

Reconstructing the Older Hebrew Text of the Book of Joshua: An Analysis of Joshua 10

Kristin De Troyer

I. Introduction

In this contribution I will study three crucial concepts and phrases in the MT and OG book of Joshua. I will offer text critical data as well as study the translation technique of these three concepts and phrases, in order to prove that when the Old Greek translation of the Book of Joshua was produced, the Hebrew text underlying the Old Greek translation did not yet have the concepts of a highly developed joint collaboration between Joshua and Israel, the stress on the camp of Israel, nor the importance of its location at Gilgal. I will argue that it was only the later (proto-) Masoretic redactor that created these and inserted them in the older narrative of the Book of Joshua. In other words, the Hebrew text underlying the Old Greek book of Joshua was edited to become what is currently known as the Masoretic text of the Book of Joshua. The goal of the editorial changes was to ensure that the striking of the enemies could be seen as a joint operation by Joshua and all Israel with him, that the joint operation was even more unified by the use of their camp to move forward, and finally, that the main camp was located at Gilgal—the place from where not only the land was taken but also where the first king was anointed.

I.1. A Summary of the Research Done So Far

In his 1979 article, “Joshua: The Hebrew and Greek texts”¹ Auld briefly summarized the history of the attention given to either the MT or the LXX

¹ A. Graeme Auld, “Joshua: The Hebrew and Greek Text,” in *Studies in the Historical Books of the Old Testament* (ed. John A. Emerton; VTSup 30; Leiden: Brill, 1979), 1-14.

of the Book of Joshua. He noted that despite some initial response to Holmes's thesis and defence of the superiority of the LXX, scholars continued to work with the MT. Auld noted: "all recent studies have continued to take the *Hebraica veritas* as their point of departure." Auld however was struck by the amount of elements in the MT that are not reflected in the LXX. With regard to the "brief pluses"² he noted that "there are about twice as many in the MT as in the LXX in Jos. i-iv, vi, viii-ix, xiii-xvi, xviii, xx-xxi, and xxiv; while in chapters v, vi, x-xii, xvii, xix, and xxii-xxiii they are four or five times as numerous."³ In other words, there are twice as many, or even four or five times as many smaller pluses in the Masoretic Text in comparison with the Old Greek. In this context, Auld also pointed to the shorter text of 4QJosh^a which "is much shorter than the MT and shares a number of minuses with the familiar LXX."⁴

In 1986, Emanuel Tov, using the textual witnesses, especially the Septuagint, distinguished between different layers in the Hebrew Text of the Book of Joshua.⁵ In his edition of 4QJosh^b (1995), Tov alerted the reader to two agreements of 4QJosh^b with the Old Greek.⁶ With regard to the Old Greek of Joshua, Tov wrote: "The translator could have shortened his text

² Ibidem, 3.

³ Ibidem.

⁴ Ibidem, 5.

⁵ Emanuel Tov, "The Growth of the Book of Joshua in the Light of the Evidence of the LXX Translation," in *Studies in bible* (ed. Sara Japhet; ScrHier 31; Jerusalem: Magnes, 1986), 321-39; repr. in idem, *The Greek and the Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays* (VTSup 72; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 385-396.

⁶ Emanuel Tov, "48. 4QJosh^b," in *Qumran Cave 4.IX: Deuteronomy to Kings* (ed. E. Ulrich et al.; DJD 14; Oxford: Clarendon, 1995), 153-160. In his Handbook, Armin Lange, however, notes "Die Handschrift liest 18mal mit und 8mal gegen M, zweimal mit und 26mal gegen G und nur 6mal eigenständig. 4QJosh^b liest somit in der Mehrzahl aller Fälle mit M gegen G. Jedoch legt die Rekonstruktion von Frag.2-3⁷⁻⁹ nahe, daß 4QJosh^b in Jos 4,1-3 den Kurztext von G bietet. Im ganzen darf 4QJosh^b trotz seiner eigenständigen Lesarten der semimasoretischen Texttraditionen zugerechnet werden." See Armin Lange, *Handbuch der Textfunde vom Toten Meer. Band 1: Die Handschriften biblischer Bücher von Qumran und den anderen Fundorten* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009), 188.

since the translation technique argument is indecisive in this book. On the other hand, in our view, the translator is not sufficiently free to allow for the assumption that the translator left out the details listed below. More likely, he found an often-shorter text.”⁷ Eugene Ulrich, in his 1995 edition of 4QJosh^a, distinguished between two textual editions of the Book of Joshua. He recognized “a sequence of the narrative that is at variance with, and probably prior to, that found in the received text of Joshua.”⁸ In his 1992 lecture at the first IOQS meeting (published in 1994, reprinted in 1999), he wrote: “It is quite possible that 4QJosh^a and Josephus retain the original story and that it has been changed in the MT tradition....”⁹ Ulrich, however, did not see the OG as representing the older stage of the Book of Joshua, but a later stage. He wrote: “A tertiary sequence is preserved in M G....”¹⁰ The latter observations were made in the context of the discussion regarding the passage MT Josh 8:31–35—a passage which is positioned differently in Qumran, MT and the Old Greek.¹¹ In his article “The Dead Sea Scrolls and

⁷ Emanuel Tov, “The Septuagint and the Deuteronomists,” *Textus* 23 (2007): 151–179; repr. in idem, *Hebrew Bible, Greek Bible, and Qumran: Collected Essays* (TSAJ 121; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 398–417, esp. 401.

⁸ Eugene Ulrich, “47. 4QJosh^a,” in *Qumran Cave 4.IX: Deuteronomy to Kings* (ed. idem et al.; DJD 14; Oxford: Clarendon, 1995), 143–152. For a description of the manuscript see also: Lange, *Handbuch*, 187–188: “Texttypologisch muß 4QJosh^a als eigenständig charakterisiert werden.” For an opinion, different from that of Ulrich, with regard to the sequence of the narrative, see Kristin De Troyer, “Building the Altar and Reading the Law: The Journeys of Joshua 8:30–35,” in *Reading the Present in the Qumran Library: The Perception of the Contemporary by Means of Scriptural Interpretations* (ed. idem and Armin Lange; SBLSymS 30; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005), 141–162.

⁹ Eugene Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible* (Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature; Grand Rapids, Mich: Eerdmans, 1999), 28. See also below for further information on 4QJosh^a and 4QJosh^b.

¹⁰ Ulrich, “47. 4QJosh^a,” 146.

¹¹ See also, Eugene Ulrich, “4QJosh^a and Joshua’s First Altar in the Promised Land,” in *New Qumran Texts and Studies: Proceedings of the First Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Paris 1992* (ed. George J. Brooke with Florentino García Martínez; STDJ 15; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 89–104. On p. 96, Ulrich writes: “I am inclined to say that 4QJosh^a—Josephus and MT—LXX display two

the Biblical Text," Ulrich specified—with a reference to the work of Lea Mazor¹²—the sequence of the two later stages, namely: G-Josh belongs to the "n+3" stage and MT-Josh belongs to the "n+4" stage of the text.¹³

In 1995, Klaus Bieberstein acknowledged that there were different Hebrew text forms of the Book of Joshua. He wrote: "Denn sie (= die Septuaginta, *added KDT*) entstand auf der Basis einer Textform, die sich in zahlreichen abweichenden Lesarten von gleichzeitig kursierenden hebräischen Textformen unterschied..."¹⁴

The discussion of the relation between the main witnesses of the Book of Joshua has also been investigated by Michael N. van der Meer (2001), albeit that the goal of his work was to clarify the relation between textual and literary criticism.¹⁵ Van der Meer has carefully analyzed the differences between the main witnesses of Joshua 1 (MT—LXX), Joshua 5:1–12 (MT—4QJosh^a—LXX) and Josh 8 (MT—4QJosh^a). With regard to his analysis of the differences in chapter 1, he stated that the "minuses of the LXX in comparison with MT are the result of a conscious attempt to streamline the redundant and layered Hebrew text for the sake of a coherent, stylised,

variant editions of the Book of Joshua, and that 4QJosh^a—Josephus preserve the earlier and/or preferable form." Similarly, in his collected essays, Ulrich writes—again with reference to the Reading of the Law passage: "It is quite possible that 4QJosh^a and Josephus retain the original story and that it has been changed in the MT tradition due to anti-Samaritan polemic"; see Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 28. See also p. 228.

¹² See Lea Mazor, "The Septuagint Translation of the Book of Joshua," *BIOCS* 27 (1994): 29–38.

¹³ Eugene Ulrich, "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Biblical Text," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment* (ed. Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam; 2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 1:79–100, esp. 85, 89–90.

¹⁴ Klaus Bieberstein, *Josua – Jordan – Jericho: Archäologie, Geschichte und Theologie der Landnahmeerzählungen Josua 1–6* (OBO 143; Freiburg/Göttingen: Universitätsverlag/Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995), 78.

¹⁵ Michael N. van der Meer, "Formation and Reformulation: The Redaction of the Book of Joshua in the Light of the Oldest Textual Witnesses" (Ph.D. diss., University of Leiden, 2001); with thanks to the author for sending me a copy of his dissertation edition.

readable Greek text.”¹⁶ He then wrote that the translator aimed “to produce a faithful, though not literal translation of the Hebrew original.”¹⁷ A similar conclusion is reached with regard to the differences between the MT and LXX of Joshua 5:1–12: “all (other)¹⁸ divergencies (*sic*) between MT and LXX can be ascribed to the careful and well-considered literary restructuring and reformulation by the Greek translator.”¹⁹ Finally, with regard to the different location of the “8:30–35 section” of the MT text of Joshua, Van der Meer concluded that the “Greek translator transferred the problematic passage to a position nearly that would in his view fit better the logical order of events.”²⁰ Overall, Van der Meer stressed that the differences between MT and LXX “are the result of the Greek translator’s attempt to relieve the narrative from the tensions that had resulted from the Deuteronomistic reworking of the older narrative.”²¹

So far, I have given a survey of the research on the relationship between the MT and the OG in general. As I am however interested in Joshua 10, I noted that in his discussion of the Hebrew and Greek texts of the Book of Joshua, Auld reported “that viii 9, 13 share characteristics with MT pluses elsewhere. They attest the same pedantic concern for the location of the camp and the precise whereabouts of Joshua himself at any given moment as we find in X 15, 43 ...”²² The location of the camp was taken up again by Van der Meer. He did not agree that the MT displays a “common pedantic redaction.”²³ He pointed especially to the fact that the minus of (the LXX,

¹⁶ Ibidem, 211.

¹⁷ Ibidem.

¹⁸ Van der Meer records two cases where the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the Old Greek might have contained an error and where the Hebrew *Vorlage* might have used a different grammatical form, but also in these cases does MT reflect the older text. See ibidem, 351.

¹⁹ Ibidem.

²⁰ Ibidem, 434.

²¹ Ibidem, 442.

²² Auld, “Joshua: The Hebrew and Greek Texts,” 5.

²³ Van der Meer, “Formation and Reformulation,” 273.

added KDT) 8:13 must be seen as part of the larger minuses in 8:11b-13. Moreover, against the hypothesis that the omission of Gilgal in the LXX verses can be seen as a plus of the MT, Van der Meer pointed to occurrences of Gilgal in both LXX and MT that according to him disprove the hypothesis of the MT having added the location Gilgal.²⁴ It is precisely the element of location that also drew my attention, albeit in combination with the concept of a camp which seems to be the place to which Joshua *cum suis* return.

1.2 Three Key Concepts of Joshua 10

In Joshua chapter 10 the following phrase can often be read: “he [i.e. Joshua] and Israel with him returned to the camp at Gilgal.” The phrase “he [i.e. Joshua] and Israel with him” occurs in vv. 7, 15, 29, 31, 34, 36, 38, and 43. In most of these verses it is Joshua, and all his people with him, who goes up to a certain city and takes it. In all these verses, the main verb is a third person singular: it is thus Joshua who does something, but he is accompanied by his people. In three verses, vv. 15, 38 and 43, Joshua returns (שוב) to his camp, and so do his people. In vv. 15 and 43, the camp is the camp at Gilgal.

I will demonstrate that Josh 10, and especially these verses, can be used to reconstruct the history of the biblical text, from the Old Hebrew text as witnessed in the Old Greek to the (proto-)Masoretic text. In my opinion, the elements of ‘with him,’ ‘camp’, and finally ‘Gilgal’ are more emphasized in the later Masoretic Text of the Book of Joshua than in the Old Greek and its Hebrew *Vorlage*, which is earlier than the Masoretic Text. In this contribution, I will first study the MT text and then the OG. In the study of the Old Greek text of the verses in which the elements of ‘with him,’ ‘camp’, and ‘Gilgal’ occur I will use both translation technique studies and textual-historical data.

²⁴ See below §II.3, Gilgal.

II. Analysis of the Three Concepts in the Hebrew and Greek Text of Joshua

II.1. With Joshua

The companions are labelled in three ways: (all) Israel (vv. 1, 10, 11a, 12b²⁵, 14, 15, 29, 31, 34, 36, 38, 43), the sons of Israel (vv. 4, 11b, 12a, 20²⁶, 21b, 42a, 42b) and a third general category, such as the fighting force or mighty warriors (both in v. 7), (all) the people (v. 21) or all the men of Israel (v. 24), who are further defined as the chiefs of the men of the fighting force (v. 24).

In the second half of the chapter, there is a formula used to indicate who goes with whom: "(Joshua,) he and all Israel with him." This formula appears in vv. 29, 31, 34, 36, 38, and 43.²⁷ These verses give the impression that Joshua and all Israel work as a team.

In the first part of the chapter, aside from vv. 7, 20, and 24, however, there is actually not that much collaboration between Joshua and Israel. In 10:9: it is Joshua who comes up against the enemy, not Israel. In 10:18-19, Joshua commands the Israelites to roll large stones against the mouth of the cave in which the five Amorite kings hide and to pursue the enemies. In 10:10-11, Israel is mentioned, but not Joshua: God throws the enemies in a panic in front of Israel (v. 10) and the enemies flee in front of Israel (v. 11a). It is mentioned that some Israelites were killed with the sword (v. 11b) and that God delivered the Amorites in the hands of the Israelites (v. 12).

On the other hand in vv. 7, 20 and 24, Joshua and the Israelites are collaborating. In 10:7, when it is said that Joshua goes up from Gilgal, it is Joshua and Israel, who are further labelled as all people of war and all the

²⁵ Note that in v. 12, the syntactical position of Israel/sons of Israel differs in the MT and the OG. It is however precisely the difference between MT and OG which led John Alberto Soggin to remark in 1972 that "it shows all the characteristics of an omission by homoioteleuton in MT." See John Alberto Soggin, *Joshua* (OTL; London: SCM, 1972 [2nd ed., 1982]), 119.

²⁶ There is an unexpected singular in v.20.

²⁷ A similar expression *הוא וכל־עמו* is also used in Josh 8:14, but this time it refers to the King of Ai and his men. Similarly, it is used in Num 21:33 (the King of Bashan and his people), Deut 2:32 (Sihon and his people) and 3:1 (the King of Bashan and his people).

strong men of the force: ויעל יהושע מן־הגלגל הוא וכל־עם המלחמה עמו וכל גבורי החיל. In 10:20 it is said that Joshua and the Israelites (יהושע ובני ישראל) were finishing off the five unfortunate Amorite kings. Finally in 10:24, Joshua calls the men of Israel and he speaks: אל־קציני אנשי המלחמה ההלכוּא אִתּוֹ (to the chiefs of the warriors, who had gone with him) – clearly these men have been accompanying him. Although there is no formula used in the first part of the chapter, in contrast to the second part of the chapter, at times Joshua and his force work together. It is however not always the case. The latter becomes obvious in v. 21, where it is said that the people return to Joshua in the camp at Makkedah – as if Joshua had been in the camp ever since he got there and had to deal with the Amorite kings.

In the second part of the chapter, it is much more evident that both Joshua and his people with him go out, move on to a next victim city and take it. As already mentioned, in vv. 29, 31, 34, 36, 38, and 43 it is he (Joshua) and all Israel with him who are on the road. These verses are each time the first verse of a new section in which a report of a battle is given: in v. 29 Joshua, and all Israel with him, travels from Makkedah to Libnah and he fights against Libnah. In v. 31, Joshua, and all Israel with him, move on to Lachish, in v. 34 to Eglon,²⁸ in v. 36 to Hebron, in v. 38 to Debir. Finally in v. 43 Joshua, and all Israel with him, returns to Gilgal. Verses 29, 31, 34, 36, and 38 all are introductory verses of very short campaign-stories. It needs to be said that the taking of Makkedah is an extremely short campaign story. Most of the stories contain the following elements: Joshua and all Israel with him, moved on from X to Y, laid siege to Y, assaulted Y; then, they took it and struck it, and they destroyed every person in the city. The short campaign story ends with a comparative remark: just as he had done to X, so he did to Y. Verses 31–32 have an unusual additional verse 33 in which King Hiram of Gezer comes to the aid of Lachish, but is then dealt with by Joshua – and I therefore record it in conjunction with 31–32.

²⁸ According to Auld, the fact that the Greek text reads Odollam, and not Eglon, represents “information from a parent text different from MT.” See A. Graeme Auld, *Joshua* (Septuagint Commentary Series; Leiden: Brill, 2005), 159–160.

	28	29-30	31-32	/33/	34-35	36-37	38-39
Joshua and Israel with him	-	x	x	-	x	x	x
Passed on	-	x	x	-	x	x	(x)
Laid siege	-	x	x	-	x	-	-
Assaulted	-	x	x	-	x	x	x
They took and struck	he	God ²⁹	God	He	x	x	x
They destroyed every person	x ³⁰	x	x	x	x	x	x
He did as he had done before	x	x	x	-	x	x	x

The structure of the Masoretic Text of Joshua can now be reconstructed. Note that it is the formula 'he (Joshua) and all Israel with him' that divides chapter 10 in two parts; the second one being the one with the formulaic expression: he (Joshua) and all Israel with him. The two parts are followed by a concluding summary.

In the first part, it is reported that King Adoni-zedek of Jerusalem forms a coalition against a newly established ally of Joshua, namely Gibeon and the armies of the joint forces camp against Gibeon and made war against it (vv. 1-5). Gibeon then sends out a rescue call to Joshua (v. 6), who promptly goes up and defeats the joint forces (vv. 7-14), not without uttering the famous words, "Sun, stand still at Gibeon, and Moon, in the valley of Aijalon" – and a reference is made to these words in the Book of Jashar.³¹ After Joshua defeats the forces of the coalition, he returns to his camp (v. 15), but then he has to go to Makkedah to deal with the heads of the coalition, namely the five Amorites kings: Adoni-zedek, the king of Jerusalem, King Hoham of Hebron, King Piram of Jarmuth, King Japhia of Lachish, and King Debir of Eglon, who have fled from the battle and are

²⁹ See below for the elaboration on what God does in this and the next short campaign story.

³⁰ Soggin (*Joshua*, 120) notes that the mentioning of 'the king' as part of who is destroyed "is an addition in Hebrew."

³¹ See Kristin De Troyer, "Is it not Written in the Book of Jashar?" in *The Land of Israel in Bible, History, and Theology: Studies in Honour of Ed Noort* (ed. Jacques van Ruiten and J. Cornelis de Vos; VTSup 124; Leiden: Brill, 2009), 45-50.

hiding in a cave in Makkedah. And so Joshua does (vv. 16–27). With the death of the five kings the coalition is beheaded and Gibeon is safe.³²

The second part of the chapter starts with v. 28. First Joshua takes Makkedah (v. 28), then Libnah (vv. 29–30), Lachish (vv. 31–33), Eglon (vv. 34–35), Hebron (vv. 36–37), and finally Debir (vv. 38–39).

A summary of Joshua's achievements is presented in vv. 40–42, which functions as a summary for both the first and second parts, as it uses both terminology from the shorter assault stories ("Joshua destroyed all that breathed": vv. 30, 32, 33c, 35c, 37d, 39c, and 40c) as well as the longer Gibeonite-Amorite story ("the Lord fought for Israel": v. 14 and v. 42; Gibeon is mentioned in vv. 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, and 41). Finally, in v. 43 Joshua returns to his camp at Gilgal. In the concluding verses, except for v. 43, it is again Joshua who seems to be doing all the work: he defeats, he destroys and he takes the kings.

The two parts of the chapter are hinged through the mentioning of Makkedah: that is where the five Amorite kings flee to (vv. 16–27) and that is also the first city that Joshua takes and strikes, destroying all persons in it (v. 28).³³

³² Volkmar Fritz writes: "In 10,1-27 liegen zwei verschiedene Stoffe vor, die ursprünglich nicht zusammengehört haben, sondern erst redaktionell miteinander verbunden worden sind: die Schlacht bei Gibeon 1-15 und die Erzählung von dem Ende der Könige in der Höhe von Makkeda 16-27"; see Volkmar Fritz, *Das Buch Josua* (HAT I/7; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994), 109. Rudolph Smend in 1912 pointed to two redactors that inserted materials in Joshua 1-12, with 10:16-27 as a first interpolation and 10:28-43 as added by a second interpolator. See Rudolph Smend, *Die Erzählung des Hexateuch auf ihre Quellen untersucht* (Berlin, 1912), 308ff.

³³ Fritz (*Josua*, 116) also points to v. 28 as a connecting passage: "Mit der Eroberung von Makkeda (...) wird eine literarische Brücke zur vorangegangene Episode geschaffen."

The structure of the chapter is thus as follows:

- I. Joshua, the Gibeonites and the Amorite Coalition (vv. 1-27)
 - a. Report of formation and defeat of the Coalition (vv. 1-14)
 - i. Plan of the King of Jerusalem, formation of coalition and siege of Gibeon (vv. 1-6)
 - ii. Request of Gibeonites to Joshua to come and help (v. 7)
 - iii. Report of the defeat of the coalition (vv. 8-14)
 - b. Report of Joshua and forces returning to the camp at Gilgal (v. 15)
 - c. Report of Joshua's dealing with leaders of the coalition (vv. 16-27)
- II. Joshua and his taking of the cities of Makkedah, Libnah, Lachish, Eglon, Hebron, and Debir
 - a. Report of Joshua and Makkedah (v. 28)
 - b. Report of Joshua and Libnah (vv. 29-30)
 - c. Report of Joshua and Lachish (vv. 31-33)
 - d. Report of Joshua and Eglon (vv. 34-35)
 - e. Report of Joshua and Hebron (vv. 36-37)
 - f. Joshua and Debir (vv. 38-39)
- III. Concluding summary
 - a. Summary of achievements of Joshua (vv. 40-42)
 - b. Note on Joshua returning to his camp at Gilgal (v. 43)

The different sections of the first part of the story are interconnected with each other through common usage of words and expressions. For instance, in v. 7, the people that fight with Joshua are defined as **וכל-עם המלחמה עמו וכל גבורי החיל** ("all the people of the war with him, and all the mighty warriors"). Although in v. 24 it is not precisely the **עם המלחמה** (the people of the war), there are the **אנשי המלחמה** (men of the war). Both in vv. 7 and 24 there is a double description of the people involved: in v. 7 the people are first labelled as 'all the people of the war,' and then as 'the mighty warriors,' and in v. 24 they are first referred to as 'all the men of Israel' and then as 'the men of the war.' In v. 7 the people go with Joshua (**עמו**) and in v. 24 they are the ones that are going with him (**ההלכו אתו**).

Moreover, the idea of ‘with him (Joshua)’ is certainly found in the second part of the chapter, as every short assault story contains a reference to ‘with Joshua.’

The Old Greek text has similar categories of people collaborating with Joshua: Israel, the sons of Israel, all Israel. The longer descriptions of vv. 7 and 24 are appropriately translated. The Old Greek seems to render the Hebrew text in a “relatively faithful”³⁴ way. The formula “he (Joshua) and all Israel with him” is rendered: *Ἰησοῦς καὶ πᾶς Ἰσραηλ μετ’ αὐτοῦ* = (Joshua and all Israel with him). The alternation between Joshua fighting or doing something on his own and Israel acting on its own, as well as the collaborative events are reflected in the Greek text.

A couple of exceptions however need to be noted. A very important fact is that the Old Greek of Joshua has neither v. 15 nor v. 43 – we will return to this issue later. In 10:1, not only Israel is mentioned but also Joshua. Most likely this is the result of the translator levelling this text with 10:4, in which both in MT and OG it is reported that the Gibeonites have made peace with Joshua and the Israelites. For the rest of the first part, the Old Greek seems to follow the MT. Another exception occurs in 10:28. Whereas in the MT, it is Joshua alone who was fighting, in the Old Greek text it is ‘they,’ who took Makkedah, struck it, and destroyed it.

In the second part of the chapter, the Greek translator seems to have responded differently to the presence of God in the short campaign stories.³⁵ In the MT, as can be seen from the survey of the formal elements survey of the short campaign stories, in vv. 30 and 32, which are part of the Libnah (vv. 29–30) and Lachish (vv. 31–33) stories, God is said to deliver the enemies into the hands of the sons of Israel. This is not the case in the rest of the short campaign stories. God giving the enemies in the hands of the son of Israel creates a grammatical problem: in the following phrases it is not clear as to who is actually fighting: God or Joshua or the Israelites? In MT 10:30 and 32, the third person singular is continued after God delivers the

³⁴ Mazor, “The Septuagint Translator,” esp. 32.

³⁵ See also Auld, *Joshua*, 161.

enemies: he struck it, he left no one remaining, and he did so (vv. 30 and 32). The singular most likely referred to Joshua, but as it stands, it could also be seen as referring to God. The Old Greek translator noticed the problem. In 10:30, the translator first continues with the third person singular but then switches to the third person plural, creating the idea that the Israelites were fighting. Similarly in 10:32 the third person plural is used. In 10:35, the MT does not have God in the picture, but the Old Greek does, and thus the Old Greek twice uses a singular to refer to God and then a plural to refer to the Israelites.

What is however exceptional is that in all the other cases of the short campaign stories, more precisely in the non-theological stories, the Old Greek, has used the singular form more than the plural (vv. 34b,34c,36b). Overall in the MT and OG there are also singular forms used in vv. 29,31,33,40,41,42. It needs to be said however, that there are also two verses where the Old Greek did use plurals whereas the MT did not (vv. 37b,37c,39). But overall, in the Old Greek, the short campaign stories seem to have been “one-man stories.” Only the words, “and all the people with him” seem to point to a collaboration between Joshua and the Israelites. Moreover, in the MT, there are two more verses (vv. 15 and 43) that are about Joshua and all his Israel with him, and thus it seems that there is more collaboration between Joshua and all Israel in the MT than in the Old Greek.

If we put this in the context of the larger book of Joshua, it is also worth noting that there is a distinction created between the people who are with Joshua and those who, although they are on Joshua’s side, are not with Joshua, or at least not in his camp. In 6:23 for instance, Rahab and her family are saved, because of their support for Joshua, but they remain outside of the camp. Joshua on the other hand is sometimes in the camp (MT 8:9, but not in the Old Greek)³⁶ and sometimes deliberately outside of the camp (MT 8:13, again a verse that is absent from the Old Greek³⁷).³⁸

³⁶ In his survey of research on the Book of Joshua, Ed Noort refers to Holmes who gave a list, in which MT 8:9 appears, of “Fällen, bei denen das Minus von LXX keine Kürzung des M darstellt, sondern umgekehrt.” Noort continues

So far I have noted that there are two tendencies in the MT. On the one hand the MT emphasizes much more than the Old Greek text that Joshua worked in tandem with Israel. This concept, Joshua and all Israel with him, is crucial for the MT but not that important for the Old Greek. On the other hand, a distinction is created between the people who are with Joshua and the people who at times are not with Joshua and are outside his camp. I now turn to the notion of the camp.

II.2. *The Camp*

In the Greek text, the most common translation of the Hebrew word *מחנה* (camp) is *παρεμβολή* (camp). Below I have created a combined list of these two words:

1:11	מחנה	παρεμβολή
3:2	מחנה	παρεμβολή
4:8	מלון	παρεμβολή
5:8	מחנה	παρεμβολή
6:11	מחנה	παρεμβολή
6:14	מחנה	παρεμβολή

paraphrasing Holmes: "MT hat hier ein Plus, das als redaktionelle Erweiterung angesehen werden darf." See Ed Noort, *Das Buch Josua. Forschungsgeschichte und Problemfelder* (EdF 292; Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1998), 47, referring to S. Holmes, *Joshua: The Hebrew and Greek Texts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1914). On p. 52, Noort refers to Dillmann who labels 8:9b as one of the "Lücken (*die, added KDT*) in LXX bestimmt fehlerhaft ist," with reference to August Dillmann, *Die Bücher Numeri, Deuteronomium und Josua* (2nd ed.; KEH; Leipzig, 1886). He also adds 10:15 and 10:43 to this list. Although Noort offers a good survey of the work done on the relationship between esp. MT and LXX, he seems to uphold the view of Noth. He writes: "Der ... Standpunkt, MT biete den besseren Text, LXX aber gelegentlich eine bessere Lesung, hält sich im 20. Jh. durch und wird auch von Noth 1953 vertreten"; see Noort, *Das Buch Josua*, 53.

³⁷ According to the edition of 4QJosh^a there is also no 8:13 in the Qumran text. See Eugene Ulrich, *The Biblical Qumran Scrolls: Transcriptions and Textual Variants* (VTSup 134; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 251. Noort (*Das Buch Josua*, 47), again, refers here to Holmes.

³⁸ See below for a further discussion of 8:9–13.

6:18	מחנה	παρεμβολή
6:23	מחנה	παρεμβολή
7:22	–	παρεμβολή
8:13	מחנה	–
8:22	יִשְׂרָאֵל	παρεμβολή
9:6	מחנה	παρεμβολή
10:5	מחנה	λάος
10:6	מחנה	παρεμβολή
10:15	מחנה	–
10:21	מחנה	–
10:43	מחנה	–
11:4	מחנה	οἱ βασιλεῖς
18:9	מחנה	–

In all the cases, but one, the entire camp of the people of Israel is intended.³⁹ Nine times the Hebrew word מחנה is rendered with παρεμβολή (1:11; 3:2; 5:8; 6:11, 14, 18, 23; 9:6; 10:6). There are however exceptions to the standard rendering of מחנה with παρεμβολή and these are most interesting: how can these exceptions be explained? In 4:8 the Hebrew text reads ‘the lodging place,’ which most likely was not a ‘camp,’ and hence, the word מִלִּינָה (lodging place) is used; the Old Greek however considers it a camp. In 7:22, the Old Greek specifies that the tent (of Achan, who had dared to take some silver from the spoil) was in the camp—the Hebrew only notes that they went to the tent and that the silver was hidden in the tent. In 8:22, the MT reads that the Israelites were on this and that side, in other words that they surrounded their enemy; the OG renders that the enemies were in the midst of the camps (of the Israelites), who were on this side and others on the other side.⁴⁰

In 10:5, the Old Greek does not label the fighting forces of the coalition of the five Amorite kings ‘camps,’ but ‘people.’ This however, completely

³⁹ In 11:4 the armies are the armies of the enemies. Moreover, in 5:8 the camp refers to only the males of Israel.

⁴⁰ See below for a detailed analysis of the camp(s) surrounding Ai.

corresponds, with the Greek text of 10:7, in which it is said that Joshua and his fighting ‘people’ come up. It looks like the Old Greek text has levelled out the two armies that are going to meet each other. Unfortunately, 4QJosh^a breaks off right before this phrase. In 11:4, the MT reads that the kings and their armed forces were marching out. The Old Greek emphasizes that the kings were marching out, as in the former verses many people were mentioned: the Canaanites, Amorites, Hittites, Perizzites, and Jebusites. In 11:4, the reader is reminded that all these *and their kings* are marching out. The Old Greek has thus clarified the Hebrew text and in doing so replaced the camps with the kings (οἱ βασιλεῖς).

The other exceptions are more difficult to explain. Why do the texts of 10:15, 10:21, and 10:43 not have a counterpart to the Hebrew word מחנה or why in the case of vv. 15 and 43 is the entire verse missing? In 10:21 the Hebrew (MT) text reads: וישבו כל־העם אל־המחנה אל־יהושע מקדה בשלום (They, all the people, returned to the camp, to Joshua, to Makedah, in peace). There is thus a double location to which the people return: they return to the camp, to Joshua. Then, a third location appears in apposition to Joshua: Joshua at Makkedah.⁴¹ Finally it is said that the people return in peace – but that is not important for the time being. The Old Greek text has the people return in good health⁴² but has one location less than the Hebrew text: the people return to Joshua at Makkedah in good health: καὶ ἀπεστράφη πᾶς ὁ λαὸς πρὸς Ἰησοῦν εἰς Μακκηδα ὑγιεῖς. There is no mention of returning to the camp. The camp is also absent in one of the oldest witnesses of the Old Greek text: the Schøyen Joshua codex. Udo Quast’s preliminary note on 10:21 of the Greek text of the book of Joshua makes it clear that the addition ‘to the camp’ is a hexaplaric correction towards the Masoretic Text – it

⁴¹ Soggin (*Joshua*, 120) notes: “LXX and V lack ‘in the camp’; followed by ‘Makkedah’, this word is meaningless, unless one supposes that Joshua had established a camp near the cave, which we are not told.”

⁴² In English one could turn this into a word-play: they returned in one piece, instead of in peace.

definitively was not part of the original Old Greek text of Joshua.⁴³ A similar picture can be seen in 18:9: the MT reads that the people RETURNED to the camp of Joshua at Shiloh. The Greek text does not mention the camp or Shiloh.

With regard to 10:15 and 10:43: both verses state: Then Joshua returned, and all Israel with him, to the camp at Gilgal. Both verses are present in the Masoretic Text but absent from the Old Greek text. As time progressed both verses were added to the text of the Old Greek to make it conform to the later Masoretic Text. The text critical data as preliminary given by Udo Quast confirm that the addition of both verses to the Old Greek text was a hexaplaric correction.⁴⁴ It also needs to be noted here that both verses are absent from the the Schøyen Joshua codex.⁴⁵

The text critical data clearly confirm that the Old Greek text does not contain 10:15 and 10:43 and that there is no camp mentioned in the Old

⁴³ πρὸς Ἰησοῦν] pr (* Arm^{mssmg} Syh^L Syh^{M(vid)}(vid)) εἰς (πρὸς 72) τὴν παρεμβολὴν (-βουλὴν 458) W 376 n q 85^{mg}-321^{mg}-343-344^{mg}-346^{mg} 318 58-72 68-122 82 129 392 Aeth Arm Syh^{LM(vid)} = MT. I am very grateful to Udo Quast (†) for having given me this note.

⁴⁴ Quast noted for 10:15—and again I am most grateful to Udo Quast (†) for having given me these notes:

+ (15) (* G 344^{mg} Syh^L; / Syh^M) καὶ ἐπεστρεψε(ν) (-ψαν (lat) Aeth^F; ὑπεστρ. F^b) ἰησοῦς καὶ πας (+ο λαὸς B W) ἰσραὴλ (ισλ W) μετ' αὐτοῦ (ras ca 4 litt pro μετ' αὐτοῦ Syh^L) εἰς (πρὸς F^b) τὴν παρεμβολὴν (om εἰς τὴν παρ. 75; om μετ—παρ. 129) εἰς γαλαγαλα (-λαν G; τῆς γαλαγαλ pro εἰς γ. F^b) B^{mg} F^{bm}g W O^{'-128} f n q 85^{mg}-321^{mg}-343-344^{mg}-346^{mg} 121^{mg} z 58 68-122 82 129 489 646 Aeth^F Arm Syh^{LM} = MT.

And for 10:43:

+ (* G Syh^{LM}) καὶ ἀνεστρεψεν ἰησοῦς καὶ πας ἰσραὴλ μετ' αὐτοῦ (+ εἰς πόλεμον G) εἰς τὴν παρεμβολὴν (om καὶ 2^o—παρεμβολὴν 19-108) εἰς (ισλ εν 376) γαλαγαλα (-λων 376) O 85^{mg} Aeth^C Arm Syh^{LM} = MT.

⁴⁵ See Kristin De Troyer, *LXX, Joshua (MS 2648)* (ed. Rosario Pintaudi; Papyri Graecae Schøyen, P^SSchøyen I; Papyrologica Florentina XXXV/Manuscripts in the Schøyen Collection, Greek Papyri V; Firenze: Gonnelli, 2005), 79–145 + Plates XVI–XXVII. Fritz (*Das Buch Josua*, 112) notes with regard to v. 15: “der Satz ist wahrscheinlich aus 43 übernommen.” But he also writes with regard to v. 43: “43 entspricht 15. Die Abschlußformel steht aber hier an ihrem ursprünglichen Platz” (p. 117).

Greek of 10:21. Moreover, the study of the translation technique confirms that there is no good reason in these verses why the Old Greek would have dropped the word,⁴⁶ let alone omitted two entire sentences if they had been in the Hebrew *Vorlage* of Joshua. In order to find out why the camp is not mentioned in 10:21 and why vv. 15 and 43 are absent, we now turn our attention to the location of the camp, namely at Gilgal.

II.3. Gilgal

In the book of Joshua, the location Gilgal first appears in 4:19,⁴⁷ when the Israelites arrive at Gilgal, בגלגל. Similarly in 14:6, the Israelites once again arrive in, or literally reach or come near to Gilgal (בגלגל). In 10:6 and 10:7 the Israelites leave Gilgal. Moreover, the place name Gilgal appears with a *he-directionis* in 10:6, 7 (with the meaning of leaving!), 9 (similarly in a context of leaving!), 15, 43 and 15:7 (in a description of a boundary). It appears as a place name – without the *he-directionis* – in 9:6.

In 4:19 and 14:6 Gilgal is the name of the place where the Israelites arrive. In 4:19 they make camp there – the verb חנה is used, not a noun. In 14:6 neither חנה nor מחנה is used. Similarly, when the Israelites leave Gilgal there is no mention of חנה or מחנה. In all the other cases (9:6; 10:6,15,43), it is the place where Joshua's camp is located. Joshua's camp at Gilgal is thus mentioned first in 9:6.⁴⁸

⁴⁶ Contra Dominique Barthélemy, *Critique Textuelle de l'Ancien Testament: 1. Josué, Juges, Ruth, Samuel, Rois, Chroniques, Esdras, Néhémie, Esther: Rapport final du Comité pour l'analyse textuelle de l'Ancien Testament hébreu institué par l'Alliance Biblique Universelle* (OBO 50/1; Fribourg/Göttingen: Éditions Universitaires/ Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982), 17.

⁴⁷ For a good summary of the issues surrounding Gilgal, see Bieberstein, *Josua – Jordan – Jericho*, 62–71, 137–141, 209–210.

⁴⁸ Van der Meer ("Formation and Reformulation," 272–273) does not differentiate between all these different usages. In his argument against Gilgal as a plus of the MT redaction, his examples of 4:19; 10:7 and 14:6 are not useful as there is actually no reference to a camp in the verses. The only two valid references are 9:6 and 10:6. However, in both verses there is the problem that the people go to both Joshua *and* to the camp at Gilgal. See also the discussion in §II.2, ad 10:21.

The translation of the place name גלגל in the Old Greek of Joshua is γαλγαλα, except for 14:6 and 15:7 where it is γαλγαλ – clearly the latter stems from a different tradition.⁴⁹

4:19	בגלגל	ἐν γαλγαλοῖς
4:20	בגלגל	ἐν γαλγαλοῖς
5:9	גלגל	γαλγαλα
5:10	בגלגל	–
9:6	גלגל	γαλγαλα
10:6	גלגל	γαλγαλα
10:7	מגלגל	ἐκ γαλγαλων
10:9	מגלגל	ἐκ γαλγαλων
10:15	גלגל	–
10:43	גלגל	–
12:23	בגלגל	γαλιλαιας
14:6	בגלגל	ἐν γαλγαλ
15:7	גלגל	γαλγαλ

Beyond the Book of Joshua, the place Gilgal is mentioned in MT Deut 11:30; Judg 2:1 and 3:19; 1 Sam 10:8; 11:14,15(2x); 13:4,7,8,12,15; 15:12; 2 Kgs 2:1; Neh 12:29; Hos 4:15; 9:15; 12:12; Amos 4:4; 5:5 and Mic 6:5 (in Eccl 12:6 and Ezek 10:13, it does not indicate a place name but wheels). There are three more cases with a *he-directionis*: 2 Sam 19:16, 41 and 2 Kgs 4:38. In OG

⁴⁹ Van der Meer does not note these differences. Also, in 12:23 the Old Greek renders with γαλιλαιας. For the use of γαλιλαιας for rendering גלגל and גלגל (20:7 and 21:32), see Jacqueline Moatti-Fine, *Jésus (Josué): Traduction du texte grec de la Septante, Introduction et Note* (La Bible d'Alexandrie; Paris: du Cerf, 1996), 165. See also below for the broader use of the place name and its translation.

Judg 2:1; 3:19, OG Hos 9:15; 12:12;⁵⁰ Mic 6:5 (and maybe in OG Neh 12:29) the name of the place is *γαλαλα*; in all other instances it is *γαλαλαα*.⁵¹

The first time Gilgal is mentioned in the MT is in 4:19. After the Israelites emerge from the Jordan, they encamp at Gilgal: וַיִּחַנוּ בְּגִלְגָל. Joshua takes twelve stones and sets them at Gilgal. The place Gilgal however only receives its name in 5:9, right after the circumcision. The place where the (second) circumcision happens is named Gilgal—the place being named after God’s rolling away the disgrace of Egypt (5:9).

While they were staying in the camp at Gilgal to heal they also celebrated Passover (5:10). As in 4:19 and 4:20, the Old Greek renders the Hebrew place name of 5:9 with *γαλαλαα*—it does not mention that the Israelites are encamped at Gilgal in OG 5:10. In 9:6 however, Joshua is clearly at Gilgal. In 10:6, the delegation of the Gibeonites meets Joshua at his camp at Gilgal and Joshua goes up from Gilgal. In 10:15, Joshua returns to Gilgal. Meanwhile the five Amorite kings flee to Makkedah and Joshua commands to roll large stones against the mouth of the cave in which they are hiding. Then, unexpectedly and illogically it is stated that “all the people return safe to Joshua to the camp at Makkedah” (10:21). I have already dealt with this verse. In this context, I remind the reader that what is crucial here is that it is not Gilgal to which the people return, but Makkedah. In other words, Joshua has moved his camp from Gilgal to Makkedah. From there and moving from one city to another, the short campaigns against Libnah, Lachish, Eglon, Hebron and Debir commence. At the end of the story, however, there is another illogical phrase, namely 10:43 in which again it is said that Joshua and all Israel with him return to Gilgal.

⁵⁰ Why the translator of Hosea used both forms is not clear. Jan Joosten, Eberhard Bons and Stephan Kessler translate Galgal in 9:15 and 12:12 and Gilgal in 4:15, but have no explanation for the difference; see Eberhard Bons, Jan Joosten and Stephan Kessler, *Les douzes prophètes: Osée: Traduction du texte grec de la Septante, Introduction et Notes* (La Bible d’Alexandrie; Paris: du Cerf, 2002), 91–94, 132, 151–154.

⁵¹ But note that the reading *γαλαλαα* is found in 2 Kgs 2:1 in Codex Vaticanus and in 1 Sam 10:8 in Codex Alexandrinus; in 1 Sam 10:8 Codices B and E (Codex Bodleianus) and 121 read *γαλααδ*. Also, OG Deut 11:30 reads *γολολ*.

In the Greek text, the problem of Gilgal is absent. As vv. 15 and 43 are not part of the text, there is no one returning to Gilgal. There is also no reason to believe that the Old Greek translator simply omitted these references, as she/he has so far never done that and rendered all occurrences of camp or camp at Gilgal appropriately (see the analysis of 'camp' above). Only in 18:9 does the Greek translator not mention a camp at all, but precisely in this section, the camp has again switched location, namely now the camp is at Shiloh. The omission of Gilgal in 10:15 and 10:43 is thus not making an illogical Hebrew text more logical, it most likely has to do with the absence of the emphasis on Gilgal as the place to which Joshua *returns* in the Old Hebrew text that was the *Vorlage* of the Old Greek.⁵² This conclusion is similar to the one of Mazor, who demonstrated that the changes, resulting from the process of addition of verses, in the MT of Joshua 1-12 were made to emphasize that Gilgal was the base for the operations of the conquest.⁵³

⁵² Against Soggin (*Joshua*, 127) who states: "A return to Gilgal here is absurd, historically speaking, and LXX has also suppressed it. But it is an obvious case of the *lectio difficilior*, and as such should be kept." Soggin has elaborated in his commentary on Joshua that Gilgal belongs to one of the pre-Deuteronomistic elements of the conquest narrative. He writes: "*In the first part (chs. 1-12)*, it is easy to see that we are faced with a mosaic of very different materials, almost all of which, however are associated with the territory of Benjamin and its sanctuary, Gilgal. ... We know that the Benjaminite sanctuary of Gilgal was raised to the status of a national sanctuary at the time of Saul the Benjaminite. ... [I]t was the Gilgal region, if not Gilgal itself, that was the starting place not only of the troops who conquered the territory of Benjamin in the strict sense, but of the expedition to the south (10.8-9) and all the undertakings described in Judges 1.1" (Soggin, *Joshua*, 9). Whereas I do not deny that Gilgal was important in the days of Saul, I also see a renaissance of the Benjaminite line in for instance the Book of Esther, which in its Hebrew form could be dated to the fourth to second century BCE. Auld (*Joshua*, 166) notes: "As after v. 14, so after v. 42 MT adds a note detailing the return of Joshua and all Israel to the camp at Gilgal."

⁵³ Michael N. van der Meer, quoting the dissertation of Lea Mazor, "The Septuagint Translation of the Book of Joshua: Its Contribution to the Understanding of the Textual Transmission of the Book and Its Literary and Ideological Development" (Ph.D. diss.; The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1994), 167-168 (Heb.), in Michael N. van der Meer, *Formation and Reformulation: The*

Gilgal only appears back in the narrative of the biblical text in the Book of Judges. In Judg 2:1 an angel of God went up from Gilgal to Bochim. In other words, in what is generally considered the most recent addition to the Book of Judges,⁵⁴ the idea of Gilgal is present.⁵⁵ Gilgal is also the place that in the Book of 1 Samuel, Samuel visits on a yearly basis (7:16), where Samuel first anoints Saul (10:8), and where the kingship of Saul is renewed (11:14–15). As I have mentioned elsewhere, the value of Gilgal as headquarters diminished soon afterwards.⁵⁶ It seems however that Gilgal was associated with Saul and his kingship, but I strongly doubt that Gilgal was the headquarters for Joshua, if the latter existed at all.

III. Conclusion

The text-critical data and the study of the translation technique of three crucial concepts and phrases, that is: Joshua and all Israel with him, the camp, and Gilgal, demonstrate that when the Old Greek translation of the Book of Joshua was produced, the Hebrew text underlying the Old Greek translation did not yet have the concepts of a highly developed joint collaboration between Joshua and Israel, the stress on the camp of Israel, nor the importance of its location at Gilgal. Tov was correct when he wrote: "he (= the Old Greek translator, *added KDT*) found an often-shorter text."⁵⁷ It

Redaction of the Book of Joshua in the Light of the Oldest Textual Witnesses (VTSup 102; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 65.

⁵⁴ See for instance, John Alberto Soggin, *Judges: A Commentary* (OTL; London: SCM Press, 1981), 4. On p. 31, Soggin writes: "[S]ince this whole section is obviously an interpolation between the end of Joshua and 2:6ff., it has been supposed that the interpolation happened after the Dtr redaction of Judges or at least in a final stage of it." Referring to Smend, Soggin states that in 2:1–5 "we find evidence of the last phase of the Dtr redaction, that of so-called DtrN."

⁵⁵ See especially Alexander Rofé, "The End of the Book of Joshua according to the Septuagint," *Henoah* 4 (1982): 17–36.

⁵⁶ Kristin De Troyer, *Rewriting the Sacred Text: What the Old Greek Texts Tell Us about the Literary Growth of the Bible* (Text-Critical Studies, 4; Atlanta/Leiden: SBL/Brill, 2003), 29–58.

⁵⁷ Tov, "The Septuagint and the Deuteronomists," 401.

was only the later (proto-)Masoretic redactor that created these concepts and inserted them in the older narrative of the Book of Joshua. By doing so, the striking of the enemies became a joint operation by Joshua and all Israel with him, the joint operation was even more unified by the use of their camp to move forward, and finally, the main camp was located at Gilgal—the place from where not only the land was taken but also the first king was anointed.

Lea Mazor in her work, had concluded that the “LXX reflects a Hebrew *Vorlage* of the non-Masoretic type.”⁵⁸ Like Tov, Mazor posits “two separate recensions of the book of Joshua.”⁵⁹ Whereas Mazor specifies that “LXX and MT are two separate recensions which have split off from a common source,”⁶⁰ I conclude that the MT is a further redactional reworking of the shorter Hebrew *Vorlage*. I acknowledge however that Mazor has taken more text into consideration than I and thus, the conclusions of the current study should be considered tentative until further research is performed on additional passages in Joshua.⁶¹

That my conclusion may have some impact on the hypotheses of the different layers in the Book of Joshua seems obvious. Instead of labelling Gilgal one of the older and unifying traditions, I consider it part of a late Masoretic tradition.

Appendix: A Note about the Camp(s) Surrounding Ai

In the battle against Ai, a strategy about how to conquer it is developed, involving an ambush and an army which pretends to flee. It is not clear in the different texts where the ambush and the camp are and where Joshua is.

⁵⁸ Mazor, “Septuagint of Joshua,” 33.

⁵⁹ Ibidem, 36. Tov, “The Growth of the Book of Joshua,” 338; repr. idem, *The Greek and the Hebrew Bible*, 395.

⁶⁰ Mazor, “Septuagint of Joshua,” 38.

⁶¹ I would like to thank the anonymous reviewer(s) for the constructive comments and suggestions.

In 8:9b Joshua spends the night among the people. This note is absent from the Old Greek text. In 8:13 Joshua stays in the valley. The latter verse is absent from the Greek text. Moreover, the note about camping at the Northside of the city (8:11b) is also absent from the Old Greek text.

As these verses function within our argument about the ‘camp,’ we summarize the Mazor–Van der Meer discussion here and then, offer our own understanding.⁶² With regard to Joshua 8:11b–13, Mazor argued that the section is constructed from material of Josh 8 and Judg 20,⁶³ the plusses in MT being the result of an attempt to account for the multiple ambushes in Judg 20:29. Van der Meer summarizes and criticizes the hypothesis of Lea Mazor. He offers detailed counterarguments against her thesis, focussing on Judg 20 and on the Qumran material. With regard to MT 8:11b–13, including 8:9b (“but Joshua spent the night outside of the camp”), Van der Meer first offers his views on what he calls, albeit with a question mark, the “literary-critical solution offered by LXX.”⁶⁴ He clarifies that in OG chapter 8 all the action happens in one night and on the next day; moreover, the men come from the direction of Gilgal/Jericho—not from the North. The result of the OG deleting many a detail is a smooth story: “Most of the elements that disturb the logical sequence of the narrative are absent from the Greek version.”⁶⁵ Van der Meer then turns towards the evidence from Qumran reminding the reader of the view of Ulrich regarding 4QJosh^a who “suspects a shorter Hebrew text like that reflected in LXX.”⁶⁶ With regard to

⁶² Auld (*Joshua*, 148) notes that the Greek version of the taking of Ai story is “considerable shorter than the Hebrew (MT)”, but that “in general, the Greek is not inherently unsatisfactory.”

⁶³ See Lea Mazor, “A Textual and Literary Study of the Fall of Ai in Joshua 8,” in *The Bible in the Light of Its Interpreters: Sarah Kamin Memorial Volume* (ed. Sara Japhet; Jerusalem: Magnes, 1994), 73–108 (Heb.).

⁶⁴ Van der Meer, *Formation and Reformulation*, 357.

⁶⁵ Ibidem. Van der Meer’s view is similar to the view held by Max Margolis and noted by Dominique Barthélemy (*Critique Textuelle*, 11): “Ce n’est que l’une des initiatives prises par le *G pour éliminer tous les désaccords de temps et de lieux qui trahissent l’origine composite du récit de la prise d’Ai.” See also Moatti-Fine, *Jésus (Josué)*, 136.

⁶⁶ Van der Meer, *Formation and Reformulation*, 367.

the Greek text, Van der Meer concludes: "Since the Greek translation was probably produced outside Palestine (Alexandria?), by a scholar who was probably not familiar with all the specific details of the geography of Israel (...), it is more logical to ascribe this pattern of variants in geographical detail to the ignorance of the Greek translator with respect to these specific toponyms, than to assume that a later editor was overly concerned about the precise whereabouts of the events described in the narrative, as Auld holds."⁶⁷

I consider MT 8:9b,11b-13 a secondary insertion into the MT story of the battle against Ai.⁶⁸ The structure of the story points clearly to 8:14 being the continuation of 8:1-8. In 8:2, first God commands to set an ambush behind the city; in 8:4, Joshua repeats the divine command to his troops and also commands to set an ambush behind the city. When the commands are executed and the attack starts, in 8:14, it is repeated that the ambush is behind the city. Moreover, the instructions of 8:3-8 are executed in 8:14-21: lying in ambush (8:4 and 8:14), pretending to flee (8:5-6 and 8:15-17), seizing the city (8:7 and 8:18) and setting the city on fire (8:8 and 8:19).⁶⁹ In

⁶⁷ Ibidem, 376.

⁶⁸ Van der Meer (ibidem, 355) regards 8:11ff as "a rival account of the narrative in the verses preceding it (8:3-9). He states that "this redactor embedded the long discursive passage into the original narrative..." He distinguishes between two literary layers: "[1] a Deuteronomistic layer (DtrJ), to which verses 1, 2, 3-9, 15, 17, 21-25, and 27-29 belong, and [2] an older pre-Deuteronomistic layer consisting of verses 10-14, 16, 18-20, and 26" (p. 379). Van der Meer also acknowledges that the "original narrative has been taken up by the Deuteronomistic historian, and transformed into an idealized account of an exemplary victory over an enemy of *all Israel* according to the Deuteronomistic Law, led by Joshua under the auspices of Yhwh" (p. 380). Although I agree with Van der Meer that there are two stories conflated in Joshua 8, I consider vv. 9-13 as wedged into the text, with a later MT redactor, however, adding vv. 9b, 11b and 13.

⁶⁹ The MT clearly aims to make sure that the instructions given by God or Joshua are precisely executed. See Kristin De Troyer, "Did Joshua have a Crystal Ball? The Old Greek and the MT of Joshua 10:15,17 and 23," in *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of Emanuel Tov* (ed. Shalom M. Paul et al.; Leiden: Brill, 2002), 571-589. With regard to the text in MT/OG Joshua 8 I

other words, the commands first given by God (8:1-2), and then further elaborated by Joshua (8:[3]4-8) are executed in 8:14-21. The *Wiederaufnahme* of the text becomes obvious when focusing on the ambush location: in all the three sections it is the same: it is behind the city: לעיר מאחריה (8:2, in God's instruction, 8:4, in Joshua's instruction and finally in 8:14 in the execution of the instruction).

In contrast with this location is the ambush position to the West of the city in 8:9 and repeated in 8:12 and summarized in 8:13.⁷⁰ The location to the ambush to the West of the city in 8:9-12 and the combination with the North in 8:13 in my opinion has to do with the fact that the MT more strongly emphasizes the direction of the conquest: the army not only comes from Jericho but also from Gilgal. After all, in 4:19, for the first time in MT Joshua, it reads that 40,000 encamp in Gilgal (חנה + בגלגל) and in MT 5:10 it again reads that the men are encamped at Gilgal. From there they set out to Jericho (6) and the area of Bethel (7), which is East of Ai (7:2), to first spy and then fight against Ai (8). The MT is thus clear: Joshua works his way with his entire army from Gilgal over Bethel to Ai. It is thus more logical to

note that the element of burning the city can be found in both MT and LXX 8:19, however the instruction to set the city on fire can only be found in MT 8:8. There is thus not only a tendency to have the executions of a command follow more precisely the instructions, but also that in the case of the fire, the instructions have been adapted to the executions. That this adaptation happened after the Old Greek was translated can be seen from 4QJosh^a where specifically the concept of destroying the city with fire is present (but note the difficulty with the rest of the Qumran fragment precisely in 8:7-8, see Van der Meer, *Formulation and Reformulation*, 390 referring to Leonard J. Greenspoon, "The Qumran Fragments of Joshua: Which Puzzle Are They Part Of and Where Do They Fit?" in *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings: Papers Presented to the International Symposium on the Septuagint and Its Relations to the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Writings* (Manchester, 1990) [ed. George J. Brooke and Barnabas Lindars; SCS 33; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992], 159-194, esp. 170). Note that Auld (*Joshua*, 149) incorrectly sees the inconsistency on the Hebrew level as "an assonance not present in the Hebrew text."

⁷⁰ Van der Meer (*Formulation and Reformulation*, 356) also points to the doublet of Joshua spending the night among the people (8:9) and Joshua spending the night in the valley (8:13).

put the main camp in the North and a second section of 5000 in the West of the city of Ai. The inhabitants of Ai will set out from their city in the same direction as the conquest, namely from the East to the West. The depiction of a further taking over of the Land from East to West is thus continued in the story.⁷¹

Moreover, the location of the ambush in the West also has to do with the whereabouts of Joshua. In MT 8:9 Joshua is not in the camp of the ambush, but in the camp of Israel. It is the latter camp that he wakes up in 8:10 and that he leads to fight from the North in 8:10. In 8:12 Joshua seems to create a second ambush party. I think however, that this verse only emphasizes that Joshua sets the ambush party to the West of the city. In other words, he was in charge of the ambush as well as of the camp of Israel. As he is clearly between the different groups, MT 8:13 needs to report that Joshua is in the valley, thus neither with the ambush party in the West, nor with the camp of Israel in the North.

The Old Greek however, does not have these interests in the precise location of the camp nor with where precisely Joshua is: in 4:19 it states that the Israelites are camped at Gilgal – a rare verb is used: *καταστρατοπεδεύω*.⁷² Then, as there is no mention of a camp at Gilgal in 5:10, the next occurrence of a camp comes in the Jericho story, where the camp is mentioned (6:11, 14, 18, 23). So, although there is a movement from Gilgal to Jericho, Gilgal does not receive extra emphasis. The camp is merely moving from one place to the next. Next, the Old Greek text does not have a specification in 7:2 that Ai is East of Bethel; it only has that *ἡ ἐστὶν κατὰ Βαιθηλ*. In other words, there is

⁷¹ See also Bieberstein (*Josua – Jordan – Jericho*, 426), though taking a slightly different direction and crediting the “äthiologische Redaktion” for the geographical precision: “Demnach umschreiben die ätiologischen Anknüpfungspunkte einen Bogen der von der Ebene Achor in der Wüste Juda über den Jordan bei Jericho, Ai und Gibeon bis nach Makkeda in die südliche Schefela reicht.”

⁷² The simplex form is used in Gen 12:9; Exod 13:20; 14:2 (bis), 10; Num 24:2; Deut 1:40; 2 Macc 9:23; 4 Macc 3:8 and Prov 4:15, mostly referring to camping in the wilderness or close to the (Red) sea.

also no direction that indicates or stresses the direction of the conquest from the East to the West.

With regard to the position of Joshua, it is very clear: there is an ambush party lying to the West of the city (8:9) and there is the camp that Joshua wakes up and leads (8:10) and the latter camp goes to the East side of the city of Ai, towards the city of Ai (8:11). It is repeated that there is an ambush party in the West (8:12), but not that the camp is in the North of the city or that Joshua is in the valley, as he is with the camp of Israel in 8:11a. In the Old Greek, there is thus neither an emphasis on the direction of the conquering of the land nor an emphasis on Joshua also being in charge of the ambush party.⁷³ The emphases however are very much present in the MT, more precisely in 8:9b, 11b and 13, and can be accredited to a later MT editor: the latter has further elaborated the precise locations of the camp as well as the whereabouts of Joshua in relation to the camp(s).⁷⁴ With regard to *החנה/παρεμβολή* it should thus come as no surprise that 8:13 is only available in the MT, as it summarizes the locations of the camps and Joshua's position.

⁷³ Lange (*Handbuch*, 193) also believes that in certain sections of 4QJosh^a the text might represent a shorter and Old Greek-like text: "So legt z.B. die materiale Rekonstruktion von 4QJosh^a 9 II, 13-16 (= Jos 8,3-14) und 4QJosh^b 2-3^{7,9} (= Jos 4,1-3) einen Jos-G ähnelnden Kurztext nahe."

⁷⁴ Although Wellhausen notes that most likely the Old Greek has eliminated all the inconsistencies he leaves open the possibility that the elimination happened on a Hebrew level as he puts in brackets "oder ihres Textes": "Beachtung verdient, dass die Sept. die aus der Verbindung der zwei verschiedenen Versionen entstandenen Anstösse fast alle beseitigt hat. So fehlen V. 12.13, ebenso in V. 14 die beiden widersprechenden Zeitbestimmungen, ferner in V. 20 der letzte Satz, endlich ganz V. 26. Ein ähnliches Verfahren der Sept. (oder ihres Textes) lässt sich auch sonst im Buche Josua nachweisen." See Julius Wellhausen, *Die Composition des Hexateuchs und der historischen Bücher des Alten Testaments* (2nd ed.; Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1889), 126. See also Barthélemy, *Critique Textuelle*, 11.