quotation formula, וַיֹּאמֶר אֵלָיו כָּלֵב "Caleb said to him," also on the main storyline. Caleb's speech recounts a version of the stories found at Num 13–14 and Deut 1:19–46. The speech and its narrative frame here in Josh 14:6–15 contain a number of definite references to the stories in Numbers and Deuteronomy, the most important in the context of going up to take possession of the inheritance, which are, the name of the location as Hebron (Num 13:22; Josh 14:13, 14, 15), that its inhabitants are Anakim (Num 13:22, 28, 33; Josh 14:12, 15), that it was a large, fortified city (Num 13:28; Deut 1:28; Josh 14:12); and that Caleb (and his offspring) was to inherit it (Num 14:24; Deut 1:36; Josh 14:9, 13, 14).[84] Because Caleb is telling a story (i.e., *narrative speech*), there are a couple of instances of *wayyiqtol* preterites in his embedded speech, as might be expected: וָאָשֵׁב אֹתוֹ דָּבָר "I returned to him (Moses) a word" (Josh 14:7); and וַיִּשָּׁבַע מֹשֶׁה "Moses swore" (Josh 14:9).[85] The speech is a request from Caleb to Joshua to remember the promise by Moses of specific land to him and a demand to give it to him (תְּנָה־לִּי)—the time to do so is now.

---

[84] Other verbal correspondences beside the inclusion by name of Joshua and/or Caleb (Num 13:6, 16, 30; 14:6, 24, 30, 38; Deut 1:36, 38), or Moses in the original events are: Kadesh (Barnea) (Num 13:26; Deut 1:19; Josh 14:6, 7); they returned to them a word / I returned to him a word (Num 13:26; Josh 14:7); our brothers melted our hearts / my brothers . . . melted the heart of the people (Deut 1:28; Josh 14:8); wilderness (banishment) / journey to the wilderness / Israel walked in the wilderness (Num 14:25–35; Deut 1:40; Josh 14:10); the hill country (Num 13:17, 29; Josh 14:12); fully went after me / fully went after the LORD / fully went after the LORD (my/the) God (of Israel) (Num 14:24; Deut 1:36; Josh 14:8, 9, 14).

[85] There is no mention of Moses swearing in either the Numbers or Deuteronomy segments. One other notable difference in vocabulary between the stories is the term used for the exploration of the twelve men. In Numbers the term used regularly is תּוּר "reconnoitre" (Num 13:2, 16, 17, 21, 25, 32; 14:6, 7, 34, 36, 38). In Deut 1:22 the term used is חָפַר "search." The book of Joshua uses here the term רַגֵּל "scout" (Josh 14:7) as does Deut 1:24.

The narrative frame to the speech picks up again on the main storyline at Josh

14:13—וַיְבָרְכֵהוּ יְהוֹשֻׁעַ וַיִּתֵּן אֶת־חֶבְרוֹן לְכָלֵב בֶּן־יְפֻנֶּה לְנַחֲלָה "Joshua blessed him. He gave

Hebron to Caleb, son of Jephunneh, as an inheritance." There is some circumstantial

material in Josh 14:14–15[86] and then the narrative is interrupted by the description of

Judah's allotment in Josh 15:1–12.[87] The narrative continues, with a resumptive

repetition at Josh 15:13 that connects back to Josh 14:13–15.[88] There is then the main

storyline וַיֹּרֶשׁ מִשָּׁם כָּלֵב "Caleb drove out from there," at Josh 15:14, the three certain

Anakim—Sheshay, Ahiman, and Talmay—that makes another connection back to Num

13:22.[89] The narrative takes a turn, on the main storyline by means of the *wayyiqtol*

clause, at Josh 15:15 as the scene moves without a break from Hebron to Debir—וַיַּעַל

מִשָּׁם אֶל־יֹשְׁבֵי דְּבִר "he went up from there against those dwelling in Debir." This narrative

could be viewed as somewhat at odds with the narrative at Josh 10:36–39 where it is

Joshua and all Israel that took and struck Hebron and Debir.[90] However, they are not

mutually exclusive, as the vignette at Judg 1:9–16 demonstrates. There (Caleb?) and

Othniel strike and take Debir (and Hebron?) *in the context of* Judah's exploits in the

southern hill country, albeit after the death of Joshua recorded in Judg 1:1.

Joshua 15:15 introduces the interesting story about Caleb, his daughter Achsah,

and his kinsman Othniel that is duplicated almost verbatim at Judg 1:11–15.[91] The

---

[86] That Hebron was formerly Qiryat Arba is also recounted at Judg 1:10.

[87] Rösel, *Joshua*, 241.

[88] Dozeman, *Joshua 13–24*, 195–96.

[89] The order of the three Anakim in Num 13:22 is Ahiman, Sheshay, and Talmay.

[90] Boling, *Joshua*, 376; Rösel, *Joshua*, 241.

[91] Differences are limited to different *wayyiqtol* verbs at Josh 15:15 (וַיַּעַל "he went up") and Judg 1:11 (וַיֵּלֶךְ "he went"); defective morphology of Debir (דְּבִר) at Josh 15:15 and *plene* at Judg 1:11 (דְּבִיר), twice each; the definite article is lacking on שָׂדֶה "a field" at Josh 15:18 and included at Judg 1:14, הַשָּׂדֶה "the field"; Josh 15:19 has the *wayyiqtol* verb וַתֹּאמֶר "she said" without a following prepositional phrase and Judg 1:15 adds לוֹ "to him (Caleb)"; Josh 15:19 uses a different imperative expression, תְּנָה־לִּי, for "give to me" than that at Judg 1:15, הָבָה־לִּי; in Josh 15:19 the subject of the final *wayyiqtol* verb is left implicit in

narrative features of this story were described in some detail above in the analysis of

Judg 1, but it is suitable at this point to point out how this story might function differently

in its two distinct contexts. Thomas Dozeman stated that

> Judges 1:12–15 is embedded within a pro-Judean narrative, in which Judah has
> already conquered Hebron and Debir. The insertion of the story about Caleb,
> Achsah, and Othniel immediately after Judah's conquest is abrupt; no explanation
> is provided for the introduction of Caleb. The addition does acquire function in
> the subsequent literary development of the book of Judges, especially in the role
> of Othniel.[92]

He went on to state that the

> aim of the author of Josh 15:13–19 is to reinterpret the pro-Judean account of
> Caleb from Judg 1:12–15. The author of Joshua underscores the central role of the
> northern hero Joshua in allotting territory to Judah and in granting the city of
> Hebron to Caleb. Both of these themes contrast to the portrayal of Judah in Judg 1
> as conquering Hebron and Debir and as giving one or both of these cities to
> Caleb.[93]

This may, or may not, be the intention of the implied author, and Trent Butler was of the

differing opinion that the "reason for incorporating the Caleb tradition at this point is to

demonstrate again that everything was done according to the divine word, even when no

specific reference can be made to where such a command was given. The command to

Joshua is simply the command given to Moses and fulfilled through Joshua."[94]

Regardless of the adequacy of such explanations, the diffusion of the command-execution

pattern from the book of Joshua over a period of three generations (Moses, Joshua, post-

Joshua Judah) in the Joshua–Judges relationship is noticeable.

---

the verb form, וַיִּתֶּן־לָהּ "he gave to her" whereas the name is made explicit in Judg 1:15, וַיִּתֶּן־לָהּ כָּלֵב "Caleb
gave to her."
[92] Dozeman, *Joshua 13–24*, 196.
[93] Dozeman, *Joshua 13–24*, 196.
[94] Butler, *Joshua 13–24*, 135.

The notice at Judg 1:16 about the Kenites is not reflected in the narrative of Joshua. It is perhaps only included in Judges to set up the characters Heber and Jael in Judg 4–5.

Joshua 15:63 // Judges 1:8, 21—Jebusites Persist in Jerusalem

The first half of the book of Joshua perpetuates the tradition of a complete and absolute conquest of the land of Canaan, which is exemplified at Josh 11:23 by the notice (much of it on the main storyline) that וַיִּקַּח יְהוֹשֻׁעַ אֶת־כָּל־הָאָרֶץ כְּכֹל אֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר יְהוָה אֶל־מֹשֶׁה וַיִּתְּנָהּ יְהוֹשֻׁעַ לְנַחֲלָה לְיִשְׂרָאֵל כְּמַחְלְקֹתָם לְשִׁבְטֵיהֶם וְהָאָרֶץ שָׁקְטָה מִמִּלְחָמָה "Joshua took all the land in accordance with all that the LORD had spoken to Moses. Joshua gave it as an inheritance according to their allotments to their tribes, and the land was at rest from war." The key structural verse at Josh 13:1[95] introduces an *unexpected problem* into the story—a common literary device that propels the plot forward— וִיהוֹשֻׁעַ זָקֵן בָּא בַּיָּמִים וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֵלָיו אַתָּה זָקַנְתָּה בָּאתָ בַיָּמִים וְהָאָרֶץ נִשְׁאֲרָה הַרְבֵּה־מְאֹד לְרִשְׁתָּהּ "and now Joshua had grown old, advanced in days. The LORD said to him: 'you have grown old, advanced in days, and *very much land remains to possess*.'" The second half of the book of Joshua contains several examples of this countertradition that "points forward to the problems created in the book of Judges."[96] Joshua 15:63 is one example of these.[97] Butler proposed that these "notices are

---

[95] Joshua 13:1 begins with a temporal clause that provides the setting for what follows, and continues with a main storyline quotation formula and the LORD's speech to Joshua that is mostly expository but culminates on a predictive and hortatory note.

[96] Butler, *Joshua 13–24*, 122.

[97] Other examples are Josh 13:13; 16:10; 17:12–13. Joshua's response to the LORD's prompting at Josh 13:1 is found at Josh 18:3, "So Joshua said to the Israelites, 'How long will you be slack about going in and taking possession of the land that the LORD, the God of your ancestors, has given you?'" (NRSV).

carefully placed in our section at the end of units to give theological interpretation to the units."[98]

These theological interpretations are not all the same, however. Here at Josh 15:63 the Jebusites persisted in dwelling in Jerusalem because לֹא־יָכְלוּ בְנֵי־יְהוּדָה לְהוֹרִישָׁם "the Judahites were *not able* to drive them out." Similar phraseology is used in Josh 17:12, וְלֹא יָכְלוּ בְּנֵי מְנַשֶּׁה לְהוֹרִישׁ אֶת־הֶעָרִים הָאֵלֶּה "yet the Manassehites were *not able* to drive out these cities." In these two instances alone in the book of Joshua, it is the *inability* to drive out the inhabitants that is expressly mentioned. In the corresponding parallels in Judg 1:21, 27, Benjamin(!) and Manasseh simply *did not* drive the inhabitants out. Gordon Mitchell maintained that "Joshua speaks of an inability to conquer, while Judges suggests an unwillingness to do so, and in this way emphasizes Israel's sin."[99] This may be so, but it would be more compelling if it applied also to the instances at Josh 13:13 where לֹא הוֹרִישׁוּ בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל אֶת־הַגְּשׁוּרִי וְאֶת־הַמַּעֲכָתִי "the Israelites *did not* drive out the Geshurites and the Maacathites," and Josh 16:10 where לֹא הוֹרִישׁוּ אֶת־הַכְּנַעֲנִי "they *did not* drive out the Canaanite." It is worth noting that the book of Judges does tend to draw attention more readily to the culpability of the Israelites than the book of Joshua. The pro-Judahite perspective of Judges is also in evidence there with the shifting of blame for not expelling the Jebusites from Jerusalem onto the Benjaminites in Judg 1:21 after Judah had explicitly captured the city in Judg 1:8.

---

[98] Butler, *Joshua 13–24*, 123.
[99] Mitchell, *Together in the Land*, 156.

Joshua 16:10 // Judges 1:29—Allotment to Josephites (Ephraim)

The inheritance of Ephraim is described at Josh 16:5–10, within the context of the combined inheritance of the Josephites introduced at Josh 16:1–4. The boundary paths are described in those two sections in much the same manner as those in Josh 15, with a number of *weqatal* clauses. The final notice concerning Ephraim is found at Josh 16:10—וְלֹא הוֹרִישׁוּ אֶת־הַכְּנַעֲנִי הַיּוֹשֵׁב בְּגָזֶר וַיֵּשֶׁב הַכְּנַעֲנִי בְּקֶרֶב אֶפְרַיִם עַד־הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה וַיְהִי לְמַס־עֹבֵד "but they had not driven out the Canaanite who dwelt in Gezer. The Canaanite dwelt in the midst of Ephraim until this day. It was made subject to forced labor." The parallel at Judg 1:29 is almost identical. It adds "Ephraim" specifically as the subject of the opening verb as this would not be clear in its context like it is in Josh 16:10. This more readily permits the use of a pronominal suffix on "in *its* midst" in the second clause of Judg 1:29, whereas Josh 16:10 has "in the midst of Ephraim until this day," which by naming it this way emphasizes it. The Judg 1:29 passage, in turn, adds the prepositional phrase, בְּגָזֶר "in Gezer," which emphasizes the location. The added notice at Josh 16:10bβ that "it was made subject to forced labour" is not reflected in Judg 1:29, where mere coexistence is how it is presented. The question might be asked: is it more, or less, culpable to simply coexist with the inhabitants of the land, or to subject them to forced labour?[100]

Joshua 17:11–13 // Judges 1:27–28—Allotment to Josephites (Manasseh)

The description of the allotment to Manasseh is found at Josh 17:1–10, with an embedded narrative about the daughters of Zelophehad and how they attained an inheritance among

---

[100] The Canaanites/Amorites are noted to have been subjected to forced labour at Josh 16:10; 17:13; Judg 1:28, 30, 33, 35. This goes contrary to the prohibition of this option for inhabitants of the promised land in Deut 20.

the rest of the Manassehites to the west of the Jordan River (cf. Num 27:1–7; 36:1–12). There is an addendum inserted at Josh 17:11–13 that is essentially duplicated at Judg 1:27–28.[101] It lists a series of cities belonging to Manasseh in the territories of Issachar and Asher (the additional detail of extraterritoriality is not revealed in Judg 1:27) that were *not able* to be taken by the Manassehites. In Judg 1:27 it simply states that "Manasseh *did not* drive (them) out."[102] There is a slight discrepancy in the list here at Josh 17:11 as they are in a different order and a sixth city, En-dor, is added, as is a note at the end of the verse that distinguishes the simple Dor (the third city listed) as actually being Naphath(-dor).[103]

The main narrative storyline picks up—in the second half of both Josh 17:12 and Judg 1:27—with the *wayyiqtol* clause that וַיּוֹאֶל הַכְּנַעֲנִי לָשֶׁבֶת בָּאָרֶץ הַזֹּאת "the Canaanite was intent to dwell in that land." In Judges this brings one episode to a close and sets up as a transition to the next episode (see above in the analysis at section 4.2.4 Episode 4). The main storyline continues in Josh 17:13, following the brief temporal clause וַיְהִי כִּי חָזְקוּ בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל "when the Israelites became strong," with וַיִּתְּנוּ אֶת־הַכְּנַעֲנִי לָמַס "they put the Canaanite to forced labour." Judges 1:28 is basically the same, the only differences being יִשְׂרָאֵל "Israel" rather than בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל "the Israelites," and וַיָּשֶׂם "it put (שׂים)" rather than וַיִּתְּנוּ "they put (נתן)." They both end off the main storyline with the circumstantial notice, וְהוֹרֵשׁ לֹא הוֹרִישׁוֹ "but did not drive it out completely." In Judges, this verse prepares the reader as the setting for the lengthy exposition that follows. Here in Joshua, it brings

---

[101] Lindars believed these passages come from a common source (*Judges 1–5*, 56).

[102] Lindars suggested that the *inability* of Manasseh to drive out the Canaanite is deliberately omitted in Judg 1:27 "to make the list a suitable basis for the indictment of Israel in 2:2 (and) to reinforce the Dtn introduction which follows in 2:6—3:6" (*Judges 1–5*, 50).

[103] Butler, *Joshua 13–24*, 109.

closure to the description of the inheritance of Manasseh. The next vignette will connect back to the opening section concerning the allotment of the Josephites at Josh 16:1–4.

Joshua 17:14–18 // Judges 1:19—Josephites Complain About Their Allotment

The narrative at Josh 17:14–18 is the report of a conversation between Joshua and the Josephites that connects directly back to the exposition at Josh 16:1–4 that briefly describes Joseph's allotment. That exposition ended on the narrative main storyline with the notice that וַיִּנְחֲלוּ בְנֵי־יוֹסֵף מְנַשֶּׁה וְאֶפְרָיִם "the Josephites—Manasseh and Ephraim—maintained (it) as a possession," and the narrative was then interrupted by the lengthier expositions concerning the individual inheritances/allotments to Ephraim and Manasseh. The dialogue begins here at Josh 17:14 picking up on the main storyline with the quotation formula וַיְדַבְּרוּ בְּנֵי יוֹסֵף אֶת־יְהוֹשֻׁעַ לֵאמֹר "the Josephites spoke to Joshua, saying." The quotation formula is typical of dialogue initiation where the speaker and the addressee are referred to by name.[104] The content of the Josephites' query begins in Josh 17:14bα as the object of the main storyline quotation formula and runs מַדּוּעַ נָתַתָּה לִּי נַחֲלָה גּוֹרָל אֶחָד "why have you given to me one allotment as an inheritance?" So now, as the Hebrew text unfolds, the inserted descriptions of the individual inheritances/allotments to Ephraim and Manasseh at Josh 16:5—17:13 seem incongruous with the framing narrative, as they actually describe the two distinct portions that *were* allotted/inherited. In context, the Josephites seem unnecessarily contentious, and perhaps a bit presumptuous.

---

[104] Longacre, *Joseph* (2003), 159.

Joshua responds in v. 15—conceivably a bit ironically. The main storyline

quotation formula, וַיֹּאמֶר אֲלֵיהֶם יְהוֹשֻׁעַ "Joshua said to them," identifies the speaker by

name and the addressee by preposition with a pronominal suffix. This manner of

quotation formula "represents a speech act as a *decisive intervention*, or a speech act that

the speaker attempts to make so. It is often equivalent to a kind of rank pulling on the part

of the speaker."[105] The content of the reported speech at Josh 17:15aβ–b, אִם־עַם־רַב אַתָּה

עֲלֵה לְךָ הַיַּעְרָה וּבֵרֵאתָ לְךָ שָׁם בְּאֶרֶץ הַפְּרִזִּי וְהָרְפָאִים כִּי־אָץ לְךָ הַר־אֶפְרָיִם "if you (are [such?]) a

numerous people, (then) go up on your own accord to the forest, and clear terrain there

for yourselves in the land of the Perizzite and the Rephaim, if indeed the hill country of

Ephraim (is) too restrictive for you," seems like an obvious compromise by the leader,

based on the previous self-aggrandizement of the Josephites, but which does not overtly

cause them to lose face.

The Josephites are not satisfied. They reiterate what they have said already and

add that וְרֶכֶב בַּרְזֶל בְּכָל־הַכְּנַעֲנִי הַיֹּשֵׁב בְּאֶרֶץ־הָעֵמֶק "all the Canaanite who dwell in the land of

the valley have iron chariotry." The quotation formula used is וַיֹּאמְרוּ בְּנֵי יוֹסֵף "the

Josephites said." This configuration, where the speaker is named and the addressee is not

indicated in any manner, usually "indicates that the speech is intended to be final and

does not anticipate answer or contradiction; *this also includes expressions of puzzlement

and outrage* (where again no real answer is expected)."[106]

---

[105] Longacre, *Joseph* (2003), 164. Longacre went on to state there that "the assumption here is: since Sp(eaker): Ø + Add(ressee): N(oun)/pr(onoun) is the normal form of quotation formula for continuing dialogue, any departure from this norm is significant. Here the departure from the norm consists in promoting the speaker from Ø to N(oun), thus underscoring the importance of him and his utterance, while the addressee is referred to only by pronoun."

[106] Longacre, *Joseph* (2003), 169. Longacre noted there as well "that this pattern of quotation formula in continuing dialogue is an extreme of departure from the norm." He later clarifies this departure as "Sp(eaker): N(oun) + Add(ressee): Ø expressing something on the order of an emotional outburst" (177).

So Joshua responds to this outburst with a measured response. The quotation

formula used is וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוֹשֻׁעַ אֶל־בֵּית יוֹסֵף לְאֶפְרַיִם וְלִמְנַשֶּׁה לֵאמֹר "Joshua said to the house of

Joseph, to Ephraim and to Manasseh, saying." The highest level of participant reference

is understood by Longacre to be "nouns (including proper names) + qualifiers."[107] The

addressee is now referred to as "the house of Joseph" rather than simply "the

Josephites"; the individual tribes are also added epexegetically by name to their identity.

This goes well beyond what is required by the reader to simply follow the conversation—

this manner of reference puts extra focus on the addressee. Additionally, one particular

use of a quotation formula that explicitly names the speaker and the addressee, aside from

dialogue initiation, is when the dialogue takes an important or otherwise dramatic turn.[108]

That seems to be the case here. Another use of this form of quotation formula, dialogue

medial, is to indicate "that the narrator regards the speaker and the addressee as of equal

status."[109] It is less clear that this is what the implied author is striving to achieve here,

but it is possible. In any case, the importance of Joshua's response becomes evident in the

form of discourse it presents—predictive speech.

The content of Joshua's reported speech—the direct object of the main storyline

wayyiqtol quotation formula—begins עַם־רַב אַתָּה וְכֹחַ גָּדוֹל לָךְ לֹא־יִהְיֶה לְךָ גּוֹרָל אֶחָד "you are a

numerous people and have great power. There will not be for you one allotment" (Josh

17:17b), כִּי הַר יִהְיֶה־לָּךְ "for the hill country will be yours" (Josh 17:18aα). The complete

setting of the predictive speech is found in Josh 17:17:b–18aβ. According to Longacre,

---

[107] Longacre, *Joseph* (2003), 139.
[108] Longacre stated that Sp(eaker): N(oun) + Add(ressee): N(oun) in *dialogue medial* signals that the utterance thus introduced *redirects* the dialogue so that it takes a sudden and important turn, much like a fresh beginning. The assumption behind this claim . . . is that, since Sp(eaker): N(oun) + Add(ressee): N(oun) normally signals dialogue initial, the occurrence of this pattern anywhere else has special significance" (*Joseph* [2003], 162).
[109] Longacre, *Joseph* (2003), 163.

the fourth and final band of verb ranking for predictive discourse provides the *setting* by means of nominal, verbless clauses, and the imperfect (*yiqtol*) of *hāyâ* "be" (also, by *yēš* existential clauses and *waw* + perfect [*qatal*] of *hāyâ* "be," which do not occur here).[110] There is some new information added in this setting; Joshua affirms much that has already been agreed, implying that they already have two allotments, and adds, as impetus, that they are very powerful. The setting ends with כִּי־יַעַר הוּא "because it is forest" (Josh 17:18aβ), which sets up the main line of prediction, carried by *waw* + perfect (*qatal*), and which constitutes the first band of verb ranking for predictive discourse (thus denoting the main predictive speech line)[111]—וּבֵרֵאתוֹ וְהָיָה לְךָ תֹּצְאֹתָיו "you will clear it; and its confines will be yours" (Josh 17:18aγ–δ). Here we do also have *waw* + perfect (*qatal*) of *hāyâ* "be," which Longacre categorized in his fourth band of verb ranking as *setting* as just described above. It does not seem to me that that is how we should understand this particular situation because the setting has already been well established and this event has not happened yet, so it thus remains highly predictive. Rather, the *wəhāyâ* functions as a finite verb on this occasion, in coordination with the immediately preceding one, on the main line of prediction. Coinciding with these main predictions is a *backgrounded* prediction,[112] כִּי־תוֹרִישׁ אֶת־הַכְּנַעֲנִי "for you will drive out the Canaanite." The final noun clause is concessive, כִּי רֶכֶב בַּרְזֶל לוֹ כִּי חָזָק הוּא "even though it has iron chariotry that (makes) it strong," and so well off the main line of prediction.

---

[110] Longacre, *Joseph* (2003), 106. He made an important note later that is relevant here. "For predictive discourse I have not assumed an irrealis band into which negated verbs automatically fit . . . I have rather assumed that since predictive discourse is per se projected and hence in a sense irrealis, negated verbs rank much as their affirmative counterparts" (108n12).

[111] Longacre, *Joseph* (2003), 106.

[112] Longacre, *Joseph* (2003), 106. Band Two of predictive verb rank is constituted by *yiqtol* and noun + *yiqtol*.

The comparison to the introduction to Judges comes mainly between Josh 17:18 and Judg 1:19. In Judges, the tribe in view is Judah, rather than the house of Joseph. In context, וַיְהִי יְהוָה אֶת־יְהוּדָה "the LORD was with Judah," is expressed by the narrator at Judg 1:19; at Josh 17:14 it is self-expressed by the speaking character, the Josephites, בֵּרְכַנִי יְהוָה "the LORD had blessed me." These are roughly equivalent. The two main distinguishing features, aside from the difference in tribes, is first that וַיֹּרֶשׁ אֶת־הָהָר "(Judah) *took* possession of the hill country" in the past, and for the Josephites it was still in the future, כִּי הַר יִהְיֶה־לָּךְ "for the hill country *will* be yours." Second, in Judg 1:19 it is conceded that לֹא לְהוֹרִישׁ אֶת־יֹשְׁבֵי הָעֵמֶק כִּי־רֶכֶב בַּרְזֶל לָהֶם "it was not possible to drive out the inhabitants of the valley because they had iron chariotry."[113] In Josh 17:18, it is predicted by Joshua that תוֹרִישׁ אֶת־הַכְּנַעֲנִי כִּי רֶכֶב בַּרְזֶל לוֹ "(the Josephites) will drive out the Canaanite, even though it has iron chariotry." In these parallels, the book of Joshua seems more optimistic about success than the book of Judges, but the reluctance of the Josephites in the book of Joshua points to a future in which the command and obedient execution template is put under some tension.[114]

---

[113] On the use of the negative plus לְ plus infinitive as prohibitive, see *GKC*, 349. Cf. LXX Judg 1:19, ὅτι οὐκ ἐδύνατο κληρονομῆσαι (ἠδυνάσθησαν ἐξολεθρεῦσαι [LLX^B]) τοὺς κατοικοῦντας τὴν κοιλάδα "because it could not dispossess (destroy) the dwellers of the valley"; Josh 17:12 וְלֹא יָכְלוּ בְּנֵי מְנַשֶּׁה לְהוֹרִישׁ אֶת־הֶעָרִים "yet the Manassehites had not been able to drive out these cities."

[114] The optimism of Joshua in contrast to the pessimism of Judges in similar matters of inheritance and taking the allotted land are also found in a few repeated geographical notices. In Josh 19:28–30, there is mention of the cities of Sidon, Achzib, Aphek, and Rehob as part of the inheritance of the tribe Asher. In Judg 1:31 Asher *failed to drive out* the inhabitants of these cities. In Josh 19:42, Shaalabbin and Aijalon are listed as cities inherited by the tribe of Dan (and which were subsequently lost to them, prompting them to migrate and take Lesham-dan). In Judg 1:35, the house of Joseph subjected the Amorite inhabitants of these cities to forced labour.

Summary of the Excursus

There are some narrative connections between the historical traditions found in the book

of Joshua and the introduction to the book of Judges in Judg 1 that have been explored

here. In the comparison of the sacking of Ai (Bethel?) at Josh 8:10–23; 12:9, 16 with its

so-called parallel at Judg 1:22–26 we noted significant differences in time, place names,

action sequences, and participants. The complete annihilation of Ai by Joshua at Josh

8:21–29 contrasts with the result of Manasseh not driving out the Canaanites and the

Canaanites continuing to dwell in the land as recounted at Judg 1:27–28. Likewise, the

battle against Adoni Zedek (Bezek?) at Josh 10:1–5, 22–27; 12:10, when compared with

its so-called parallel at Judg 1:1–8, exhibits substantial differences in time, place, action

sequences, and participants. The pattern of command-verbatim execution that is so

evident in the book of Joshua—particularly at Josh 10:22–27—begins right away in the

book of Judges to show deterioration (Judg 1:1–8) with Judah asking Simeon to go up

with it/him, and progressively continues to deteriorate to the point of outright refusal

(Judg 1:27–33).

4.2.6 Episode 6 (Judges 2:1–5)—The Messenger of the LORD Goes Up to Bochim

Judges 2:1–5 recounts in an abrupt fashion the confrontation of the people by the

messenger of the LORD at Bochim. It has a narrative frame around the messenger's

speech that connects back to an earlier time in the book of Joshua[115] with the mention of

Gilgal and the implication that there was an assembly at the place they would come to

---

[115] This allusion will become more significant in the next episode with the extended recapitulation of events from the book of Joshua.

name Bochim. The temporal setting of Judg 2:1–5 is indistinct, but the unit starts out on

the main storyline and is marked as an episode by the introduction of a new thematic

participant, the Messenger of the LORD. At this point וַיַּעַל מַלְאַךְ־יְהוָה מִן־הַגִּלְגָּל אֶל־הַבֹּכִים

"the messenger of the LORD went up from Gilgal to Bochim" and then וַיֹּאמֶר "he said"

(Judg 2:1), both *wayyiqtol* main storyline preterites. This messenger is mentioned one

more time in v. 4, thus fulfilling the conditions for recognition of a thematic participant.

The "dialogue" initiation takes place with an identification of the speaker as the

messenger of the LORD in the lead-up to the quotation formula, but those addressed are

left undefined for the moment other than as a plural "you" (אֶתְכֶם) twice within the

opening of the speech act of v. 1b. The reader finds out explicitly in Judg 2:4 that אֶת־

הַדְּבָרִים הָאֵלֶּה אֶל־כָּל־בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל "these words (were spoken) to all the people of Israel."

The speech is longer and more complex than anything we saw in Judg 1. It begins

with something of a misfire in the Hebrew text. Commentators have generally agreed that

the *yiqtol* form of the verb cannot be right, אַעֲלֶה אֶתְכֶם מִמִּצְרַיִם "I will bring you up from

Egypt" (Judg 2:1), positing a textual problem in that something seems to have fallen out

here, and therefore conjecturally rendering it as something akin to "I brought you up" or

"the Lord brought you up."[116] The use of *wayyiqtol* forms to carry the main event line in

---

[116] Boling, *Judges*, 62; Lindars, *Judges 1–5*, 77; Moore, *Judges*, 58; Soggin, *Judges*, 25. Waltke and O'Connor considered it a preterite(!) (*IBHS*, 498). Longacre and Bowling asserted that it has "past time reference" and suggest that "since the bringing up of Israel from Egypt was a prolonged affair of forty years, the yqtl here may have an iterative thrust which reflects this" (*Understanding Biblical Hebrew Verb Forms*, 30). The LXX is not necessarily a trustworthy guide to a solution here as it is expansive in this verse (καὶ ἐπὶ Βαιθηλ καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον Ισραηλ "and to Bethel and to the House of Israel") and at this exact point appears to avoid the anthropomorphism concerning the LORD with additional insertions as underlined (A. καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς Κύριος κύριος ἀνεβίβασεν ὑμᾶς ἐξ Αἰγύπτου "and he said to them the Lord, the Lord brought you up from Egypt"; B. καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς Τάδε λέγει Κύριος ἀνεβίβασα ὑμᾶς ἐξ Αἰγύπτου "and he said to them thus says the Lord: 'I brought you up from Egypt'"). The Hebrew *wayyiqtol* (narrative tense) is rather consistently translated in the LXX of Judges so far with an aorist indicative as here in both versions. In Judg 1, out of 59 occurrences, two are translated with imperfect indicatives (Judg 1:1 וַיִּשְׁאֲלוּ = ἐπηρώτων; and Judg 1:29 וַיֵּשֶׁב = κατῴκει [though aorist indicative κατῴκησεν in Rahlfs' B text]), one is untranslated (Judg 1:17), and the remaining 56 are aorist indicatives.

reported direct address is not unheard of as it is used extensively in Josh 24:2–13 where

Joshua himself acts as the narrator of an embedded story. What is different in the

conjectured and following uses of *wayyiqtol* here however is the use of first-person

address by the messenger rather than a third-person narration. The speaker has taken on

the persona of the LORD, the sender of the messenger.[117] The messenger continues to

"narrate," וָאָבִיא אֶתְכֶם אֶל־הָאָרֶץ אֲשֶׁר נִשְׁבַּעְתִּי לַאֲבֹתֵיכֶם "I brought you into the land that I had

sworn to your fathers." This does not sound like the simple narration of an embedded

story—it seems like a more sophisticated kind of personal retrospection that heightens the

confrontational nature of the event. Longacre has assured us that "the narrative sequence

paragraph and the simpler sort of dialogue paragraph carry in a somewhat routine way the

burden of propelling the story forward."[118] Here the story does not seem to be propelled

forward—the speech itself gives the impression of a singular event rather than a

continuing sequence of activity. It is embedded as the grammatical object of the main

storyline quotation formula. There is an unusual occurrence of a *wayyiqtol* form in the

direct speech (story-telling by a character) that we examined above at Josh 23:9—"the

LORD drove out before you"—which is an example of the "certain percentage" of

wayyiqtol forms that do not function strictly as narrative tense preterites, but rather

function to "foreground" the off-the-main-storyline clauses in question.[119] This appears to

---

[117] "As always in Jud., Yahweh himself as he appears to men in human form or otherwise sensibly manifests his presence" (Moore, *Judges*, 57).

[118] Longacre, *Joseph* (2003), 202.

[119] Buth, "Functional Grammar," 85–88. Elizabeth Robar understood a number of *wayyiqtol* occurrences in direct speech as resultative perfects ("*Wayyiqtol* as an Unlikely Preterite," 26–28). Longacre was of the opinion that climactic narrative sequence paragraphs incorporate "midparagraph backreference, followed by a paraphrase unit" (*Joseph* [2003], 87), which seems to be the case here. He also described the peak as "a kind of zone of turbulence in which predictable discourse features are skewed so that certain typical features are removed or partially suppressed, while other features are introduced (that) may have the longest stretch of dialogue involving the longest speech at that point" (*Joseph* [2003], 18).

be the proper way to understand the *wayyiqtol* verbs within the utterance here, even though it is in the first person whereas story-telling is usually in the third person. The messenger of the LORD refers to significant events in the history of the people. The relative clause אֲשֶׁר נִשְׁבַּעְתִּי לַאֲבֹתֵיכֶם "that I had sworn to your fathers" with a *qatal* verb recounts an equally important event in the even more distant past.

The complexity of the speech is added to at Judg 2:1bε–ζ where there begins a self-quotation within the quotation of the reported speech—וָאֹמַר לֹא־אָפֵר בְּרִיתִי אִתְּכֶם לְעוֹלָם "I said: 'I shall not ever break my covenant with you.'" After the introductory quotation formula in *wayyiqtol*, the use of the *yiqtol* verb presents the reader with the forward- or future-looking perspective from the time of the speaker's past when the LORD had originally spoken the promise. The promise had not originally been given to the addressees of the message in the narrative, but it had been given to their fathers in the distant past *concerning* them. They, the addressees, have put the promise in jeopardy, nonetheless. The messenger of the LORD continues to address them, directly now, from a relative past-looking-forward perspective with וְאַתֶּם לֹא־תִכְרְתוּ בְרִית לְיוֹשְׁבֵי הָאָרֶץ הַזֹּאת מִזְבְּחוֹתֵיהֶם תִּתֹּצוּן "and you shall not make a covenant with those who dwell in this land. You shall break down their altars" (Judg 2:2). The second-person references ("you" plural) with the initial independent pronoun and the two times as subject of the *yiqtol* verbs implicitly casts blameworthiness on the addressees. The implicitness of the blame quickly becomes explicit when, from the perspective of the speaker at the time the speech is made, refers to the addressees own past to indicate their deliberately willful rejection of the speaker's previous guidance, וְלֹא־שְׁמַעְתֶּם בְּקֹלִי "but you did not harken (*lôʾ-qatal*) to my voice." The self-quotation ends with the start of this clause, but that this is one of

those infrequent instances of *momentous negation*[120] that brings the negated clause much

closer to the main event line is a reasonable deduction, particularly in conjunction with

the following interrogative, מַה־זֹּאת עֲשִׂיתֶם "what is this you have done?" The tension has

come to its highest point here and all the events since Judg 1:1 have been slowly building

up to a peak at this point, even though the typical tensions of narrative plot have not been

evident largely beyond single episodes.

Judges 2:3 begins to resolve the tension by bringing a future perspective to bear

within the utterance. The resolution is given by the speaker. The use of וְגַם אָמַרְתִּי "and so

I say" is not so much a quotation formula as it is a signifier of direct speech continuance

that emphasizes the following utterance as decisively established.[121] The follow-on is

predictive/prescriptive, using a negated *yiqtol*, a *weqatal* of *hāyâ*, and a *yiqtol* of *hāyâ*:

לֹא־אֲגָרֵשׁ אוֹתָם מִפְּנֵיכֶם וְהָיוּ לָכֶם לְצִדִּים וֵאלֹהֵיהֶם יִהְיוּ לָכֶם לְמוֹקֵשׁ "I will not drive them out from

your presence, but they will be at your sides and their gods will be a snare to you." There

is a continuation of the momentous negation here that is an appropriate and deliberate

response to the intransigence of the addressees—"you did not harken . . . I will not drive

them out."

The messenger speech ends, and a temporal clause introduces the non-verbal, but

rather vocal, response—וַיְהִי כְּדַבֵּר מַלְאַךְ יְהוָה אֶת־הַדְּבָרִים הָאֵלֶּה אֶל־כָּל־בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וַיִּשְׂאוּ הָעָם אֶת־

קוֹלָם וַיִּבְכּוּ "when the messenger of the LORD spoke these words to all the people of

Israel, the people *raised* their voices and *wept*" (Judg 2:4). The narrative is now back on

---

[120] Longacre, *Joseph* (2003), 79.
[121] With Waltke and O'Connor I understand this as "an *instantaneous perfective* [that] represents a situation occurring at the very instant the expression is being uttered. This use appears chiefly with *verba dicendi* ('verbs of speaking,' swearing, declaring, advising, etc.) or gestures associated with speaking" (*IBHS*, 488). It is a performative speech act.

the main storyline with the paired *wayyiqtol* verbs. This episode, and the entire introductory prologue of Judg 1:1—2:5, comes to a suitable closure with two more main storyline clauses, וַיִּקְרְאוּ שֵׁם־הַמָּקוֹם הַהוּא בֹּכִים וַיִּזְבְּחוּ־שָׁם לַיהוָה "they called the name of that place Bochim. They sacrificed there to the LORD" (Judg 2:5). A geographical reference at or near the close of an episode is not unusual as it has already been seen, for instance, at Judg 1:16, 21, 26, 36. The terminus of this episode is once more, atypically, found to be directly on the main storyline rather than eased out by way of some circumstantial notice. On this occasion it is an explicit reference back to the setting in Judg 2:1a.

Recall now that, up to this point, the Judges narrative has been more episodic than plot-driven until the sudden climax reached in Judg 2:2–3. The episodic tone reasserts itself throughout the rest of the second chapter and at least the first six (and perhaps eleven) verses of ch. 3, with some individual peaks within the episodes of Judg 2:6—3:11 reflecting back on the subject matter of Judg 2:2–3. This lends support to the proposition of the generalized introductory character of this entire part of the book (cf., e.g., Gen 1–2). Once the reader arrives at Judg 3:7—or perhaps 3:12—many of the elements that will become important to plot (protagonist and antagonist characters, context, betrayals, and expectations) have already been introduced. The reader is then able to track and situate these in the context of the introduction, and beyond into the book of Joshua, once the stories that follow begin to unfold.

4.2.7 Episode 7 (Judges 2:6–10)—A Recapitulation Concerning Joshua

There is a substantial duplication of material in Josh 24:28–31 and Judg 2:6–9, but there are also some divergences. The parallels are not exact in all places, but the following

correspondences are evident: Josh 24:28–31 is reflective of Judg 2:6, 8–9, and 7, in that order; Judg 2:6–9 is reflective of Josh 24:28, 31, and 29–30, in that order; Judg 2:10 is not represented in Josh 24; and Josh 24:32–33 is not represented in Judg 2.[122] This episode seems to have been constructed as an introduction to the stories and times of the judges.[123]

Joshua 24:28–33 constitute the last six verses in the book of Joshua. Joshua 24:29 begins with a temporal clause that signals the termination of an episode at the end of v. 28—which began at Josh 24:1—and the beginning of another with v. 29,[124] where the main storyline picks up with the death of Joshua at some time after he sent the people away at the end of the previous episode. Verses 29–31 certainly bring the book of Joshua

---

[122] With respect to one of the textual issues of LXX Josh 24:28–31 there is a transposition in the Greek to Josh 24:29 (LXX) of its Hebrew equivalent from its location at Josh 24:31 (MT). In the LXX, Josh 24:28–31 is represented by the equivalent of Judg 2:6–9 (LXX and MT), *in the same order*. The most economical explanation is that the translator of Joshua was familiar with the tradition found in Judges and followed it at this point.

[123] Graeme Auld, in his detailed analysis of Judg 1, indicated that in 1887 Karl Budde clearly identified the introductory matter beginning at Judg 2:6 with "the main substance of the book" (chs. 3–16) and which was distinguished from the material inserted later in Judg 1:1—2:5 (Auld, "Judges 1," 261; Budde, "Richter und Josua," 93–166). Rösel argued that Josh 23 and 24 are parallel accounts of the tribal assembly and Joshua's speech (however, with Josh 24 being older than the Deuteronomistic creation of Josh 23), that the death of Joshua is paralleled at Josh 24:28–31 and Judg 2:6–9, and that the Book of Judges has two introductions—Judg 1:1–2:5, and Judg 2:6–23 ("Überleitungen," 343–44). He viewed Judg 2:6 as later than Josh 24:28 because of the additions of וַיֵּלְכוּ בְנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל (the Israelites went), and לָרֶשֶׁת אֶת־ הָאָרֶץ (to possess the land). Auld saw this verse rather as being added to Josh 24:28 from Judg 2:6, with the omissions of the phrases under consideration made at that time ("Judges 1," 264). To Rösel, Judg 2:7 appeared to have some secondary reinforcement by אֲשֶׁר רָאוּ אֵת כָּל־מַעֲשֵׂה יְהוָה הַגָּדוֹל (who had seen all the great works of the LORD) of an earlier Josh 24:31 reading, וַאֲשֶׁר יָדְעוּ אֵת כָּל־מַעֲשֵׂה יְהוָה (and who knew all the works of the LORD), the change in verb influenced by the verb in Josh 23:3 (ראה see) against a more original verb in Judg 2:10 (ידע know) ("Überleitungen," 344). These arguments do not ultimately demonstrate the direction of influence. Lindars saw a much more complex interaction here, with Judg 2:7 and 10 as the original deuteronomistic introduction to Judges (against Rudolph as only later deuteronomistic additions [*Elohist*, 241–42]; but cf. Noth who saw Judg 2:7 as a crucial deuteronomistic link back to a deuteronomistically edited book of Joshua [*Josua*, (1953), 9]), with the duplication in Judg 2:6 of Josh 24:28 considered a catch-line that eases the reading from one scroll to another (Lindars, *Judges 1–5*, 91–97). Moore argued Judg 2:7 and Judg 2:6; 8–10 (E source) to be from two distinct, yet parallel accounts, and thought arguments bearing on direction of influence were inconclusive (*Judges*, 63–67). There is clearly still more work to be done on the relationship of these passages.

[124] See Lambdin on the topic of terminal or initial disjunctive clauses, "indicating either the completion of one episode or the beginning of another" (*Introduction to Biblical Hebrew*, 164). See also Waltke and O'Connor, *IBHS*, 651–52.

to a fitting conclusion with the notices of Joshua's death and burial, and that Israel served the LORD during his lifetime and for some time afterward. These events are all marked as being on the main storyline by a *wayyiqtol* verb form; וַיָּמָת יְהוֹשֻׁעַ "Joshua died" . . . וַיִּקְבְּרוּ אֹתוֹ "they buried him" . . . וַיַּעֲבֹד יִשְׂרָאֵל אֶת־יְהוָה "Israel served the LORD" (Josh 24:29–31). However, there are still two more verses that recount the burial of Joseph's bones and the death and burial of Eleazar the priest (Josh 24:32–33). The only element of this portion that is on the main storyline is the final main clause, וַיִּקְבְּרוּ אֹתוֹ "they buried him (Eleazer)" (Josh 24:33). The people and Joshua are thematic participants.

The obvious temporal dislocation at Judg 2:6 marks the beginning of a new episode in Judges (Joshua was dead in Judg 1:1). The scene changes here where we see Joshua—alive again—dismissing the people—וַיְשַׁלַּח יְהוֹשֻׁעַ אֶת־הָעָם "Joshua sent the people away"—in order that they might go (purpose clause) לָרֶשֶׁת אֶת־הָאָרֶץ "to take possession of the land."[125] The main storyline here continues, וַיֵּלְכוּ בְנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל "the Israelites went" . . . וַיָּמָת יְהוֹשֻׁעַ "Joshua died" . . . וַיַּעַבְדוּ הָעָם אֶת־יְהוָה "the people served the LORD" . . . וַיִּקְבְּרוּ אוֹתוֹ "they buried him" . . . וַיָּקָם דּוֹר אַחֵר "another generation rose up" (Judg 2:7–10). Judges 2:10 begins with a circumstantial clause, thus off the main storyline, recognized as such by a passive *qatal* verb form later in the clause. That clause, וְגַם כָּל־הַדּוֹר הַהוּא נֶאֶסְפוּ אֶל־אֲבוֹתָיו "likewise, all that generation were gathered to its fathers," should be understood as a *recapitulation*. It refers to the generation of the elders in Judg 2:7 who were contemporaneous with Joshua but outlived him. Judges 2:10 also looks forward and prepares for the next episode by anticipating the new temporal setting by means of

---

[125] "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" (Frevel, "Untying Tangles," 291).

introducing the next generation. Judges 2:10b moves the narrative forward in temporal

sequence to the generation following Joshua with the relative clause, אֲשֶׁר לֹא־יָדְעוּ אֶת־יְהוָה

וְגַם אֶת־הַמַּעֲשֶׂה אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה לְיִשְׂרָאֵל "who had not known the LORD, nor the work that (the

LORD) had done for Israel." The *repetition* is used here with a negative that

distinguishes the new generation's lack of knowledge from the previous one's

knowledge. With the new temporal setting and a modest, if memorable (due to the

repetition), description of one of the thematic participants of the next episode (the next

generation), the speedy apostasy that comes at Judg 2:11 has been anticipated.

Judges 2:6–10 is more ambiguous in perspective than its counterpart in the book

of Joshua. To this point the narrative in Judges "is told from a psychological perspective

external to that of the characters."[126] At v. 11 the perspective becomes more

encompassing, internalized in some fashion in the characters. Concerning Judg 2:6—3:6

Polzin stated: "It begins by continuing the external point of view of the preceding section,

but we soon realize that the narrator has now become an omniscient panchronic observer

who is permitted to penetrate the consciousness of all his characters, God included."[127]

Judges 2:6–10 is also clearly retrospective, and so has a significant follow-on effect on

the temporal perspectives of the four (sub-)episodes 2:11–15; 2:16–23; 3:1–6; and 3:7–

11, which come after it in the narrative.

The marking of the opening to Josh 24:29 with a temporal clause, signifying the

closing of one episode and the start of another is a key observation. There is no such

marking in the parallel text in Judg 2:8. In Judges it is simply a part of a continuing main

storyline that runs from Judg 2:6 through to 2:10; "Joshua sent the people away . . . the

---

[126] Beldman, *Completion of Judges*, 87.
[127] Polzin, *Moses and the Deuteronomist*, 150.

Israelites went . . . the people served the LORD . . . Joshua died . . . they buried him . . .

another generation rose up." Judg 2:1–5 and 2:11–15 each have their own ways of

announcing the beginning and end of new episodes that are noted in the analysis. The

death of Joshua in the book of Joshua, and the notice that Israel had served the LORD all

his (Joshua's) days (Josh 24:31), serve as a fitting conclusion to the book of Joshua—

Israel is in possession of the land. This, we have already stated, will not be the case in the

next episode of Judges when the next generation quickly falls away from the LORD.

Nonetheless, Judg 2:7 indicates that the people, *who had seen all the great work that the*

LORD had done, served the LORD.[128] The reader might ask if this will be the case

elsewhere at some point later in the book, so that the land (i.e., the people) gets rest

because the people are again serving the LORD, having seen the LORD's great works

wrought through the various deliverers the LORD raises.

4.2.8 Episode 8 (Judges 2:11—3:6)—Israel Does Evil, the LORD Reacts, and the Nations of Testing

4.2.8.1 Episode 8a (Judges 2:11–15)

Judges 2:11—3:6 is an episode, with Judg 2:11–15, 2:16–23, and 3:1–6 sub-episodes, by

virtue of that next generation of Israelites (anticipated in Judg 2:10) and the LORD as

thematic participants. The Israelites remained faithful only for as long as those who had

seen the great works of the LORD were alive. As soon as Joshua and his generation were

buried, a new generation arose (Judg 2:10), and in this sub–episode that starts in v. 11

---

[128] In Josh 24:31 and Judg 2:7 I have rendered the three suffixal (*qatal*) verbs as past perfectives (Waltke and O'Connor, *IBHS*, 484) because it helps to distinguish them from the main storyline of the narrative carried by the prefixal (*wayyiqtol*) verbs in this instance. The direct object marker referring to (the body of) Joshua is morphologically defective in Josh 24:30 and *plene* in Judg 2:9. This textual issue is of no consequence to the narrative.

and extends to v. 15, וַיַּעֲשׂוּ בְנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל אֶת־הָרַע בְּעֵינֵי יְהוָה "*the Israelites* did the evil in the sight of the LORD." The main storyline continues, וַיַּעַבְדוּ אֶת־הַבְּעָלִים "*they (the Israelites) served the Baalim*" . . . וַיֵּלְכוּ אַחֲרֵי אֱלֹהִים אֲחֵרִים "*they* went after other gods" . . . וַיַּעַזְבוּ אֶת־יְהוָה "*they* forsook the LORD" . . . וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲווּ לָהֶם "*they* bowed down to them," וַיַּכְעִסוּ אֶת־יְהוָה "*they* provoked the LORD to anger," וַיַּעַזְבוּ אֶת־יְהוָה "*they* (again) forsook the LORD," וַיַּעַבְדוּ לַבַּעַל וְלָעַשְׁתָּרוֹת "(and) *they* served the Baal and Ashtaroth" (Judg 2:11–13). In vv. 14–15 the main storyline continues very tersely, וַיִּחַר־אַף יְהוָה בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל וַיִּתְּנֵם בְּיַד־שֹׁסִים וַיָּשֹׁסּוּ אוֹתָם וַיִּמְכְּרֵם בְּיַד אוֹיְבֵיהֶם "the anger of the LORD burned against Israel, (the LORD) gave them into the hand of the plunderers, they plundered them, (the LORD) sold them into the hand of their enemies," before it resolves into some lines of circumstantial material that bring the episode to a close. The final sequence, וַיֵּצֶר לָהֶם מְאֹד "it/he (the LORD?) distressed them greatly," is a *wayyiqtol* clause, but it can not be determined if it is on the main storyline, or if it is bringing the circumstantial material to an emphatic close through foregrounding. If the LORD is the subject, then it is on the main storyline, but if the subject is the situation, then it seems to be a matter of foregrounding. In either case, the new generation of Israelites is reiterated here at the end of the episode—not just inherent in the verb forms and pronominal suffixes but by name and with an independent pronoun as well at Judg 2:14a—thus confirming them as thematic participants of the episode. The LORD is equally a thematic participant.

This section of the introduction to the book of Judges is important, not just as a one-time event following the death of Joshua, but as both a pattern for the subsequent individual stories that make up the cycle of stories about the judges, and as a causal (and temporal!) link to the degeneration found at the end of the book of Judges. David

Beldman said Judg 2:11–23 is *proleptic* (i.e., indicating in advance), whereas, for

example, 18:30 (Jonathan-ben-Gershom-ben-Moses clearly representing the generation

after Joshua) and 20:28 (Phinehas-ben-Eleazer-ben-Aaron also representing the

generation after Joshua) are *analeptic* (i.e., retrospective).[129] Narrative time is constituted

by order, duration, and frequency,[130] so considering this, Beldman was likely correct to

state that the "infidelity and debauchery took place very early—in the time period

represented in the beginning of the book!"[131]

> According to this strategy of ending, the narrator raises in the end section new
> ideas or topics or presents subjects in a new way that provokes a reevaluation of
> the narrative as a whole. Rhetorically, these new issues raised [i.e., cultic places
> and practices, and the LORD's kingship] in the end section are of utmost
> significance as they are arguably the point of the whole narrative.[132]

Judges 2:10[133] and 2:11–13 (cf. Deut 17:2–7) are vital for understanding this linkage.

There is a stark contrast between the generation of Joshua and the elders who survived

him (Judg 2:7) and the one that arose immediately after who did not know the LORD nor

the deeds done by the LORD (Judg 2:10). The explicit notices in each of the narratives of

Judg 17–18 and 19–21 to the third generation following Moses and Aaron (i.e., Jonathan-

ben-Gershom-ben-Moses [Manasseh?] and Phinehas-ben-Eleazar-ben-Aaron) are surely

"not incidental."[134] The notice of Phinehas is particularly intriguing as he is also

connected with the narrative at Num 25. One might also ask if this is the same generation

as Othniel-ben-Kenaz, which it definitely seems to be. "A significant insight . . . is that

the utter moral, spiritual, and social breakdown that the end section displays is not meant

---

[129] Beldman, *Completion of Judges*, 71.
[130] Beldman, *Completion of Judges*, 69.
[131] Beldman, *Completion of Judges*, 124.
[132] Beldman, *Completion of Judges*, 125.
[133] As Beldman indicated (*Completion of Judges*, 135).
[134] Beldman, *Completion of Judges*, 133.

to be understood as the result of a steady decline on the part of Israel over the course of the judges period. Rather, the temporal references subtly but unmistakably indicate that the breakdown existed early in the period."[135] This insight supports the idea that the book of Judges presents a view of repeated, rather than persistent apostasy on the part of Israelites, and that its first instances took place quickly and deeply following the death of Joshua.

4.2.8.2 Episode 8b (Judges 2:16–23)

I have distinguished a sub-episode here based on the Israelites fading a bit from view as a thematic participant in this section to make room for the introduction of judges as secondary thematic participants. The אֱלֹהִים אֲחֵרִים "other gods" make a bid for secondary thematic participant by mention twice by name, twice by independent pronoun, and once by pronominal suffix, but probably do not rise to that level. The LORD continues as a primary thematic participant and gives an extended divine speech (Judg 2:20b–22) that is framed by a summary announcement (Judg 2:16–20a, 23). Judg 2:22–23 ends the entire sub-episode on the ominous note that the LORD would not be driving out the nations quickly, in order to test the new generation (cf. Judg 3:1, 4).

The main storyline starts וַיָּקֶם יְהוָה שֹׁפְטִים "the LORD raised up judges" and וַיּוֹשִׁיעוּם "they (the judges) delivered them (the Israelites)" (Judg 2:16). Verse 17 contains some important circumstantial information, carried by the suffixal (*qatal*) verb forms, concerning the degeneration of the relationship between the Israelites and the LORD from one generation to the next. The verse does also contain one potential *wayyiqtol*

---

[135] Beldman, *Completion of Judges*, 143.

storyline notice, וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲווּ לָהֶם "they (the Israelites) bowed down to them (the other

gods)."[136] Verses 18 and 19 continue to provide a wealth of circumstantial information as

might be expected in a summary announcement. Both verses begin with temporal clauses,

demonstrating their off-line nature. As with the circumstantial material in v. 17, the

material in these two verses remains important, even if it is not on the main storyline.

These two verses, in fact, expand upon v. 17 by first reflecting on the *habitual* activities

of the LORD in v. 18, and then indicating the *habitual* activities of the Israelites in v. 19.

The prominence of suffixal (i.e., perfective) verbs in Judg 2:17–19 indicates the *habitual*

nature of the activities of this new generation of Israelites in this off-line segment. These

verses, which bring the summary narrative to a close, are important when viewed in

consideration of the following body of the book of Judges as anticipating the pattern of

activity that will come about.

The characteristic elements of the summary notice, found in a representative form

at Judg 10:6–10, and which are found in more or less full forms in each of the judge

stories, are: first, that וַיֹּסִפוּ בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל לַעֲשׂוֹת הָרַע בְּעֵינֵי יְהוָה "the Israelites once again did evil

in the sight of the LORD" (Judg 10:6); second, וַיִּחַר־אַף יְהוָה בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל "the anger of the

---

[136] Boda and Conway noted that:

> Although *wayyiqtols* are normally on the narrative backbone . . . this clause is clearly subordinate
> since it parallels the action of the people in v. 17b: they committed adultery with other gods // they
> bowed down to them. This is probably because the *wayyiqtol* is a continuative narrative form of
> the *qatal* in v. 17b, and these subordinate clauses explicate the way—in narrative form—in which
> the people failed to listen to the judges (*Judges*, 173n1).

That interpretation follows the usual perfect with *waw*-consecutive tense sequence understanding of
traditional grammars (e.g., *GKC*, 330–39). Others have nonetheless commented on the *uncharacteristic*
occurrence of this *wayyiqtol*, seemingly embedded in what is clearly circumstantial material. For example,
see Robar, where she asserted that "it is not the morphosyntax that determines the mainline/offline status
the reader perceives, but rather the cognitive response to the syntactic embedding. An embedded unit will
naturally be perceived as 'offline' or secondary" (*Verb and Paragraph*, 107). So, it may be that this is
simply an unusual case of *wayyiqtol* in narrative not maintaining the main storyline, but rather contributing
to circumstantial, offline comment.

LORD burned against Israel" (Judg10:7a); third, וַיִּמְכְּרֵם בְּיַד־ "he sold them into the hand

of . . ." (Judg 10:7b); fourth, Israel was afflicted for a certain number of years (Judg

10:8); fifth, וַיִּזְעֲקוּ בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל אֶל־יְהוָה "the Israelites cried out to the LORD" (Judg 10:10);

and finally, the LORD would typically raise up a deliverer for them—but not

immediately, or explicitly in the case of Jephthah—and then the people would live in

peace for a certain number of years after a great deliverance.

The speech of the LORD at Judg 2:20–22 is, of course, the focus of this sub-

episode. It is introduced with the notice that וַיִּחַר־אַף יְהוָה בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל "the anger of the LORD

burned (*wayyiqtol*) against Israel," and a straightforward quotation formula in *wayyiqtol*,

וַיֹּאמֶר "(the LORD) said." So, the entire following speech is the grammatical direct object

of a main storyline verb. We recall that Longacre did not provide complete guidance

concerning the verb constellations applicable to direct speech in general, indicating that

they use entirely different and distinct constellations of verb forms than narration, often

of a predictive (irreal) or expository nature, and in which the *waw* plus suffixal verb form

is at the fore to carry the main line and with the prefixal/imperfect verb form clauses off-

line.[137] Heller provided us with some helpful insight into the verb constellations used in

different types of reported direct speech in Biblical Hebrew.[138]

Verse 20 contains a series of *qatal* form verbs that clearly refer to the past and

carry the main speech line of historically oriented speech.[139] The speech begins with a

causal clause referring to the past, יַעַן אֲשֶׁר עָבְרוּ הַגּוֹי הַזֶּה אֶת־בְּרִיתִי "because this nation

transgressed my covenant," with the implied subject of the verb being indicated as a third

---

[137] Longacre, *Joseph* (2003), 106.
[138] Heller, *Narrative Structure*, 456–81.
[139] Heller, *Narrative Structure*, 458–62.

person plural by the verb form, the actual subject indicated as a third person singular (seemingly a collective) by the noun and demonstrative pronoun, and the object being the first-person possession of the speaker. Verse 20 continues with a subordinate/relative clause that refers to a more distant past, אֲשֶׁר צִוִּיתִי אֶת־אֲבוֹתָם "the one I had commanded their fathers," with the verb subject in the first person of the speaker and the object as the third person plural possession of the generation of Israelites about whom the LORD is speaking. The final clause of v. 20 continues in the same past as the first clause, וְלֹא שָׁמְעוּ לְקוֹלִי "but they did not harken to my voice," with the subject of the verb indicated as a third person plural by the verb form and the object as once again being the first-person possession of the speaker. The modes of participant reference here are very specific and there is no ambiguity concerning the referents. An interesting aspect of this verse that will continue through the next two verses until the end of the speech, is that the LORD is referring to the Israelites in the third person and is not addressing them directly in the second person like in Judg 2:1–3. Who is the LORD speaking to?

Verse 21 has a forward-looking, future orientation signified by the negated *yiqtol* form of verb[140] plus an infinitive, גַּם־אֲנִי לֹא אוֹסִיף לְהוֹרִישׁ אִישׁ "for my part,[141] I will no longer drive out anyone." This is followed by two prepositional phrases, מִפְּנֵיהֶם מִן־הַגּוֹיִם "from their presence from the nations." Then the relative clause אֲשֶׁר־עָזַב יְהוֹשֻׁעַ "that Joshua had left" that is *qatal* and retrospective, and which interestingly ends with the embedded temporal clause וַיָּמֹת "when he died" that is in the *wayyiqtol* form![142] This

---

[140] Heller demonstrated that *yiqtol* (basic) and *weqatal* (continuative) forms carry the main speech line in predictive speech (*Narrative Structure*, 462–64).

[141] On the correlative use of גַּם (Williams, *Hebrew Syntax*, 64). Waltke and O'Connor averred, stating that "it has no special emphasis and . . . means little more than 'also'" (*IBHS*, 301).

[142] There could be a textual issue here that would render any discussion of this unusual *wayyiqtol* occurrence moot. The LXX has καὶ ἀφῆκεν, which is a simple repetition of the idea already expressed of something left behind by Joshua. Lindars indicated some kind of literary dependence on Josh 23:13 and

makes some sense, however, when we remember that Longacre postulated for direct

speech, particularly the expository portions, a verbal constellation that would be the

specific inverse of that for narrative.[143] So this *wayyiqtol* does not all-of-a-sudden put this

bit of circumstance on the main storyline (cf. the comment above on Judg 2:17), but it is,

in fact, about as far off the main storyline as is possible. Nonetheless, it is another very

unusual use of *wayyiqtol*.

     Verse 22 begins with an infinitival purpose clause, לְמַעַן נַסּוֹת בָּם אֶת־יִשְׂרָאֵל "in order

to test Israel by them (i.e., anyone from the nations that Joshua left)," that carries on from

v. 21 as a single sentence. The testing purpose is expanded in v. 22b: הֲשֹׁמְרִים הֵם אֶת־דֶּרֶךְ

יְהוָה "whether they would keep (participle) *the way* of the LORD," לָלֶכֶת בָּם "to walk

(infinitive) in *them*" (note the disagreement in number between "way" and "them") כַּאֲשֶׁר

שָׁמְרוּ אֲבוֹתָם "just as their fathers had kept (*qatal*) (the way of the LORD)"—אִם־לֹא "or

not." Thus, the speech of the LORD ends on an ominous note. Just in case the seriousness

of the situation has escaped the notice of the reader, the narrator recapitulates, on the

main storyline, that וַיַּנַּח יְהוָה אֶת־הַגּוֹיִם הָאֵלֶּה "the LORD (not Joshua) left those nations"

(Judg 2:23). And to make the existing circumstance perfectly clear, the narrator

concludes לְבִלְתִּי הוֹרִישָׁם מַהֵר וְלֹא נְתָנָם בְּיַד־יְהוֹשֻׁעַ "(the LORD) did not drive them (those

nations) out quickly and (in fact) did not give them over into the hand of Joshua."

---

further noted that this clause is lacking in the OL and therefore probably in the OG due to uncertainty about
what was in the Hebrew *Vorlage* in the mind of the translator at that point. He suggested an original וַיָּנַח (נוח
[*hiphil*] "leave") in the Hebrew that would have introduced Judg 2:23 and that was corrupted from וַיָּמֹת on
that basis. This implies that Judg 2:22 is an interpolation into Judg 2:20–21, 23, which itself was
"incorporated from some other context" (*Judges 1–5*, 110–11). This is not a wholly satisfactory explanation
as the corruption might be presumed to have worked in the other direction, and the subjects are different for
the *qal* in v. 21 (Joshua) and the *hiphil* in v. 23 (the LORD).

    [143] Longacre, *Joseph* (2003), 111.

4.2.8.3 Episode 8c (Judges 3:1–6)

It is difficult to know exactly how to consider this section. Is it an episode of its own, or

is it simply an embedded sub-episode? I have opted for the latter based on the continuity

with the previous two sub-episodes of the Israelites and the LORD as thematic

participants—mentioned by name here in Judg 3:1, 2, 4, 5, and the Israelites implied as

subjects of the final two main storyline verbs of v. 6. This sub-episode is closely linked to

the one preceding it by the mention at Judg 3:1 of הַגּוֹיִם אֲשֶׁר הִנִּיחַ יְהוָה "the nations that the

LORD had left" (cf. Judg 2:21, 22 [by pronoun בָּם], 23). The scene has become

temporally more diffuse, if geographically more distinct. Characters proliferate as the

individual nations are listed. Its expository nature is demonstrated in the use of the verbal

constellation that includes *qatal*, infinitives, participles, a plural *wayəhî*, and *yiqtol*

forms.[144] Judges 3:1b–2 introduces a new idea of "a different motive for the failure of the

conquest."[145] Verse 3 is the list of the individual nations, and v. 4 is a recapitulation by

the narrator of the final verse of the LORD's speech in Judg 2:22. The wording is altered

somewhat by the narrator, switching out הֲשֹׁמְרִים הֵם אֶת־דֶּרֶךְ יְהוָה לָלֶכֶת בָּם כַּאֲשֶׁר שָׁמְרוּ אֲבוֹתָם

"whether they would keep *the way* of the LORD, to walk in *them* just as their fathers had

kept" for לָדַעַת הֲיִשְׁמְעוּ אֶת־מִצְוֹת יְהוָה אֲשֶׁר־צִוָּה אֶת־אֲבוֹתָם "to know whether they would harken

to the commands of the LORD that (the LORD) had commanded their fathers." The

narrator again changes what the LORD said in its essence by leaving out the fact that

their fathers had been, at least in some sense, obedient in the LORD's opinion—so

---

[144] Heller, *Narrative Structure*, 464–68.

[145] Lindars considered it a naïve gloss (*Judges 1–5*, 113). In his translation he puts it in brackets thus: "(that is, all those who had not experienced any wars in Canaan; it was simply for the sake of the [new] generations of the sons of Israel, so as to teach war to them, to those at least who had not experienced them previously)," (*Judges 1–5*, 94).

obedience is possible. The narrator also adds the flourish that the commands of the LORD had been given בְּיַד־מֹשֶׁה "by the hand of Moses." In v. 5 the Israelites become the subject of the continuing exposition that notes their ongoing circumstance; וּבְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל יָשְׁבוּ בְּקֶרֶב הַכְּנַעֲנִי הַחִתִּי וְהָאֱמֹרִי וְהַפְּרִזִּי וְהַחִוִּי וְהַיְבוּסִי "and the Israelites were dwelling in the midst of the Canaanite, the Hittite, and the Amorite, and the Perizzite, and the Hivite, and the Jebusite." The narrator has at this point painted for us a very dismal picture of the situation of the Israelites in comparison with the rather positive view at the beginning of Judg 1, and even in comparison with the ambivalence of the LORD as a character who was willing to wait and see what the outcome might be at Judg 2:22 and 3:4.

The narrator has not yet quite exhausted the pent-up negativity, and the main storyline is reasserted with the Israelites continuation as the subject— וַיִּקְחוּ אֶת־בְּנוֹתֵיהֶם לָהֶם לְנָשִׁים "they took their (the Canaanite, etc.) daughters for themselves as wives" . . . וַיַּעַבְדוּ אֶת־אֱלֹהֵיהֶם "they served their gods" (Judg 3:6). Notice of intermarrying is first mentioned here in Judg 3:6, right on the cusp of proceeding with the first, unadorned, instance of the judges-cycle. This is particularly shocking and at the same time intriguing! How might this interact with the presentation in the ending of the book of Judges where the Israelites swear to not give their daughters to the Benjaminites (Judg 21:1), whereas here they have no qualms of intermarrying with the Canaanites?[146] That is a question for another day, but the narrator has brought the introduction to the book of Judges to a culminating point here at Judg 3:6—the Israelites have become very bad.

---

[146] Peter Miscall pointed out the "grotesqueness of the solution and horrible consequences of the oath" in the situation where "an Israelite city acts like Sodom" (*1 Samuel*, 6–7). The Israelites have become just like, perhaps even worse than, the Canaanites.

4.2.9 Episode 9 (Judges 3:7–11)—Cushan-rishathaim and Othniel
(or rather, The Israelites and the LORD)

Judges 3:7–11 is transitional in that it is an enacted paradigm of the proleptic summary

announcement of 2:11–19, which sketches the pattern in story form that the following

variations will mimic in particular ways. This story is essentially a summary itself

without a hint of embellishment aside from the necessary proper names of the

participants and geographic locators. It is a mere five verses! Boling thought that this

story has been stripped of its details to act as a mere pattern for the following stories.[147]

The transitional nature of this short story provides something of a dénouement from the

shocking climax of the previous few verses before proceeding into the cycle of stories

that make up the main body of the book of Judges.

The episode starts immediately on the main storyline without any kind of

introductory temporal or circumstantial setting, likely due to the residual effect of the

lengthy exposition that ended the previous episode. It might even be taken initially by the

reader as another recapitulation of the key elements of the summary narrative until the

specificity of v. 8 is revealed. The storyline proceeds וַיַּעֲשׂוּ בְנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל אֶת־הָרַע "the Israelites

did the evil" . . . . וַיַּעַבְדוּ אֶת־הַבְּעָלִים וְאֶת־הָאֲשֵׁרוֹת . . . "they forgot the LORD" . . . וַיִּשְׁכְּחוּ אֶת־יְהוָה "they forgot the LORD"

"they served the Baalim and Asheroth" (Judg 3:7). The Israelites present themselves as a

potential thematic participant as the subjects of these storyline verbs. The story continues

וַיִּחַר־אַף יְהוָה "the LORD was angry" . . . וַיִּמְכְּרֵם "(the LORD) sold them" . . . ־וַיַּעַבְדוּ בְנֵי

יִשְׂרָאֵל אֶת־כּוּשַׁן רִשְׁעָתַיִם "the Israelites served Cushan-rishathaim" (Judg 3:8). The LORD

becomes a potential thematic participant. The main storyline goes on: וַיִּזְעֲקוּ בְנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל "the

Israelites cried out" . . . וַיָּקֶם יְהוָה מוֹשִׁיעַ "the LORD raised up a deliverer" . . . וַיּוֹשִׁיעֵם אֵת

---

[147] Boling. *Judges*, 83.

עָתְנִיאֵל בֶּן־קְנַז "Othniel-ben-Kenaz delivered them" (Judg 3:9).[148] The Israelites and the

LORD remain thematic, and Othniel is found for the first time as the subject of a

storyline verb. Following one short circumstantial clause with a feminine *wayəhî* form,

וַתְּהִי עָלָיו רוּחַ־יְהוָה "the Spirit of the LORD was on him" (Judg 3:10), the story resumes

וַיִּתֵּן יְהוָה בְּיָדוֹ אֶת־כּוּשַׁן "he judged Israel," וַיִּשְׁפֹּט אֶת־יִשְׂרָאֵל "he went out to war," וַיֵּצֵא לַמִּלְחָמָה

רִשְׁעָתַיִם "the LORD gave Cushan-rishathaim into his hand" . . . וַתָּעָז יָדוֹ "his hand

prevailed." Othniel here makes a strong bid as a secondary thematic participant. The

story ends on a geographical note, introducing a new participant—the Land—וַתִּשְׁקֹט הָאָרֶץ

"the Land was quiet" . . . וַיָּמָת עָתְנִיאֵל בֶּן־קְנַז "Othniel-ben-Kenaz died" (Judg 3:11). The

Israelites and the LORD are confirmed as thematic participants and Othniel-ben-Kenaz is

confirmed as secondarily thematic. The density and compact nature of this deliberately

crafted story is seen in the fact that, aside from the one circumstantial clause in v. 10,

every verb form used is a *wayyiqtol*. The typical terseness of Biblical Hebrew narrative is

taken to its limit here, with only the minimum numbers of indirect objects, prepositional

phrases, and modifiers necessary to communicate the essential pieces of information.

There is no ornamentation or extraneous material—every turn of phrase is important.

4.3 Conclusions

The aim of this chapter—noted at the outset—was to use Longacre's form of discourse

analysis as a narrative approach to the text of Judg 1:1–3:11 in order to help bring better

understanding to the narrative shape and purpose of the *opening* to the book of Judges,

---

[148] The direct object marker אֵת before the name of Othniel-ben-Kenaz (Caleb's younger brother) is enigmatic. Perhaps the full name is in apposition to the subject implied in the verb. Waltke and O'Connor allowed that אֵת can mark the subject of a transitive verb, particularly in appositions (*IBHS*, 182).

and to demonstrate, insofar as it is possible, the intentional unity (i.e., cohesion and coherence) of this section of narrative, and the validity and utility of Longacre's approach. The key findings of this chapter related to this purpose were: first, that Judg 1:1—3:11 demonstrates that thematic participant references are reliable in confirming the spatio-temporal or circumstantial opening and closing features that often mark off the extent of individual episodes; and second, that the spatio-temporal features and character thematization of the narrative under consideration have critical interpretive functions in terms of narrative structure and the perspective of the implied author. As portions of this narrative—Judg 1:11–15, 20, and Judg 2:6–9—are also found at Josh 15:13–19 and Josh 24:28–31, it was also possible to make a comparison between these synoptic passages in terms of how they function in their individual contexts. Observations on these comparisons are examined in some detail in the next chapter.

The methodological approach of this chapter was concentrated on spatio-temporal markers, characterization, and the determination of episodic structure by means of discourse analytical (textlinguistic) findings to control the narrative approach to its reading. The most important consideration in the application of the discourse analysis above is the use in different discourse types (e.g., narrative, predictive, historical or persuasive direct speech, exposition, etc.) of the different *verbal constellations* to discriminate between the main discourse line and various levels of supporting material. For Biblical Hebrew narrative, *wayyiqtol* verb clauses carry the main storyline and the embedded direct reported speech uses other means. By carefully delineating the main discourse lines, the narrative features such as plot, time, space, characters, and point of view stand out more clearly. This chapter demonstrates a perspective in the introduction

to Judges that can be distinguished from that of the book of Joshua. The book-seam

provides a clear and distinctive turning point between the eras represented in the

continuous narrative flow between those two books.

4.3.1 Episodic Structure

4.3.1.1 Application of the Method

The application of Longacre's method of discourse analysis was used to determine the

episodic structure of the introduction to the book of Judges. Initiation of an episode or

sub-episode is often done with a temporal or circumstantial clause off the main storyline

(e.g., Judg 1:1, 9, 14, 28; 3:1). Sometimes an episode will not open with a temporal or

circumstantial marker, Judg 3:7 being the clearest example with its conspicuous change

of scene. Other examples in this study are at: Judg 1:5 where we saw a narrowing of the

scene and the introduction of the lord of Bezek as a thematic participant; Judg 1:17 with a

change of scene and the introduction of Simeon once again as a thematic participant;

Judg 1:22 with a change of scene and the introduction of the House of Joseph as a

thematic participant; Judg 2:1 with a change of scene and the introduction of the

Messenger of the LORD as a thematic participant; Judg 2:6 with a change of scene and

the introduction of the very much alive Joshua as a thematic participant; Judg 2:11 with a

change of scene and the introduction of *the next generation* of Israelites as a thematic

participant; and Judg 2:16, which is more ambiguous as there is no real change in scene,

but there is however the introduction of the judges as secondary thematic participants and

an implied temporal hiatus to close the preceding sub-episode in v. 15.

4.3.1.2 Structure of the Story

The following structure of the introduction to the book of Judges was confirmed by the analysis in this chapter.

- Judges 1:1–8. Episode 1—Judah (and Simeon?) Goes Up Against Bezek and Jerusalem

    o Judges 1:1–4. Episode 1a

    o Judges 1:5–8. Episode 1b

- Judges 1:9–16. Episode 2—Judah Goes Down Against Hebron and Debir

    o Judges 1:9–13. Episode 2a

    o Judges 1:14–16. Episode 2b

- Judges 1:17–21. Episode 3—Judah and Simeon (and Benjamin?) Take and Give Territory

- Judges 1:22–27. Episode 4— The House of Joseph Goes Up Against Bethel

- Judges 1:28–36. Episode 5—Israel Becomes Strong

- Judges 2:1–5. Episode 6—The Messenger of the LORD Goes Up to Bochim

- Judges 2:6–10. Episode 7—A Recapitulation Concerning Joshua

- Judges 2:11—3:6. Episode 8—Israel Does Evil, the LORD Reacts, and the Nations of Testing

    o Judges 2:11–15. Episode 8a

    o Judges 2:16–23. Episode 8b

    o Judges 3:1–6. Episode 8c

- Judges 3:7–11. Episode 9—Cushan-rishathaim and Othniel (transition to the main cycle of following stories)

4.3.2 The Value of Tracking Thematic Participants

Characters in a story contribute important points of view that are entirely relevant to interpretation. It is especially useful to pay close attention to the points of view of the most prominent characters. Thematic participants of a paragraph are usually introduced in the first or second sentence. They are repeated at least once more—often toward the end—and are the subject of at least one clause on the main storyline or repeatedly occur as other than the subject of such clauses. They are referred to several times successively by name (third-person) or pronoun (first- or second-person). There may be up to two primary thematic participants (equal prominence) and there may be one that is secondary (less prominent). We have just seen above *the critical use of thematic participant identification in determining episodic boundaries*, particularly for Judg 2:1–5.

The cast of Judg 1:1—3:11 may be grouped according to the following hierarchy. The main participants are the people of Israel, the LORD, and the inhabitants of the land (who are often represented by the Canaanite). The minor participants, by virtue of being thematic multiple times, are Judah (who are also part of the people of Israel), and the Canaanite (who is also part of the inhabitants of the land). Other more minor participants, by virtue of being thematic once each, are the lord of Bezek, the Amorite (who is also part of the inhabitants of the land), Simeon, the House of Joseph, the watchers, the Luzite, the messenger of the LORD, Joshua, judges in general, perhaps the other gods, and Othniel.

4.3.3 Time in the Narrative

The book of Judges starts with the notice "after the death of Joshua," and so all the events of ch. 1 are considered to take place following this. The first episode is given "the first place" in Judg 1:1, the second contains a temporal clause at Judg 1:9—"and afterward"— that makes time progress sequentially, as do the series of main storyline *wayyiqtol* verb clauses that run through the first three episodes concerning Judah and Simeon. Episode four concerns the House of Joseph and is somewhat less clear in exactly where it falls in the temporal sequence due to the shift in thematic participant, but it is clearly after Judah and Simeon *begin* their forays (how much later is not revealed).

The most significant shift of time perspective comes at Judg 2:6 where "Joshua sent the people away" and there emerges a distinct temporal disjunction. The narrative moves to a time before that noted in Judg 1:1, that is, before the death of Joshua. The scene changes to where we see Joshua—alive again—dismissing the people in Judg 2:6 in order that they might go and take possession of the land. This is the clearest marker that a completely new retrospective narrative section has begun at Judg 2:6. That the episode of Judg 2:6–10, "A Recapitulation Concerning Joshua," brings the narrative back around to the point in time reached at the very *beginning* of the book of Judges, is a creative way of describing the same time period from quite distinct points of view—first, from the point of view of the Israelites, and second, from that of the LORD.

4.3.4 Some Final Thoughts on the Narrative Approach to Judges 1:1—3:11

The ultimate aim of the narrative approach of this study was the drawing out of meaning by carefully relating the various parts to each other to get a sense of the whole. Narrative

approaches in general tend to be creatively individualistic, and often lack the

methodological controls that would lead to consistent replicability of findings. The

situating of narrative discourse within the broader scheme of text typology, and the

application of discourse analysis according to Longacre's general method, provides some

such methodological control.

Story, as a discourse type, operates within the two parameters of positive

contingent temporal succession (set in a past in terms of projection) and positive agent

orientation. With respect to agent orientation, it has the possibilities of either plus or

minus tension. In this *introduction* to the book of Judges we have seen examples of both,

with perhaps less tension overall than in regular stories. The tension that was present was

momentous, however, and appeared to come upon the reader suddenly (e.g., Judg 2:2b,

20–21).

In the end, there is a great deal of merit to Klein's view that this extended

introduction (Judg 1:1—3:11) is an *exposition* of the book that establishes the major

judge paradigm for the main narrative portion of the book. For her, coherence is gained

by the establishment of two points of view, the LORD's (Judg 2:1—3:11), who sees

failure and wickedness, and the Israelites' (Judg 1:3–36), who are more-or-less

successful/content according to the narrator, and between whom an ironic interplay

develops throughout the remainder of the book.[149] I would challenge, however, the notion

that the LORD's perspective is entirely negative. The generation of the fathers that had

seen the great deeds of the LORD is viewed at least somewhat positively by the

character, the LORD, if not necessarily by the narrator. This awareness opens

---

[149] Klein, *Triumph of Irony*, 35–36.

possibilities for interpreting the great deeds done by the LORD when deliverers are raised up as efficacious in giving the Land (the people) its rest.

The following chapter is a summary of findings from the examinations of Josh 23–24, Judg 1:1—3:11, and the passages from the book of Joshua that parallel the accounts of Judg 1, which are relevant to describing the distinct perspectives that underlie the transition at the book-seam of Joshua–Judges. Some additional concluding remarks on the methodology are included. The value of situating the discourse analysis in the context of diachronic efforts to describe the Joshua–Judges book-seam is also noted.

CHAPTER 5: SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

We set out at the beginning to accomplish three things: first, to refine our understanding of the differences in perspective between the books of Joshua and Judges, especially at the dense book-seam between Josh 23:1 and Judg 3:11, using Robert E. Longacre's discourse analysis as a constrained narrative approach; second, to establish Longacre's discourse analysis as a valid method for doing a constrained narrative approach; and third, to acknowledge the complex compositional histories of these texts while concentrating on their relative narrative coherence and cohesion within the MT.

5.1 Summary of How Past Research Informed This Study

We set this study in the context of a limited view of Martin Noth's Deuteronomistic History hypothesis, and a recognition of the possibility of the existence of a Hexateuch at a certain point in the history of the development of the Hebrew Bible. The resulting effect was that we understood that the broad theological perspective of Josh 23:16 remains a major controlling factor in the books of Joshua and Judges, and the Deuteronomistic History as a whole—"If you transgress the covenant of the LORD your God, which he enjoined on you, and go and serve other gods and bow down to them, then the anger of the LORD will be kindled against you, and you shall perish quickly from the good land that he has given to you" (Josh 23:16, NRSV).

We reviewed a number of critical-historical approaches to the formation of the texts under consideration, with particular attention paid to those studies that dealt explicitly with the book-seam, in order to gain perspective on the points of view of those entities entangled in the creation of the texts and how they all (the traditions, sources, forms, redactions, and intertextual interpretations) have been understood by the church and academy. As lead-ins to each analytical chapter, we also outlined various—at times competing—proposals for describing the literary structures and/or narrative approach evaluations of the books of Joshua and Judges in order to narrow the context for our scrutiny of the book-seam. But by concentrating on a synchronic analysis and (an) implied author(s) of the texts, *as opposed to another diachronic attempt*, and recognizing that the books are connected in order canonically, we have come at the explanatory problem of the book-seam from a new angle. What was new in this study is the textlinguistically-controlled narrative approach that elicited both the continuities and discontinuities evident especially at the transition/overlap between the books. In all of this we have gained an appreciation for the literary artistry and relative coherence of the narratives under consideration, even if they came to their current state through a lengthy compositional process.

5.2 Conclusions Regarding the Method

Longacre's discourse analysis method has been validated as a legitimate narrative approach to the Biblical Hebrew narrative under consideration. The verbal constellation forms proposed by Longacre and refined by Roy L. Heller (among others), and their band/level distance from the main event line of the discourse types (e.g., involvement in

foregrounding and backgrounding, and marking text unit boundaries), and the

enumeration and the distance positioning of participant references in relation to the main

storyline, were instrumental in bringing a more complete understanding of the narratives.

Those quantitatively determined textlinguistic data provided boundary markers for

episodes (often through temporal markers or the identification of primary participants)

and helped define the roles of the several participants (characters, props, and narrator).

And not only that, but the application of the verbal constellations approach of Longacre

and Heller to new texts of different discourse types has enhanced the understanding of the

functions of specific verb forms in specific contexts. Whereas Heller's methodology

usefully refined our understanding of the verbal constellations used for different purposes

in Biblical Hebrew narratives (including especially within embedded direct speech), the

application of Longacre's methodology to trace the use of characters, time, and space as

the basic building blocks of stories and the essential components used to generate plot

and perspective has established itself as an effective control on the excesses or vagueness

of narrative approaches in general.

5.3 Findings Concerning Joshua–Judges Overall

We noted above that the broad theological perspective of Josh 23:16 remains a significant

controlling factor in the books of Joshua and Judges, but that statement needs to be

assigned the caveat that there is an uneven application of that overriding perspective

between the two books—Judges being more severe than Joshua. There is also the

noticeable "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."[1] As we now have them, Joshua and Judges are distinct works—they each have editorial perspectives that exhibit overall cohesion and coherence, as well as differences in emphasis and perspective. In other words, for the most part, they each come from the standpoints of implied authors.

5.4 Findings Specific to Joshua

The book of Joshua is foremost a narrative containing stories, events, and descriptions, fitted into the larger Primary History of which it is an integral part. It speaks of military conquest and the allotment of the land. It has, nonetheless, considerable portions of exposition and persuasive direct reported speech embedded within the narrative framework. Overall, it is instructional in nature—just like the remainder of the Primary History—and so therefore aimed at an implied reader. The power of Israel to remain on the land is seen to be conditional, and there would be a cost for disobedience to the divine command. (A prominent pattern in the book is the depiction of divine command, and obedient and immediate execution of the command, especially by the character Joshua). Correlated to this is the ambiguity about how much of the land remains to be taken—the second half of the book tends to be more pessimistic concerning this, and the speeches of chs. 23 and 24 each deal with this ambiguity differently.

The notice at Josh 13:1 that "Joshua had grown old, advanced in days," connects back narratively to Josh 11:23 where it is remarked that Joshua took the whole land and allotted it to the tribes of Israel, and forward to the duplicate notice at Josh 23:1 that introduces Joshua's farewell speech. Because of the temporal dislocation created for chs.

---

[1] Frevel, "Untying Tangles," 294.

13–22 by that *Wiederaufnahme* (resumptive repetition), a focus is brought to bear on ch. 23 as an interpretive guide to the conquest and settlement stories in view of the overriding deuteronomistic theology of land possession tied to obedience to the Law and avoidance of entanglements with the inhabitants of the land. Joshua 24, on the other hand, has a wider horizon that reaches back to the patriarchal narratives, emphasizing the victories of the LORD, service to the LORD, and continuing worship of the ancestral God.

The narrative juxtaposition of Josh 11:23; 13:1, with only the defeated kings lists intervening, has another dislocating effect—it moves quickly (in reading time) from Joshua taking the whole land and allotting it to the tribes of Israel, to an announcement that "*very much land remains to possess*." Insofar as this is a *theological* or *ideological* complication, it is also the injection of an unexpected problem into the storyline that encourages reader interest and propels the plot forward narratively.

Joshua 23 is essentially a deuteronomistic speech by Joshua exhorting the people to follow the LORD. The ideological emphasis is unmistakable—continued possession of the land is conditional. It is not particularly at odds with the narrative arc established by Josh 11:23; 13:1a // 23:1b where "Joshua took the whole land . . . and the land had rest (cf. Josh 23:1a) . . . and now Joshua had grown old, advanced in days." However, the narrative complication that "very much land remains to possess" introduced at Josh 13:1bδ is dealt with obliquely by Josh 23:4–5 where Joshua states that the LORD will push back any remaining nations. The location of those nations is unclear, whether persisting in the heartland as is insinuated by some of the exposition in the second half of Joshua, or pressing in from the periphery as seems the case in Judges. In this context, the

warnings of Josh 23:6–8, 11–13, 15–16 are ominous, and in the context of the

Deuteronomistic History they are *proleptic*. The land, and life itself, really is at risk of

being lost. There is a subtle shift in the prognosis of Josh 23:16 where the previously

mentioned *possibility* of apostasy in Josh 23:12 becomes a decided and *inevitable*

prediction. It will eventually find a form of fulfilment in Judg 2:11–15.

The account of the Assembly at Shechem (Josh 24:1–28) also deals obliquely

with the narrative complication of Josh 13:1bδ. The facts that it is temporally indistinct

and geographically connected with the account of the altar at Mount Ebal of Josh 8:30–

35, and that its monologue and dialogue harken back to the times of the patriarchs and

Exodus, as well as the conquest, serve to extend the narrative arc *back* through significant

portions of the Pentateuch, thus it is somewhat *analeptic*. Like Josh 23—but much more

extensively—"Past history is retold to admonish the people to diligent service of God and

to warn them against disastrous revolting,"[2] and there is also a merging of Joshua's

generation with that of their fathers, and even more distant forebearers. That has the

effect of drawing the Israelites in the story that are present for the speech into the

embedded story of the speech itself in a powerful way. It even draws in the implied

readers in a subtle way to set them up for the hortatory finale to the speech in Josh 24:14–

15 where there remains a *choice* to serve the LORD, or not.

The finale to the book at Josh 24:29–33, while having a certain amount of

duplication in Judg 2:6–9, provides a suitable closure to the book of Joshua with notices

of Joshua's death and burial, and that Israel served the LORD during his lifetime and for

some time afterward (Josh 24:31), and with the implication that Israel is in possession of

---

[2] Winther-Nielsen, *Functional Discourse Grammar*, 315.

the land. The marking of the opening to Josh 24:29 with a temporal clause, signifying the closing of one episode and the start of another at that point is a critical observation for this study. There is no such marking in the parallel text in Judg 2:8 where it is simply a part of the continuing main storyline of Judg 2:6–10.

There is undoubtedly a narrative framework that carries the main storyline forward in time from the death of Moses (Josh 1:1) until the death of Moses' successor Joshua (Josh 24:29), even if at times this framework exhibits temporal uncertainty. Overall, the book of Joshua does have a somewhat muted, or at least more ambiguous, perspective on the explicit viewpoint of Josh 23:16. The lack of a negative view in the text concerning the agreements between the Israelites with Rahab (Josh 2) and the Gibeonites (Josh 9) do not entirely fit with that deuteronomistic outlook. The narrative complication/problem introduced at Josh 13:1bδ finds its explicit explanation at Josh 24:23, that there are foreign gods among the people, and which serves to derail possession of the land by all Israel as noted specifically within the narrative frame.

5.5 Findings Specific to Judges

The book of Judges is, like Joshua, an episodic narrative fitted into its appropriate place in the Primary History. We decided to treat Judg 1:1—3:11 as the programmatic introduction(s) to the book, in effect, the opening story to the larger cycle of stories of the book. It is evident that Judg 3:7–11 (Cushan-rishathaim and Othniel) is transitional in nature in that it is a strictly unembellished paradigm of the proleptic summary announcement of 2:11–19, and which sketches only the basic pattern that the following variations of the judge-stories will mimic to a greater or lesser extent. The book is

integrated into the larger History by means of the character Joshua and temporal *wayəhî* "so then" connection between Josh 24:29 and Judg 1:1, and only slightly less concretely by the *wayəhî* connection between Judg 21:25 and 1 Sam 1:1 (cf. also the expression וַיְהִי אִישׁ אֶחָד "there was a certain man," only at Judg 13:2 [Manoah] and 1 Sam 1:1 [Elkanah], and the duplication of characters Eli/Eleazer and the son Phinehas at Josh 24:33 and 1 Sam 1:3). It is recalled also that Noth thought that the narratives about the judges-period extended to 1 Sam 12.[3]

The temporal flux that described crucial inflection points in the narrative arc of the book of Joshua extends to the introduction(s) and conclusion(s) to the book of Judges. Events that would be thought by the reader of Joshua to have occurred prior to Joshua's death, like Caleb's taking of Hebron and Othniel's taking of Debir, are recounted again in Judg 1, ostensibly after Joshua is said to be dead in Judg 1:1. We also see Joshua alive again in the Recapitulation Concerning Joshua (Judg 2:6–10 // Josh 24:28–31) in order to clearly reinforce the notion that *the apostasy and ensuing predicament* of the following sub-episode (Judg 2:11–15) *occurred in the generation immediately following the passing of Joshua's*. It is often thought that the conclusions (appendices?) to Judges at Judg 17–18; 19–21 signify the culmination of the debauchery of the Israelites to a time *after* the completion of the cycle of saviour stories, but they are, rather, *explicitly* connected to the third generation following Moses and Aaron, that is, the generation immediately succeeding Joshua. Judges presents a view of *repeated*, rather than *persistent* apostasy on the part of Israelites, and its first instance took place quickly—and profoundly— subsequent to the death of Joshua.

---

[3] Noth, *Deuteronomistic History*, 34–44.

Judges 1 proceeds with mild tension building throughout due to the Adoni Bezek, Caleb/Othniel/Achsah, and Bethel/Luz vignettes, and especially the increasing difficulties the tribes have in driving out the Jebusites, Canaanites, and Amorites. The chapter splits into two halves—Judg 1:1–21, 22–36—with the first part positively focused on Judah (and Simeon), but ending on a negative comment concerning *Benjamin's*[4] unwillingness to drive out the Jebusites from Jerusalem. There is only one other minor negative comment at Judg 1:19 about Judah's inability to drive out the chariot possessing inhabitants of the valley. The second part of the chapter begins with a positive description of the House of Joseph's exploits at Bethel/Luz (cf. the lack of narratorial judgement mentioned on agreements with inhabitants of the land for Rahab [Josh 2] and the Gibeonites [Josh 9]). But starting at Judg 1:27, the remaining individual tribes are treated in summary fashion in an increasingly disparaging manner until it is remarked at the end that Dan had been pushed back by the Amorites. The narrator does not *explicitly* condemn the tribes for their inability or unwillingness to drive out the inhabitants, or their willingness to subject them to forced labour, but the *implication* is one of moral degeneration and increasing culpability. Perhaps the first crack in the initial positive outlook concerning Judah is hinted at in Judg 1:3 when Judah asks his brother Simeon to go up with him to fight first—this is not in strict conformity with the pattern of divine command, and immediate and exact execution, we saw with the character Joshua in the book of Joshua.

---

[4] We noted that this verse may have been dislocated from a position after Judg 1:8. In its present location it provides a suitable ending to the episode in textlinguistic terms, but the parallel text in Josh 15:63 puts the onus on Judah, not Benjamin.

The event of the episode of the Messenger Speech at Judg 2:1–5 is incorporated into the narrative sequence and brings it to a sudden climax through a more extended and complex direct address than is found anywhere in Judg 1. It is not, as is sometimes done, to be taken as a commentary on Judg 1. The *momentous negation* in the messenger's charge that Israel "did not harken to my voice" (Judg 2:2) is emphatically about the making of covenants with the inhabitants of the land. But what covenants are in view? Whereas the geography of the event is clear in a narrative sense, its timing is not! The future orientation of Judg 2:3 that "I will not drive them out from your presence, but they will be at your sides and their gods will be a snare to you," points to the continuation of the introductory story of the book, and the stories beyond it.

The retrospective nature of Judg 2:6–10 (Recapitulation Concerning Joshua) was clarified above, and how in its new setting, and in its subtle changes, it introduces the new generation that lacked knowledge of the great things that the LORD had done (Judg 2:10). It is at Judg 2:11, on the heals of the generational change, where the judgement of the narrator more closely aligns with the messenger of Judg 2:1–5. Judges 2:11–15 reflects on the evil deeds of Israel, and the anger and consequent judgement of the LORD in short order. The narrator then turns to speak of the salvation offered by the LORD and the persistently repetitive nature of the failure of Israel in Judg 2:16–23. The result of that failure would be that the LORD—as spoken in the divine speech of Judg 2:20–22— would not be driving out the nations quickly, in order to test the new generation (Judg 2:21–23; cf. Judg 3:1, 4). The narrator's continuing exposition in Judg 3:1–6 paints a very dismal picture of the situation of the Israelites in comparison with the rather positive view at the beginning of Judg 1, and even in comparison with the ambivalence of the

LORD as a character who was willing to wait and see what the outcome might be at Judg 2:22 and Judg 3:4.

5.6 Comparisons of Joshua to Judges

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 introductory exposition is obvious.[5] Wilhelm Rudolph's contention that the book of Joshua and Judg 1 contain older written traditions that were later shaped by a deuteronomic writer, and even later adapted by deuteronomistic editors, is supported somewhat by the literary evidence. It might also be said that Judges is now a distinct work no matter what one believes about a Deuteronomistic History. Perhaps it did not always exist as a distinct work from Joshua, but it has now been created with a special introduction.[6] Some of the ideological distinctives between the two books are already well-known. For example, the pre-eminence of Judah in Judg 1,[7] the anti-Benjaminite stance of Judg 19–21,[8] and the generally Ephraimite-friendly stance of the book of Joshua,[9] are recognized by means of previous historical-critical approaches.

Some of the suspected parallels, from a historical-critical point of view, are not to be considered parallels narratively because they occur either before or after the notice of Joshua's death at Judg 1:1, and the narratives themselves are so distinctively different; the Sacking of Ai/Bethel (Josh 8:10–23 and 12:9, 16 // Judg 1:22–26) and the episodes of Adoni Zedek/Bezek (Josh 10:1–5, 22–27; 12:10 // Judg 1:1–8) are examples. Things are

---

[5] Frevel, "Untying Tangles," 293–94.
[6] Levin, "Nach siebzig Jahren," 76–78, 88.
[7] Lindars, *Judges 1–5*, 5–7.
[8] Amit, *Book of Judges*, 341–50.
[9] Nelson, *Joshua*, 8. Nonetheless, he notes that the story mostly takes place "in Benjaminite territory [and] the editorial outlook is distinctly Judahite."

murkier, however, with other episodes such as the Allotment to Caleb (Josh 14:6–15 and 15:13–19 // Judg 1:9–16, 20). We have already noted above the temporal elusiveness of Josh 13–22 due to the resumptive repetition of Joshua's old age at Josh 13:1; 23:1. Some of that temporal ambiguity seems to be transferred narratively to the account in Judg 1:9–16, 20 (the Allotment to Caleb), which is clearly equating itself to the account in Josh 14–15 (especially the giving of Achsah as wife to Othniel) as is evident in the extensive verbal similarities, even though the purposes for which each is located where it is are not perfectly clear. With respect to the mention of Canaanites owning iron chariotry when the Josephites Complain About Their Allotment (Josh 17:14–18), the taking possession of their territory is still in the future; in Judg 1:19, Judah has already taken possession of their hill country, with only the valleys remaining inhabited by Canaanites due to their advantage of iron chariots.

It is appreciated that in the book of Joshua the culpability of the tribes for not driving out the land's inhabitants is spread more evenly over all of the tribes than it is in Judg 1.[10] At Josh 15:63 the Jebusites persisted in dwelling in Jerusalem because "the Judahites were *not able* to drive them out." Similar phraseology is used in Josh 17:12, "yet the Manassehites were *not able* to drive out these cities." In these two instances alone in the book of Joshua, it is the *inability* to drive out the inhabitants that is expressly mentioned. In the corresponding parallels in Judg 1:21, 27, Benjamin and Manasseh simply *did not* drive the inhabitants out, expressing *unwillingness*. This is a quite nuanced view, as it is noted at other places in Joshua that "the Israelites *did not* drive out the Geshurites and the Maacathites" (Josh 13:13 [no exact parallel in Judg 1, but cf. Judg

---

[10] Younger, "Judges 1," 220–22.

1:30, 31, 33]) and that "they *did not* drive out the Canaanite" (Josh 16:10 [cf. Judg 1:29]). The subtle shift in outlook from Joshua to Judges is a move from more implicit criticism to a declaration that is more explicit,[11] especially in the exposition of Judg 1:27–36, even if "both accounts testify to the moral decline in Israel through the imposition of the tribal, geographic arrangement."[12] In these parallels, Joshua seems more optimistic about success than Judges, but the ambivalence of some actors in Joshua points to a future in which the command and obedient execution model is put under some tension.

Whereas the book of Joshua ends on a high note, the recapitulation of Josh 24:28–31 at Judg 2:6–10 introduces the rapid degeneration of the Israelites. *The marking of the opening to Josh 24:29 with a temporal clause, signifying the closing of one episode and the start of another is a key observation.* There is no such marking in the parallel text in Judg 2:8. In Judges it is simply and quite deliberately a part of a continuing main storyline that runs from Judg 2:6 through to 2:10, and so, is presented as an adaptation of the parallel passage in Joshua for that purpose. This episode seems to have originally been constructed as an introduction to the stories and times of the judges. Judges 2:7 indicates that the people, *who had seen all the great work that the LORD had done*, served the LORD. This was not the case in the next episode of Judges when the next generation quickly fell away from the LORD. The question might be asked—will this continue to be the case as the story of Israel unfolds? This insight supports the idea that the book of Judges presents a view of repeated, rather than persistent apostasy on the part of Israelites. In the book of Joshua—where the problem of apostasy is not an explicit or

---

[11] Younger, "Configuring of Judicial Preliminaries," 85–86. But cf. also the man from Luz/Bethel (Judg 1:23–26) with Judg 2:2, and that there is a difference between the "could not" and "would not drive out" notices of the negative second half of Judg 1.

[12] Younger, "Configuring of Judicial Preliminaries," 83.

generalized problem throughout—the character Joshua does nevertheless address the potential (Josh 23:12–13; 24:15) or tendency (Josh 23:14–16; 24:19–20, 23) of the people to transgress.

Even though it may no longer be possible to determine definitively the original placement of the notice concerning the Israelites serving the LORD throughout Joshua's life—i.e., before Joshua's death as in Judg 2:7, or after his death as in Josh 24:31— arguments for *both* positions support a *literary* reason for its specific placement at Judg 2:7. The discourse analysis has demonstrated that the rearrangement of the text in Judg 2:6–10 vis-à-vis that in Josh 24:28–31, 33 highlights the speed and depth of the apostasy, whereas Josh 24:28–31, 33 is more positive in not indicating the apostasy of the next generation in any manner.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Albright, William Foxwell. "The Israelite Conquest of Canaan in the Light of Archaeology." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 74 (1939) 11–23.

Alt, Albrecht. "Judas Gaue unter Josia." *Palästina-Jahrbuch* 21 (1925) 100–17.

———. "Das System der Stammesgrenzen im Buche Josua." In *Sellin-Festschrift: Beiträge zur Religionsgeschichte und Archäologie Palästinas; Ernst Sellin zum 60*, edited by William Foxwell Albright, 13–24. Leipzig: Deichert, 1927.

Alter, Robert. *The Art of Biblical Narrative*. New York: Basic, 1981.

Amit, Yairah. *The Book of Judges: The Art of Editing*. Translated by Jonathan Chipman. Biblical Interpretation Series 38. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

———. *Reading Biblical Narratives: Literary Criticism and the Hebrew Bible*. Translated by Y. Lotan. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001.

———. "Who Was Interested in the Book of Judges in the Persian-Hellenistic Periods?" In *Deuteronomy—Kings as Emerging Authoritative Books: A Conversation*, edited by Diana V. Edelman, 103–14. Ancient Near East Monographs 6. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2014.

Andersen, Francis I. *The Sentence in Biblical Hebrew*. Janua Linguarum, Series Practica 231. The Hague: Mouton, 1974.

Auld, A. Graeme. *Joshua: Jesus Son of Nauē in Codex Vaticanus*. Septuagint Commentary Series. Leiden: Brill, 2005.

———. *Joshua, Moses and the Land: Tetrateuch-Pentateuch-Hexateuch in a Generation since 1938*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1980.

———. "Judges 1 and History: A Reconsideration." *Vetus Testamentum* 25.3 (1975) 261–85.

———. "Textual and Literary Studies in the Book of Joshua." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 90 (1978) 412–17

Bal, Mieke. *Death and Dissymmetry: The Politics of Coherence in the Book of Judges*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988.

Bar-Efrat, Shimon. *Narrative Art in the Bible*. Translated by Dorothea Shefer-Vanson. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement 70. Bible and Literature 17. Sheffield: Almond, 1989.

Beaugrande, Robert-Alain de, and Wolfgang Ulrich Dressler. *Introduction to Text Linguistics*. Longman Linguistics Library. London: Longman, 1981.

Beldman, David J. *The Completion of Judges: Strategies of Ending in Judges 17–21*. Siphrut 21. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2017.

Bergström, Ulf. *Aspect, Communicative Appeal, and Temporal Meaning in Biblical Hebrew Verbal Forms*. Linguistic Studies in Ancient West Semitic 16. University Park, PA: Eisenbrauns, 2022.

Berlin, Adele. *Poetics and Interpretation of Biblical Narrative*. Bible and Literature 9. Sheffield: Almond, 1983.

Berner, Christoph, and Harald Samuel, eds. *Book-Seams in the Hextateuch 1: The Literary Transitions between the Books of Genesis/Exodus and Joshua/Judges*. Forschungen zum Alten Testament 120. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2018.

Block, Daniel I. *Judges, Ruth*. The New American Commentary 6. Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1999.

Bloomfield, Leonard. *Language*. New York: Henry Holt, 1933.

Blum, Erhard. "Der kompositionelle Knoten am Übergang von Josua zu Richter. Ein Entflechtungsvorschlag." In *Deuteronomy and Deuteronomic Literature: Festschrift C. H. W. Brekelmans*, edited by M. Vervenne and J. Lust, 181–212. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 133. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1997.

———. "Once Again: The Compositional Knot at the Transition between Joshua and Judges." In *Book-Seams in the Hexateuch 1: The Literary Transitions between the Books of Genesis/Exodus and Joshua/Judges*, edited by Christoph Berner and Harald Samuel, 221–40. Forschung zum Alten Testamentum 120. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2018.

Boda, Mark J., and Mary L. Conway. *Judges*. Zondervan Exegetical Commentary on the Old Testament: A Discourse Analysis of the Hebrew Bible. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2022.

Boling, Robert G. *Joshua: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. With an Introduction by G. Ernest Wright. Anchor Bible 6. Garden City: Doubleday, 1982.

———. *Judges: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. The Anchor Bible 6A. Garden City: Doubleday, 1975.

———. "Some Conflate Readings in Joshua–Judges." *Vetus Testamentum* 16 (1966) 293–98.

Brekelmans, Chris. "Joshua 24: Its Place and Function." In *Congress Volume Leuven 1989*, edited by J. A. Emerton, 1–9. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 43. Leiden: Brill, 1991.

Brettler, Marc. "Jud 1:1—2:10: From Appendix to Prologue." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 101.3 (1989) 433–35.

Brown, Francis, et al. *Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1907.

Budde, D. Karl. *Das Buch der Richter*. Kurzer Hand-Commentar zum Alten Testament. Freiburg: Mohr Siebeck, 1897.

———. *Die Bücher Richter und Samuel: Ihre Quellen und ihr Aufbau*. Giessen: Ricker, 1980.

———. "Richter und Josua." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 7.1 (1887) 93–166.

Burney, Charles F. *The Book of Judges: With Introduction and Notes*. London: Rivingtons, 1918.

Buth, Randal, "Functional Grammar, Hebrew and Aramaic: An Integrated, Textlinguistic Approach to Syntax." In *Discourse Analysis of Biblical Literature: What It Is and What It Offers*, edited by Walter R. Bodine, 77–102. The Society of Biblical Literature Semeia Studies. Atlanta: Scholars, 1995.

Butler, Trent C. *Joshua*. Word Biblical Commentary 7. Waco: Word, 1983.

———. *Joshua 1–12*. 2nd ed. Word Biblical Commentary 7a. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2014.

———. *Joshua 13–24*. 2nd ed. Word Biblical Commentary 7b. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2014.

———. *Judges*. Word Biblical Commentary 8. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2009.

Childs, Brevard S. *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979.

Choi, Baek Sung. "The Unity and the Symmetry of the Book of Job." PhD diss., University of Texas at Arlington, 2000.

Cicero, Marcus Tullius. *How to Win an Argument: An Ancient Guide to the Art of Persuasion*. Selected, edited, and translated by James M. May. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2016.

Clendenen, Ewell R. "The Interpretation of Biblical Hebrew Hortatory Texts: A Textlinguistic Approach to the Book of Malachi." PhD diss., University of Texas at Arlington, 1989.

Clines, David J. A., ed. *The Concise Dictionary of Classical Hebrew*. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2009.

Conway, Mary L. *Judging the Judges: A Narrative Appraisal Analysis*. Linguistic Studies in Ancient West Semitic 15. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2019.

Cross, Frank Moore. "The Themes of the Book of Kings and the Structure of the Deuteronomistic History." In *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic: Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel*, 274–89. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1973.

Culley, Robert C. "Exploring New Directions." In *The Hebrew Bible and Its Modern Interpreters*, edited by Douglas A. Knight and Gene M. Tucker, 167–200. The Bible and Its Modern Interpreters. Chico, CA: Scholars, 1985.

———. "Stories of the Conquest: Joshua 2, 6, 7 and 8." *Hebrew Annual Review* 8 (1984) 25–44.

———. *Studies in the Structure of Hebrew Narrative*. Semeia Supplements. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976.

De Troyer, Kristen. *The Ultimate and the Penultimate Text of the Book of Joshua*. Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology 100. Leuven: Peeters, 2018.

Dearman, J. Andrew. *Reading Hebrew Bible Narratives*. Essentials of Biblical Studies. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019.

Dempster, Steven G. "Linguistic Features of Hebrew Narrative: A Discourse Analysis of Narrative from the Classical Period." PhD diss., University of Toronto, 1985.

Dozeman, Thomas B. "The Book of Joshua as an Intertext in the MT and the LXX Canons." In *Pentateuch, Hexateuch, or Enneateuch?: Identifying Literary Works*

in Genesis through Kings, edited by Thomas B. Dozeman, et al., 185–209. Ancient Israel and Its Literature 8. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011.

———. *Joshua 1–12: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary.* The Anchor Yale Bible 6B. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2015.

———. *Joshua 13–24: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary.* The Anchor Yale Bible 6C. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2023.

Edenburg, Cynthia. "Envelopes and Seams: How Judges Fits (or not) within the Deuteronomistic History." In *Book-Seams in the Hexateuch 1: The Literary Transitions between the Books of Genesis/Exodus and Joshua/Judges*, edited by Christoph Berner and Harald Samuel, 353–69. Forschung zum Alten Testamentum 120. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2018.

———. "Joshua 24: A Diaspora-oriented Overriding of the Joshua Scroll." *Hebrew Bible and Ancient Israel* 6 (2017) 161–80.

———. "'Overwriting and Overriding,' or What Is *Not* Deuteronomistic." In *Congress Volume Helsinki 2010*, edited by Martti Nissinen, 443–60. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 148. Leiden: Brill, 2012.

Eissfeldt, Otto. *Hexateuch-synopse: Die Erzählung der fünf Bücher Mose und des Buches Josua mit dem Anfange des Richterbuches*. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1922.

———. *The Old Testament: An Introduction Including the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, and also the Works of Similar Type from Qumran: The History and Formation of the Old Testament*. Translated by Peter R. Ackroyd. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1966.

———. *Die Quellen des Richterbuches in synoptischer Anordnung ins Deutsche übersetzt samt einer in Einleitung und Noten gegebenen begründung*. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1925.

Elliger, Karl, and Wilhelm Rudolph, eds. *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1987.

Endo, Yoshinobu. *The Verbal System of Classical Hebrew in the Joseph Story: An Approach from Discourse Analysis*. Studia Semitica Neerlandica. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1996.

Eskhult, Mats. *Studies in Verbal Aspect and Narrative Technique in Biblical Hebrew Prose*. Studia Semitica Upsaliensa 12. Uppsala: Uppsala University Press, 1990.

Fernández Marcos, Natalio. *Judges*. Biblia Hebraica Quinta 7. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2011.

Fokkelman, Jan P. *Reading Biblical Narrative: An Introductory Guide*. Translated by Ineke Smit. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1999.

Foucault, Michel. *Les mots et les choses: Une archéologie des sciences humaines*. Paris: Gallimard, 1966.

Frevel, Christian. "On Untying Tangles and Tying Knots in Joshua 23—Judges 3:6: A Response to Erhard Blum, Reinhard G. Kratz and Sarah Schulz." In *Book-Seams in the Hexateuch 1: The Literary Transitions between the Books of Genesis/Exodus and Joshua/Judges*, edited by Christoph Berner and Harald Samuel, 281–94. Forschung zum Alten Testamentum 120. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2018.

Frolov, Serge. "Joshua's Double Demise (Josh. 24:28–31; Judg. 2:6–9): Making Sense of a Repetition." *Vetus Testamentum* 58 (2008) 315–23.

———. *Judges*. The Forms of the Old Testament Literature 6B. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2013.

———. "Rethinking Judges." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 71 (2009) 24–41.

Frye, Northrop. *The Great Code: The Bible and Literature*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1981.

Goldingay, John. *Joshua*. Baker Commentary on the Old Testament Historical Books. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2023.

Gros Louis, Kenneth R. R. "The Book of Judges." In *Literary Interpretations of Biblical Narratives*, edited by K. Gros Louis et al., 141–62. Nashville: Abingdon, 1974.

———. "Some Methodological Considerations." In *Literary Interpretations of Biblical Narratives 2*, edited by K. Gros Louis and J. Ackerman, 13–24. Nashville: Abingdon, 1982.

Hall, Sarah Lebhar. *Conquering Character: The Characterization of Joshua in Joshua 1–11*. Library of Hebrew Bible / Old Testament Studies 512. New York: T. & T. Clark, 2010.

Harris, Zellig S. "Discourse Analysis." *Language* 28.1 (1952) 1–30.

Hawk, L. Daniel. *Joshua*. Berit Olam Studies in Hebrew Narrative and Poetry. Collegeville, MN: Glazier/Liturgical, 2000.

Heller, Roy L. *Narrative Structure and Discourse Constellations: An Analysis of Clause Function in Biblical Hebrew Prose*. Harvard Semitic Studies 55. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2004.

Holladay, William L., ed. *A Concise Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988.

Hollenberg, Johannes. "Die deuteronomischen Beslandtheile des Buches Josua." *Theologische Studien und Kritiken* 47 (1874) 462–506.

Holzinger, Heinrich. "Josua." In *Die heilige Schrift des Alten Testaments*, edited by Emil Kautzsch and Alfred Bertholet. Vol.1. 4th ed. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1922.

House, Paul R. "The Rise and Current Status of Literary Criticism of the Old Testament." In *Beyond Form Criticism: Essays in Old Testament Literary Criticism*, edited by Paul R. House, 3–22. Sources for Biblical and Theological Study 2. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1992.

Huddleston, Neal A. "Deuteronomy as *Mischgattung*: A Comparative and Contrastive Discourse Analysis of Deuteronomy and Ancient Near Eastern Treaty Traditions." PhD diss., Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, 2015.

Hwang, Shin Ja J., ed. *The Development of Textlinguistics in the Writings of Robert Longacre*. Publications in Translation and Textlinguistics 4. Dallas: SIL International, 2010.

Hwang, Shin Ja J., and William Merrifield, eds. *Language in Context: Essays for Robert E. Longacre*. Publications in Linguistics 107. Dallas: SIL International, 1992.

Joüon, Paul. *Grammaire de l'Hébreu Biblique*. Rome: Institut Biblique Pontifical, 1923.

Joüon, Paul, and Takamitsu Muraoka. *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*. 2nd ed. Rome: Gregorian and Biblical Press, 2006.

Kautzsch, Emil, ed. *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*. Translated by Arther E. Cowley. 2nd ed. Oxford: Clarendon, 1910.

Kempf, Stephen W. "A Discourse Analysis of Genesis 2:4b—3:24 with Implications for Interpretation and Bible Translation." PhD diss., Université Laval, 1995.

Kenyon, Kathleen M. *Archaeology in the Holy Land*. London: Benn, 1960.

Kittel, Rudolf, ed. *Biblia Hebraica*. 8th ed. Stuttgart: Privilegierte Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1952.

Klein, Lillian R. *The Triumph of Irony in the Book of Judges*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement 68. Bible and Literature 14. Sheffield: Almond, 1988.

Koehler, Ludwig, and Walter Baumgartner, eds. 2 vols. *Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros*. Leiden: Brill, 1951–1953.

Koopmans, William T. *Joshua 24 as Poetic Narrative*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement 93. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1990.

Kratz, Reinhard G. *The Composition of the Narrative Books of the Old Testament*. Translated by John Bowden. London: T. & T. Clark, 2005.

———. "The Literary Transition in Joshua 23—Judges 2: Observations and Considerations." In *Book-Seams in the Hexateuch 1: The Literary Transitions between the Books of Genesis/Exodus and Joshua/Judges*, edited by Christoph Berner and Harald Samuel, 241–56. Forschung zum Alten Testamentum 120. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2018.

Lambdin, Thomas O. *Introduction to Biblical Hebrew*. New York: Scribner's Sons, 1971.

Levin, Christoph. "Nach siebzig Jahren. Martin Noths Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 125.1 (2013) 72–92.

Lindars, Barnabas. *Judges 1–5: A New Translation and Commentary*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1995.

Lisowsky, Gerhard. *Konkordanz zum Hebräischen Alten Testament: Nach dem von Paul Kahle in der Biblia Hebraica edidit Rudolf Kittel besorgten Masoretischen Text Unter verantwortlicher Mitwirkung von Leonhard Rost ausgearbeitet und geschrieben*. 2nd ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1981 [1966].

Lohfink, Norbert. "חָרַם *ḥāram*." In *TDOT*, 5:180–99.

Longacre, Robert E. *An Anatomy of Speech Notions*. Peter de Ridder Press Publications in Tagmemics 3. Lisse: de Ridder, 1976.

———. "The Discourse Structure of the Flood Narrative." In *Society of Biblical Literature 1976 Papers*, edited by George MacRae, 235–62. Missoula, MT: Scholars, 1976.

———. "The Discourse Structure of the Flood Narrative." *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 47 Supplement (1979) 89–133.

———. "The Dynamics of Reported Dialogue in Narrative." *Word* 45.2 (1994) 125–43.

———. *The Grammar of Discourse*. Topics in Language and Linguistics. New York: Plenum, 1983.

———. *The Grammar of Discourse*. 2nd ed. Topics in Language and Linguistics. New York: Plenum, 1996.

———. *Grammar Discovery Procedures: A Field Manual*. Janua Linguarum, Series Minor 33. The Hague: Mouton, 1964.

———. *Joseph: A Story of Divine Providence: A Text Theoretical and Textlinguistic Analysis of Genesis 37 and 39–48*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1989.

———. *Joseph: A Story of Divine Providence: A Text Theoretical and Textlinguistic Analysis of Genesis 37 and 39–48*. 2nd ed. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2003.

———. *Proto-Mixtecan*. Indiana Research Center in Anthropology, Folklore and Linguistics 5. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1957.

———. Review of *The Verbal System of Classical Hebrew in the Joseph Story: An Approach from Discourse Analysis*, by Yoshinobu Endo. *Hebrew Studies* 39 (1998) 216–18.

———. "Some Hermeneutic Observations on Textlinguistics and Text Theory in the Humanities." In *Functional Approaches to Language, Culture and Cognition: Papers in Honor of Sydney M. Lamb*, edited by David G. Lockwood, et al., 169–83. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2000.

Longacre, Robert E., and Andrew C. Bowling. *Understanding Biblical Hebrew Verb Forms: Distribution and Function across Genres*. SIL International Publications in Linguistics 151. Dallas: SIL International, 2015.

Longacre, Robert E., and Shin Ja J. Hwang. *Holistic Discourse Analysis*. 2nd edition. Dallas: SIL International, 2012.

Longacre, Robert E., and Stephen Levinsohn. "Field Analysis of Discourse." In *Current Trends in Linguistics*, edited by Wolfgang U. Dressler, 103–22. Research in Text Theory / Untersuchungen zur Texttheorie 2. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1978.

Martin, James D. *The Book of Judges*. Cambridge Bible Commentary. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975.

Merwe, Christo H. J. van der. "Discourse Linguistics and Biblical Hebrew Grammar." In *Biblical Hebrew and Discourse Linguistics*, edited by Robert D. Bergen, 13–49. Dallas: SIL International, 1994.

Merwe, Christo H. J. van der, et al. *A Biblical Hebrew Reference Grammar*. 2nd edition. London: Bloomsbury T. & T. Clark, 2017.

Miscall, Peter D. *1 Samuel: A Literary Reading*. Indiana Studies in Biblical Literature. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1986.

Mitchell, Gordon. *Together in the Land: A Reading of the Book of Joshua*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement 134. Sheffield: JSOT, 1993.

Möhlenbrink, Kurt. "Die Landnahmesagen des Buches Josua." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 56 (1938) 238–68.

Moore, George F. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Judges*. International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1895.

Mowinckel, Sigmund. *Zur Frage nach dokumentarischen Quellen in Josua 13–19*. Avhandlinger utgitt av det Norske videnskaps-akademi i Oslo, 2 Historisk-Filosofisk Klasse 1. Oslo: Dybwad, 1946.

Muilenburg, James. "Form Criticism and Beyond." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 88.1 (1969) 1–18.

Nelson, Richard D. *Joshua: A Commentary*. The Old Testament Library. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1997.

Nentel, Jochen. *Trägerschaft und Intentionen des deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerks. Untersuchungen zu den Reflexionsreden Jos 1; 23; 24; 1 Sam 12 und 1 Kön 8*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 297. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2000.

Niccacci, Alviero. "Analysis of Biblical Narrative." In *Biblical Hebrew and Discourse Linguistics*, edited by Robert D. Bergen, 175–98. Dallas: SIL International, 1994.

———. "On the Hebrew Verbal System." In *Biblical Hebrew and Discourse Linguistics*, edited by Robert D. Bergen, 117–37. Dallas: SIL International, 1994.

———. *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose*. Translated by Wilfred G. E. Watson. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement 86. Sheffield: JSOT, 1990.

Noth, Martin. *Das Buch Josua*. Handbuch zum Alten Testament 7. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1938.

———. *Das Buch Josua*. 2nd ed. Handbuch zum Alten Testament 7. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1953.

———. *The Deuteronomistic History*. 2nd edition. Translated by Jane Doull, et al. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement 15. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1991.

———. *Das System der zwölf Stämme Israels*. Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament 4.1. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1930.

———. *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien: Die sammelnden und bearbeitenden Geschichtswerke im Alten Testament*. Schriften der Königsberger Gelehrten Gesellschaft, Geisteswissenschaftliche Klasse 18.2. Halle: Niemeyer, 1943. Reprint, Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1957.

O'Brien, Mark A. *The Deuteronomistic History Hypothesis: A Reassessment*. Orbis biblicus et orientalis 92. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989.

Omerly, George G., III. "Verb Hierarchy and Discourse Structure in the Conquest Narrative: A Textlinguistic Commentary." PhD diss., Westminster Theological Seminary, 1997.

Peckham, Brian. *The Composition of the Deuteronomistic History*. Harvard Semitic Monographs 35. Atlanta: Scholars, 1985.

———. "The Significance of the Book of Joshua." In *The History of Israel's Traditions: The Heritage of Martin Noth*, edited by Steven L. McKenzie and M. Patrick Graham, 213–34. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1994.

Pei, Mario. *Glossary of Linguistic Terminology*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1966.

Pike, Kenneth L. *Language in Relation to a Unified Theory of the Structure of Human Behavior*. 2nd ed. Janua Linguarum, Series Maior 24. The Hague: Mouton, 1967.

Polzin, Robert. *Moses and the Deuteronomist: A Literary Study of the Deuteronomistic History*. *Part One: Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges*. Indiana Studies in Biblical Literature. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1980.

Powell, Mark Allan. *What Is Narrative Criticism?* Guides to Biblical Scholarship. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990.

Procksch, Otto. *Das nordhebräische Sagenbuch die Elohimquelle*. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1906.

Propp, Vladimir. *Morphology of the Folktale*. Edited by Louis A. Wagner. Translated by Laurence Scott. 2nd ed. American Folklore Society Bibliographical and Special Series 9. Indiana University Research Center in Anthropology, Folklore, and Linguistics 10. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1968.

Rad, Gerhard von. "The Form-critical Problem of the Hexateuch." In *The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays*, 1–78. Translated by E. W. Trueman Dicken. Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1966. Reprint, London: SCM, 1984.

———. *Die priesterschrift im Hexateuch literarisch untersucht und theologisch gewertet*. Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament 4.13. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1934.

Rast, Walter E. *Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings*. Proclamation Commentaries. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1978.

Ricoeur, Paul. *Time and Narrative*. 3 vols. Translated by Kathleen McLaughlin and David Pellauer. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984–1988.

Riepe, Jill. "The Verbs of Esther: A Discourse Analysis of a Post-exilic Text." PhD diss., University of Texas at Arlington, 2008.

Robar, Elizabeth. *The Verb and the Paragraph in Biblical Hebrew: A Cognitive-Linguistic Approach*. Studies in Semitic Languages and Linguistics 78. Leiden: Brill, 2015.

———. "*Wayyiqṭol* as an Unlikely Preterite." *Journal of Semitic Studies* 58.1 (2013) 21–42.

Rofé, Alexander. "The Editing of the Book of Joshua in the Light of 4QJosh[a]." In *New Qumran Texts and Studies: Proceedings of the First Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Paris 1992*, edited by George J. Brooke, 73–80. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 15. Leiden: Brill, 1994.

———. "The End of the Book of Joshua According to the Septuagint." Translated by Galen Marquis. *Shnaton: An Annual for Biblical and Ancient Near Eastern Studies* 2 (1977) 217–27. Reprint, *Henoch* 4 (1982) 17–36.

———. "Ephraimite versus Deuteronomistic History." In *Storia e tradizioni di Israele: scritti in onore di J Alberto Soggin*, edited by Daniele Garrone, 221–35. Brescia: Paideia, 1991.

Römer, Thomas. "Das doppelte Ende des Josuabuches: einige Anmerkungen zur aktuellen Diskussion um 'deuteronomistisches Geschichtswerk' und 'Hexateuch.'" *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 118.4 (2006) 523–48.

Rösel, Hartmut N. "The Book of Joshua and the Existence of a Hexateuch." In *Homeland and Exile: Biblical and Ancient Near Eastern Studies in Honour of Bustenay Oded*, edited by Gershon Galil, et al., 559–70. Vetus Testamentum Supplements 130. Leiden: Brill, 2009.

———. *Joshua*. Historical Commentary on the Old Testament. Leuven: Peeters, 2011.

———. "Lässt sich eine nomistische Redaktion im Buch Josua feststellen?" *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 119.2 (2007) 184–89.

———. "Die Überleitungen vom Josua- ins Richterbuch." *Vetus Testamentum* 30.3 (1980) 342–50.

Rowlett, Lori L. *Joshua and the Rhetoric of Violence: A New Historicist Analysis*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement 226. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1996.

Rudolph, Wilhelm. *Der "Elohist" von Exodus bis Joshua*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 68. Berlin: Töpelmann, 1938.

Ruiz Araica, Roger D. "העת ההיא in the Hebrew Bible and Its Role in Daniel 12:1: A Diachronic and Synchronic Study on the Semantics of Narrative and Prophetic Temporality." PhD diss., Andrews University, 2023.

Samuel, Harald. "The Attestation of the Book-Seam in the Early Textual Witnesses and its Literary-Historical Implications." In *Book-Seams in the Hexateuch 1: The Literary Transitions between the Books of Genesis/Exodus and Joshua/Judges*, edited by Christoph Berner and Harald Samuel, 187–97. Forschung zum Alten Testamentum 120. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2018.

Sasson, Jack M. *Judges 1–12: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. The Anchor Yale Bible 6D. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2014.

Saussure, Ferdinand de. *Course in General Linguistics*. Edited by Charles Bally and Albert Sechehaye. Translated by Wade Baskin. New York: Philosophical Library, 1956.

Schneider, Tammi J. *Judges*. Berit Olam Studies in Hebrew Narrative and Poetry. Collegeville, MN: Glazier/Liturgical, 2000.

Schulz, Sarah. "The Literary Transition between the Books of Joshua and Judges." In *Book-Seams in the Hexateuch 1: The Literary Transitions between the Books of Genesis/Exodus and Joshua/Judges*, edited by Christoph Berner and Harald Samuel, 257–80. Forschung zum Alten Testamentum 120. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2018.

Sharp, Carolyn J. *Irony and Meaning in the Hebrew Bible*. Indiana Studies in Biblical Literature. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2008.

Smend, Rudolf. *Die Erzählung des Hexateuch auf ihre Quellen Untersucht*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1912.

Smith, Mark S, and Elizabeth Bloch-Smith. *Judges 1: A Commentary on Judges 1:1—10:5*. Hermeneia—A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2021.

Soggin, J. Alberto. *Joshua: A Commentary*. Translated by R. A. Wilson. The Old Testament Library. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1972.

———. *Judges: A Commentary*. Translated by John Bowden. The Old Testament Library. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1981.

Sperlich, Wolfgang B. *Noam Chomsky*. London: Reaktion, 2006.

Sternberg, Meir. *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative: Ideological Literature and the Drama of Reading*. Indiana Studies in Biblical Literature. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1985.

Steuernagel, Carl. *Übersetzung und Erklärung der Bücher Deuteronomium und Josua und Allgemeine Einleitung in den Hexateuch*. Handkommentar zum Alten Testament. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck, 1900.

Summer Institute of Linguistics. "Remembering Dr. Robert Longacre (1922–2014)" [May 2014], https://www.sil.org/about/news/remembering-dr-robert-longacre-1922-2014.

Tov, Emanuel. "The Literary Development of the Book of Joshua as Reflected in the Masoretic Text, the LXX, and 4QJosh[a]." In *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible, Qumran, Septuagint: Collected Essays, Volume 3*, 132–53. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 167. Leiden: Brill, 2015.

———. "Some Sequence Differences Between the Masoretic Text and the Septuagint and Their Ramifications for Literary Criticism." In *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint*, 411–18. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 72. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

Uspensky, Boris. *A Poetics of Composition: The Structure of the Artistic Text and Typology of a Compositional Form*. Translated by Valentia Zavarin and Susan Wittig. Berkley: University of California Press, 1973.

Waltke, Bruce K., and M. O'Connor. *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990.

Webb, Barry G. *The Book of Judges*. The New International Commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2012.

———. *The Book of the Judges: An Integrated Reading*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement 46. Sheffield: JSOT, 1987.

Weinfeld, Moshe. *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1972.

Weinrich, Harald. *Tempus: The World of Discussion and the World of Narration*. Translated by Jane K. Brown and Marshall Brown. New York: Fordham University Press, 2023.

Wellhausen, Julius. *Die Composition des Hexateuchs und der Historischen Bücher des Alten Testaments*. 3rd edition. Berlin: Reimer, 1899.

Wienold, Götz. "Textlinguistic Approaches to Written Works of Art." In *Current Trends in Linguistics*, edited by Wolfgang U. Dressler, 133–54. Research in Text Theory / Untersuchungen zur Texttheorie 2. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1978.

Williams, Ronald J. *Hebrew Syntax: An Outline*. 2nd ed. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1976.

Winther-Nielsen, Nicolai. *A Functional Discourse Grammar of Joshua: A Computer-Assisted Rhetorical Structure Analysis*. Coniectanea Biblica Old Testament Series 40. Stockholm: Almquist & Wisell, 1995.

Woudstra, Marten H. *The Book of Joshua*. The New International Commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981.

Younger, K. Lawson, Jr. *Ancient Conquest Accounts: A Study in Ancient Near Eastern and Biblical History Writing*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 98. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1990.

———. "The Configuring of Judicial Preliminaries: Judges 1:1—2:5 and its Dependence of the Book of Joshua." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 68 (1995) 75–92.

———. "Judges 1 in Its Near Eastern Literary Context." In *Faith, Tradition, and History: Old Testament Historiography in Its Near Eastern Context*, edited by A. R. Millard et al., 207–27. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1994.

Zhang, Xiubin. "Discourse Analysis of Ezekiel 40–48: Keeping God's Holiness." PhD diss., Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, 2017.

[Word Count: 98,825]