

The Compositional Structure of the Enneateuch, Genesis-Kings

A Comprehensive Overview of the Results of my Analysis of the Nine Books

[Please read the General Introduction](#)

Having completed the quantitative structural analysis of the nine historical books of Genesis-Kings, we are now in a position to evaluate their numerical features to see what they can contribute to clarifying the mutual relationship between these books and to reassessing the traditional division of the nine books into the so-called Pentateuch and Former Prophets. Elsewhere I have argued that the Pentateuch model (Genesis-Deuteronomy) and Martin Noth's concept of a 'Deuteronomistic History' (Deuteronomy-Kings [hereafter DH], which also constitutes a Pentateuch!), are conflicting constructs, by which the book of Deuteronomy has become a bone of contention. Old Testament scholars have far too long allowed themselves to be in the grip of the so-called Pentateuch (which is a late construct dating from the Hellenistic Era) and the DH (which never existed as a distinct literary entity). It is high time that we realize that we cannot serve two masters whose domains overlap so manifestly and whose common interest, the book of Deuteronomy, is continuously causing a strained relationship.

Therefore, in my view, both concepts must be abandoned. Since the nineties of the previous century several leading scholars have expressed grave misgivings and serious doubts about the existence of the so-called Deuteronomistic History; most of them tried their best to modify the parameters of the concept, while some even suggested that we must envisage an Enneateuch as a single great 'Deuteronomistic' history. The time seems to be ripe for a radical paradigm shift by seeing the same information (nine books) in an entirely different way: not arranged in the traditional bipartite pattern, 9=5+4, but in a *tripartite* arrangement, 9=4+1+4. I am sure that the numerical evidence will help us to rediscover the Enneateuch as a coherent historiographic work, and perhaps more importantly, to make it *in its entirety* the focal point of our scholarly attention. My arguments are to be found in my article "The Rise and Demise of the So-called Deuteronomistic History: A Plea for the Compositional Unity of the Enneateuch, Genesis-Kings", in: *Oudtestamentische Studiën* (OTS) 2015.

I have adduced evidence strongly suggesting that the Enneateuch came into being in three distinct stages: the composition of the *Tetrateuch* (Genesis-Numbers), partly written in Babylonia, followed by *Deuteronomy*, written in Jerusalem after Ezra's return, and finally Joshua-Kings, a second *Tetrateuch*, written after the Samaritan schism. The initiator of the project was, as I hypothesize, the Levitical priest Ezra, which I call 'the Scribe', who had a team of experts among whom there must have been a skilled poet, seeing the poetic sections in the Enneateuch.

1 Genesis + Exodus + Leviticus + Numbers > **2** Deuteronomy > **3** Joshua + Judges + Samuel + Kings.

The first stage was the composition of the history-like story in Genesis-Numbers, in which the Scribe reinvented the history of the Israelites from the creation of the world to the fall of Jerusalem, describing the successive phases of their vicissitudes until their arrival at the border of the Promised Land. It was partway written in Babylonia on the basis of mainly oral traditions which had been collected by priestly scribes in which Ezra may have played a crucial role. He is by far the best possible candidate for 'the Scribe', being 'a priest and scribe learned in the law of the God of Heaven' (Ezra 7,12.21), and being the priest who was specifically invited by the people to bring 'the book of the law of Moses' and read it (parts of Exodus?) in their presence (Neh. 8,1-8).

Since Ezra himself was of *Levitical* descent (Ezra 7,1-6!) it stands to reason that it was in this capacity that he chose of all people two men of *Levitical* descent to be YHWH's agents in the story related in Exodus-Deuteronomy. That is also why the *Levitical* descent of Moses and Aaron is so strongly emphasized (Ex. 2,1, 4,14 and especially 6,14-28). The latter passage, which deals specifically with the *Levitical* descent of Moses and Aaron, is a meticulously designed paragraph consisting of **182** (7x26) words and **731** (43x17) letters. Most significantly also, according to Ezra 7,1-6, Ezra is the **17th** in the *Levitical* lineage of Aaron, by which he is symbolically authenticated and legitimized for his mission by YHWH himself.

Ezra's *Levitical* descent also explains the exclusive role attributed to the Levites in guarding and serving the Tabernacle and the Ark (Num. 1,53; 3,21-37; 8,23-26) and the emphasis on their unique relationship with YHWH, being taken by him instead of the firstborn (Num. 3-4; cf. 4,45) and most of all, their zeal for YHWH's cause (e.g., Ex. 32,25-29), which is their most consistent and characteristic role.

In this respect it is important to take into consideration that during the reign of Josiah, the *Levitical priests* were in charge of the law and its guardians (Deut. 17,18); and when Moses had written 'this law', he gave it to *the priests the sons of Levi* (Deut. 31,9). Moreover, according to the Chronicler, the Levites were at the time known as skilful with *instruments of music*, while some Levites were *scribes* (2 Chron. 34,9-13). Therefore, we may assume that in the time of Ezra and Nehemiah there was a strong elite of *Levitical* priests who had welcomed Ezra as their leader and enabled him to continue working on his project. If my theory about 'the Scribe' as a *Levitical* priest is correct, the Enneateuch can be labelled a *Levitical* priestly work.

When Ezra arrived in Jerusalem in 458 together with a considerable group of exiles, he must have had his Torah with him. In fact, Artaxerxes, in his famous decree, refers to the writing Ezra had with him as: '*the law of your God in your hand*' (Ezra 7,14), which I interpret as a reference to the Tetrateuch he had brought with him from Babylonia. As soon as was possible in those hectic days, the Scribe and his team finalized and sealed the four scrolls of the Tetrateuch for the time being, awaiting its follow-up.

Taking the *needs and requirements* of the Israelites in exile as our point of departure, we can draw important conclusions regarding the 'Deuteronomist' as the author of DH on the one hand, and the Scribe as the author of the Tetrateuch on the other hand, showing in what respects the Deuteronomist missed the mark and failed.

First, since the Israelites have lost their *national identity*, it was not the Deuteronomist, but the Scribe who invented and reconstructed the past history of the Israelites by laying bare their national origins and genealogical roots as a proud nation (Genesis!).

Second, it was the Scribe, and only he, who made Israel aware of their unique experience of coming to know YHWH as a great Warrior and Saviour in times of oppression and slavery (Exodus!).

Third, it was he who demonstrated to the Israelites YHWH's fatherly care, leadership and guardianship in the wilderness, where landless nomades wander around seeking a place to settle, suggesting to the landless exiles that this can happen again, to them (Exodus and Numbers!). Thereby the Israelites in exile could identify themselves with their fathers who were led by YHWH through the wilderness to the Promised land.

Fourth, it was the Scribe who supplied the *Levitical* priests with strong arguments for their claim to hegemony amid the religious strife between different priestly factions that had started already in Babylonia and Judah and would become very bitter after the exile.

These were the vital issues the Israelites needed most to be addressed during the exile after the catastrophe of the loss of their land, their national self-consciousness, and their faith in YHWH. And it was exactly in these respects that the Deuteronomist, if he ever existed, failed miserably.

The second stage was the composition of Deuteronomy, in which the acute problems of the resettlement are addressed, dissension and factional strife within the community, conflicting territorial claims, idolatry, and mixed marriages. The Scribe availed himself of the opportunity to *recapitulate* crucial events from the Tetrateuch and to elaborate on them in order to bring in *new issues* relevant to the *new situation*. I must limit myself to mentioning only two actualisations, which were of paramount importance: the *new covenant* made in Moab as a follow-up to the Sinai/Horeb covenant, and the prohibition of intermarriage with the indigenous nations. This new covenant was not 'invented' by the Scribe, for he derived it from the new covenant made at the time, as described in Nehemiah 9-10.

After the completion of the book of Deuteronomy – in any case *before* the Samaritan schism in 432 - the Scribe and his team rounded off and sealed the five scrolls of Genesis-Deuteronomy, once again for the time being, with the intention to continue with the writing of Joshua-Kings at a later time. Moses' marathon speech (Deut. 1,1-33,29) was finalized and sealed by its **14,118** (543x**26**) words. The five scrolls Genesis-Deuteronomy were finalized and sealed by their **5,848** (344x**17**) verses, its **304,850** (11,725x**26**) letters, the **1,820** (70x**26**) occurrences of the name YHWH, and by the **30,706** (1,181x**26**) words of Numbers-Deuteronomy.

The description of the death of Moses and the installation of Joshua as his successor (Deut. 34,1-12) had an evident open end in anticipation of the story of Joshua as the leader of the conquest. At that stage, *before* the writing of Joshua-Kings, the Samaritans had accepted Genesis-Deuteronomy as their Torah, copied the five scrolls and transmitted them from then on in their own text tradition as the Samaritan Torah, mistakenly called

the Samaritan Pentateuch. This is in my view the best explanation why the Samaritans did not obtain the scrolls of Joshua-Kings: they simply could not do so, for at the time the second Tetrateuch was still in the making. Independently the Samaritans wrote their own version of their history from Joshua onwards.¹

The third stage was the composition of Deuteronomy's follow-up, the story-like history in Joshua-Kings (a second Tetrateuch), based mainly on archival material the Scribe and his team had access to. The choice for a Tetrateuch, *four* scrolls, as the final piece of the project was in all probability to achieve an *Enneateuch* in accordance with the *nine* books of the Histories of Herodotus (± 440 BCE), which is structured as a dynastic history of *four* Persian kings: Cyrus, Cambyses, Darius, and Xerxes.

See Jan-Wim Wesselius, *The Origin of the History of Israel: Herodotus's Histories as Blueprint for the First Books of the Bible* (JSOTSuppl. 345), Sheffield Academic Press/Continuum, 2002. See also my article: "To Whom Then Will You Liken Me?": The Incomparability of YHWH in Deutero-Isaiah and the Exodus-Story, in: Ausloos H., Lemmelijn B. (ed.), *A Pillar of Cloud to Guide: Text-critical, Redactional, and Linguistic Perspectives on the Old Testament in Honour of Marc Vervenne* (BETL 269), Leuven: Uitgeverij Peeters, 2014, pp. 125-144.

The *four* books of the second Tetrateuch were finalized and sealed somewhere in the late Persian period in the usual manner. To mention only three features: the second Tetrateuch was finalized and sealed by its **4,318** (254x17) verses and by the **3,042** (117x26) verses of Samuel-Kings, and to crown it all, by the **45,760** (1,760x26) words in the entire story of Israel from the birth of Samuel until the deportation (1 Sam. 1,1-2 Ki. 17,41).

After the completion of the Enneateuch the Greek speaking Jews in Alexandria maintained the nine scrolls, basically in the form the Scribe and his team had finalized them as a single corpus. The Alexandrian Jews translated the Enneateuch into Greek, editing and expanding it in their own way as the '*historical scrolls*'. During the Hellenistic period the Jewish leaders in Jerusalem organized the *canonized scrolls* in the well-known *tripartite* arrangement *Torah + Nebi'im + Ketubim*, setting Genesis-Deuteronomy apart as the Torah for all Jews, like the Samaritans, who also had their own Torah. Since then there were two different arrangements:

The Hebrew Bible (and Protestant Christian): *Torah* (the Law) – *Nebi'im* (Prophets) – *Ketubim* (Writings);
The Septuagint (Catholic Christian Bible): *Historical books* – *Poetical, didactical books* – *Prophetic books*.

The Compositional Structure of the Enneateuch

My point of departure is the hypothesis that this corpus is a *continuous historiographic narrative* telling the ongoing Story of Ancient Israel from the beginning of the history of mankind until the fall of the kingdom of Judah. The *literary presentation* of this grand narrative: the history-like story (Genesis-Deuteronomy), and the story-like history (Joshua-Kings), was fundamentally determined by the *events* described in it, fictional or real.

This also applies to the nine main parts of the corpus, which were not determined by ideological or theological ideas, but by logically *successive episodes*, in much the same way as in the three *episodic psalms* 105, 106, and 107. See for instance my analysis (2008) of Psalm 106: <http://www.labuschagne.nl/ps106.pdf>.

In consequence, I have based the wording of the headings of the nine books squarely on the major episodes:

1. Genesis: The Antecedents: the Creation of the World, the Emergence of Nations and the Birth of Israel.
2. Exodus: The Escape of the Israelites from Egypt and their Stay at Mount Sinai where they meet YHWH.
3. Leviticus: Appendix Dealing with Regulations and Guidelines for Ritual Purity and Holiness.
4. Numbers: The March in the Wilderness until Kadesh and the Confrontation with the Hostile Nations.
- 5. Deuteronomy: Moses' Charge to the Israelites on the Eve of the Occupation of the Promised Land.**
6. Joshua: The Conquest, Occupation, and Distribution of the Promised Land.
7. Judges: The State and Behaviour of the People under the Rule of the Judges when there was no King.
8. Samuel: The Emergence of Kingship under Samuel and the Reign of Saul and David.
9. Kings: The Reign of Solomon, the Division of the Kingdom and the Fate of the Two Kingdoms.

What meets the eye immediately is that the book of Deuteronomy is positioned in pride of place at the centre, which makes it the focal point of attention. On the one hand, it belongs to the first Tetrateuch as the logical follow-

¹ See John Macdonald, *The Samaritan Chronicle no. II or Sepher Ha-Yamim. From Joshua to Nebuchadnezzar* (BZAW 84), Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1969.

up to Numbers, and on the other, it also belongs to the second Tetrateuch, serving as the preamble to Joshua-Kings. Recognizing Deuteronomy's pivotal position and its bridge function is the only way to prevent it from remaining a bone of contention and to get rid of the idea of two Pentateuchs.

As in the case of the Enneateuch, where Deuteronomy is positioned in pride of place at the centre, in Genesis the most important family history, the **Toledoth of Terah** (the Story of Abraham) has pride of place as the focal point of attention, because this is where the actual history of Israel begins. The Family Histories are preceded by a Prologue, the story of the Creation of the World, and concluded by an Epilogue, the last words of Joseph. The Family Histories, consisting of **7 Parts**, is made up of **20,072 (772x26)** words (I owe this observation to Klaas Eikelenboom).

1. **Prologue, 1,1-2,3** **The Creation of the World**
2. Part I, 2,4-4,26 The Toledoth of *the World*
3. Part II, 5,1-6,8 The Toledoth of *Adam*
4. Part III, 6,9-11,26 The two Toledoth of *Noah* and his Sons
5. **Part IV, 11,27-25,11** **The Toledoth of Terah**
6. Part V, 25,12-35,29 The two Toledoth of *Abraham's Sons*
7. Part VI, 36,1-37,1 The two Toledoth of *Esau*
8. Part VII, 37,2-50,21 The Toledoth of *Jacob*
9. **Epilogue: 50,22-26** **The last words of Joseph and his death.**

To crown it all, the book of Deuteronomy itself also divides into *nine* main parts (note the symmetry!):

1. Prologue: 1,1-5 Time and place of Moses' discourse
2. Part I 1,6-3,29 Moses' opening discourse (looking back)
3. Part II 4,1-4,49 Opening prophetic peroration
4. Part III 5,1-11,32 Moses expounds the Horeb covenant
5. **Part IV 12,1-26,19 Moses promulgates the laws**
6. Part V 27,1-28,69 Moses expounds the Moab covenant
7. Part VI 29,1-30,20 Concluding prophetic peroration (looking forward)
8. Part VII 31,1-33,29 Moses' concluding discourse and his Blessing
9. Epilogue: 34,1-12 The death of Moses and his necrology.

The Number of Verses, Words, and Letters in the Enneateuch

On the basis of evidence gleaned from the counting of verses, words, letters, and incidents of the name YHWH, I have discovered the intriguing scribal technique of *finalizing* and *sealing* a given passage by means of multiples of the divine name numbers **17** and **26**. Leaving the sub-sections of the books out of account, the counts of these items in the nine books yield the astounding picture presented in the table below. The significant ones (multiples of **17** and **26**) functioning as *sealing points* at the seams of the text, are in **bold face**.

Texts	Verses*	יהוה	Words	Letters
Genesis-Numbers	4,894/4,892	1,270x	65,688 (3,864x17)	249,940
Genesis-Deuteronomy	5,853/ 5,848 (344x17) *	1,820x (70x26)	79,982	304,850 (11,725x26) **
Numbers-Deuteronomy	2,248/2,245*	946x	30,706 (1,181x26)	118,455
Deuteronomy-Samuel	3,741/3,738*	1,422x	58,531 (3,443x17)	227,194
Joshua-Samuel	2,782 (107x26)	872x	44,237	172,284
Samuel-Kings	3,042 (117x26)	1,007x	49,721	191,993
Joshua-Kings	4,318 (254x17)	1,406x	69,657	270,744
Genesis-Joshua	6,511 (383x17) /6,506*	2,044x	90,033	344,657
Genesis-Judges	7,129/ 7,124 (274x26)*	2,219x	99,918 (3,843x26)	383,601
Genesis-Samuel	8,635/8630*	2,692x	124,219 (7,307x17)	477,134
Genesis-Kings	10,171/ 10,166 (598x17)*	3,226x	149,639	575,594
Genesis-Kings	10,166 = 5,848 + 4,318!			

* The counting of verses in Exodus and Deuteronomy is rather problematic due to the verse division in the two Decalogues (Exodus 20 and Deuteronomy 5). So Exodus 20 has either 26 or 24* verses while Deuteronomy 5 has either 33 or 30* verses.

Genesis: 1,533; **Exodus:** 1,213/1,211*; **Leviticus:** 859; **Numbers:** 1,289; **Deut:** 959/956*: total 5,853/**5,848** (344x17).*

Masoretic counts: Genesis: **1,534** (59x26) + **Exodus:** 1,209 + **Leviticus:** 859 + **Numbers:** 1,288 + **Deuteronomy:** 955 = 5,845.

** Remarkably enough, in MT (Codex L) at the end of Deuteronomy the Masoretes registered **400,945** (23,585x17) letters!

The first (clearly preliminary) sealing point is to be found at the end of the book of Numbers (36,13), showing that the entire text from Genesis-Numbers is made up of **65,688** (3,864x17) words.

Before discussing the implications of this sealing point, let me give examples in Deuteronomy of similar *preliminary* sealing points, namely at 28,69; 30,20 and 33,29. Until Deut. 28,69 the book has **11,849** (697x17) words. This final verse of Chapter 28 is a typical *cliffhanger text* that functions primarily as an Epilogue concluding Moses' exposition of the Moab covenant (27-28). At the same time, it serves as a bridge connecting Chapter 28 with 29. See Observation 8 in my analysis of [Deuteronomy 27-28](#). The only conclusion that can be drawn is that this sealing point (28,69) denotes a *temporary* pause in the flow of the narrative, a *preliminary* conclusion:

These are the words of the covenant which YHWH commanded Moses to make with the Israelites in Moab in addition to the covenant he made with them on Horeb.

Another example is to be found in Deut. 30,20: until this point, which marks the end of Moses' prophetic peroration in 29-30, the book has **12,614** (742x17) words – see Observation 4 in [Deuteronomy 29-30](#).

Also in this case we have to do with a *preliminary* sealing point indicating a *temporary* conclusion, because the storyline is continued in Chapter 31. The same applies to the sealing point at 33,29: The entire text of the book until this point (Deuteronomy 1-33, without the Epilogue, 34,1-12) has **14,118** (543x26) words!

Returning now to the sealing point at the end of Numbers (36,13), we can see that exactly the same procedure is followed here. So it is clear that we have to do with a *temporary* pause in the narrative, a *preliminary* conclusion. The final verse likewise functions as a *pivotal text* linking Numbers to Deuteronomy. In this case, however, it also serves as a *cliffhanger* prelude on what follows: the 'commandments and decrees' in Deuteronomy:

These are the commandments and decrees which YHWH issued to the Israelites through Moses in the lowlands of Moab by the Jordan near Jericho.

For the compositional device of the cliffhanger, see pp. 21f. in the analysis of [2 Samuel](#). The function of the pause in the text caused by the preliminary sealing point is much the same as that of the **P** or **S**, namely to draw attention to and focus on what follows. For particulars, see pp. 3-4 in the analysis of [1 Samuel](#).

The book of Numbers has evidently an open end anticipating what follows: the grand speech of Moses in the book of Deuteronomy. Therefore, the sealing point at the end of Numbers marks the completion of the entire text of Genesis-Numbers, which is a Tetrateuch. The question is how do we interpret this temporary pause. It may be that we have to explain it as an interruption in the compositional process of the Enneateuch, most plausibly caused by Ezra's move from Babylonia to Jerusalem. Having settled there, he found time to complete it and to write the scroll of Deuteronomy. After the completion of Deuteronomy, the books of Numbers-Deuteronomy were bound together and sealed by means of their **30,706** (1181x26) words.

Therefore, Deuteronomy belongs *primarily* to the Tetrateuch, not only because there is no break in the flow of the storyline from Numbers to Deuteronomy, but also because Genesis-Deuteronomy is finalized and sealed by **5,848** (344x17) verses and **304,850** (11,725x26) letters (the Masoretes have **400,945** [23,585x17] letters!). Moreover, its unity is underpinned by the string of **1,820** (70x26) instances of the name YHWH.

Like Numbers, Deuteronomy has an open end, because the subject matter of the book of Joshua is clearly anticipated in Deut. 34,9:

“Joshua son of Nun was filled with the spirit of wisdom, for Moses had laid his hands on him. The Israelites listened to him and did what YHWH had commanded Moses.”

Conclusion: Deuteronomy is a *pivotal text* linking the two Tetrateuchs. The Scribe and his team knew at the time they completed Deuteronomy that they would write the *indispensable follow-up*, Joshua-Kings. Most significantly, Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges and Samuel *as part of the Enneateuch* are bound together and sealed by the fact that they have altogether **58,531** (3,443x17) words.

In this respect we have to be aware of the fact that the counts in Deuteronomy-Kings are based on the text of the five books *as part of the Enneateuch* and not of the DH, of which there is no text available. Such a text never

existed, and if it did, it would not have been identical to the text handed down to us in Codex Leningrad, seeing the disrespect for MT at the time the DH was invented. It is therefore impossible to find evidence regarding the finalizing and sealing of the DH.

It is intriguing to note that **Joshua-Samuel** have altogether **2,782 (107x26)** verses and that **Samuel-Kings**, dealing with the reign of kings, are bound together by their **3,042 (117x26)** verses. And to crown it all, the Tetrateuch of **Joshua-Judges-Samuel-Kings** dealing with the period stretching from the conquest of the Promised Land to the downfall of the kingdom of Judah has altogether **4,318 (254x17)** verses, by which the second Tetrateuch, and therefore the entire Enneateuch is *definitively* finalized, sealed and canonized as a distinct literary entity. This is confirmed by the astounding fact that the **Enneateuch** has **5,848** (Genesis-Deuteronomy) + **4,318** (Joshua-Kings) = **10,166 (598x17/391x26!)** verses.

Considering that Genesis-Deuteronomy and Joshua-Kings have *individually* been finalized and sealed, it is important to note that there is a *parallel* in the book of Numbers. The stay of the Israelites at Kadesh marks a crucial turning point in the storyline dividing the book in two distinct Segments. The first, Num. 1,1-20,13, which deals with the march through the Wilderness, is finalized and sealed by its **9,418 (554x17)** words – see p. 25 in [Numbers](#). Moreover, from Gen. 1,1 until this point (Num. 20,13) the name YHWH occurs **1,118 (43x26)** times!

The second Segment, Num. 20,14-36,13, dealing with the confrontation with the hostile nations, is finalized and sealed by its **6,94 (269x26)** words, which is underscored by a series of **26** divine speeches (see pp. 45f.).

Segment A, Numbers 1,1-20,13: the march through the Wilderness until Kadesh – **9,418 (554x17)** words.

Segment B, Numbers 20,14-36,13: the confrontation with the hostile nations – **6,994 (269x26)** words.

Returning to the Enneateuch, it is noteworthy that five main parts are concluded by a significant number of words:

Ex. 40,34-38 (60=**26+34**); Deut. 34,9-12 (60=**34+26**); 1 Sam. 31,9-13 (**68=4x17**),
2 Sam. 24,23-25 (**52=2x26**), and 2 Ki. 25,23-30 (**153 9x17**).

The compositional unity of the Enneateuch is additionally underpinned by the fact that it *opens* with **52 (2x26)** words (Gen. 1,1-5, the first day of Creation) and is *concluded* by **153 (9x17)** words (2 Ki. 25,23-30, Gedaliah murdered; Jehoiachin released). In all nine books there are numerous (hundreds!) larger and smaller literary entities finalized and sealed in this way. Let me randomly lift a corner of the veil: Gen. 1,28-31, the blessing of humankind at the end of the sixth day has **85 (5x17)** words; Gen. 2,4-5, the beginning of the story of the Garden of Eden, has **34 (2x17)** words; Gen. 4,17-24, dealing with the children and grandchildren of Cain before the birth of Seth, has **104 (4x26)** words; Exodus 2,1-25, the story of Moses' birth and his flight to Midian: **340 (20x17)** words, and Ex. 4,1-17, Moses is equipped for his task: **17** verses and **255 (15x17)** words, etc. etc.

Conclusions and Burning Questions

1. The quantitative structural analysis of the historical books has brought to light that the Enneateuch is from beginning to end a numerical composition governed in various ways by the divine name numbers **17** and **26**. Here is an overview of the results of a computer assisted statistical inquiry:

Genesis	71% of the verses and 79% of the words.
Exodus	73% of the verses and 73% of the words.
Leviticus	82% of the verses and 64% of the words.
Numbers	63% of the verses and 57% of the words.
Deuteronomy	79% of the verses and 78% of the words.
Joshua	51% of the verses and 53% of the words.
Judges	61% of the verses and 58% of the words.
Samuel	85% of the verses and 68% of the words.
<u>Kings</u>	<u>74% of the verses and 76% of the words.</u>
Enneateuch	71% of the verses and 67% of the words.

For particulars the reader must consult the detailed [analyses of the nine books](#).

2. The compositional structure of the Enneateuch as a whole appeared to be determined by the nine books taken as *distinct* literary entities, in accordance with their presentation in MT (Codex Leningrad). The construct of an

Enneateuch is based on the fact that the present nine *books (scrolls in biblical times)* were rounded-off as *finalized literary entities* at the completion of their composition. Therefore, suggestions by commentators, for instance, that the caesura between Samuel and Kings can be ignored are mistaken. For the argumentation, see my analysis of 2 Samuel (<http://www.labuschagne.nl/genesis-kings/2Samuel1-24.pdf>) and that of 1 Kings (<http://www.labuschagne.nl/genesis-kings/1Kings1-22.pdf>).

The book of Deuteronomy is positioned in pride of place at the *centre* of the Enneateuch flanked by two Tetrateuchs, which expresses its high status, its central role and its function as a bridge.

3. Accordingly, the two Pentateuchs overlapping each other, *Genesis-Deuteronomy* (the Torah Pentateuch) and *Deuteronomy-Kings* (the DH Pentateuch), must definitively be discarded as outdated. This implies that future studies of the historical books must take their point of departure decidedly in the Enneateuch and not in one of the presumed Pentateuchs as has been done the past seventy years. In sum, the entire Documentary Hypothesis, the foundational dogma behind constructs that never existed, should be abandoned and considered no longer viable. Tradition criticism, redaction criticism, and literary criticism must fundamentally be reassessed. In retrospect, we may regard these outmoded concepts as necessary steps towards the achievement of a better insight into the coming into being and architecture of the historical books, honouring our predecessors for their sincere efforts in search of truth.
4. Finally, a personal remark. Whoever has scrutinized the present article will be left with fundamental questions with regard to the numerical features which appear to have played a crucial role in the composition, finalizing, and sealing, or ‘canonizing’ of the text. I can assure my colleagues, that such burning questions are mine too, but it is not for me to provide them with the answers, because the matter concerns all of us, or more correctly, all scholars who do not summarily wave the numerical aspects of the texts aside as a matter of coincidence.
 1. Is it imaginable that the present text attained its final form only as late as the last two centuries BCE?
 2. If so, is it reasonable to assume that it was *substantially manipulated* such a long time after its composition to fashion it into the present *numerical* composition? And is it conceivable that a holy, canonized text could have been treated in this way, especially in light of the implications of the ‘canonical formula’ in Deut. 4,2?
 3. Is it feasible to hypothesize that this text was finalized, sealed, and *canonized*, at the time of its composition and that it therefore constitutes an archetype of MT? If so, doesn’t this imply that all other texts must be regarded as *para-Masoretic* instead of pre-Masoretic texts?
 4. Doesn’t this entail that we have to reassess the discipline called textual criticism in a most fundamental way, envisaging a canonizing process that began at the time of the composition and sealing of a text?
 5. Why is it so difficult for critical biblical scholars to get rid of the deep-rooted aversion against numbers?
 6. Why do biblical scholars, in contrast to classical scholars, exhibit such an irrational fear for symbolism, and more specifically for number symbolism, while symbolism plays such an important role in the Bible?
 7. On what grounds do scholars base the allegation that the quantitative structural analysis of texts amounts to manipulative kabbalistic speculation, while it is basically a strict rational (computer assisted!) scholarly discipline in which number symbolism has its rightful place?

Biblical scholars must realize that they cannot continue turning a blind eye to the manifest numerical features of the Hebrew Bible as they have done, say, the past thirty-five years. As a matter of fact, forty years have now passed since the Austrian Orientalist Claus Schedl, from the University of Graz, was booed and ridiculed (in Edinburgh, if I remember correctly), when he said something about the numerical features of biblical texts. After the session, ashamed as I was for my colleagues, I went to him where he was standing stick alone outside the building to apologize and commiserate with him. Despite the sympathy I felt for Schedl as a person, it took four years before I could overcome my predisposition and came to reading his book *Baupläne des Wortes: Einführung in die biblische Logotechnik* (Wien 1974). So I know that it takes time, much time, to reassess the traditional approaches to the biblical texts, to overcome prejudices, and to attain a fundamental paradigm shift. I also learned that a fault confessed is half redressed.