CHAPTER SEVEN

THE REWRITTEN BOOK OF JOSHUA AS FOUND AT QUMRAN AND MASADA

Five different fragmentary manuscripts from Qumran and one from Masada are based on the book of Joshua or rewrite that book. The present study cautiously suggests that four, five, or all six of them represent a single composition that is named here an "apocryphon of Joshua." Each of the six manuscripts covers different themes and episodes from the book of Joshua. The coverage, nature, and tendencies of these six manuscripts are described in this study. Much attention is directed at 4Q522 (4QapocrJosh^{c}), which, despite its limited scope, provides the longest continuous stretch of preserved text of the apocryphon of Joshua. In the past, the name "apocryphon of Joshua" was given to 4Q378 and 4Q379 by Newsom (see below), and we suggest that this name be assigned to another two, three, or four texts, totaling four, five, or six texts altogether. The term "apocryphon" is probably not the most appropriate for this composition and, in fact, a name such as "paraphrase of Joshua" would be more appropriate. However, as the term apocryphon is in use in the literature, we decline to change it.

Initially, a link is established between 4Q378, 4Q379, and 4Q522, named or renamed 4QapocrJosh^{a,b,c}. At a second stage, this group of three manuscripts is expanded to include a fourth, 5Q9 (5QapocrJosh?, published as "Ouvrage avec toponymes"). The link with that text is made through the contents of the list of geographical names in 4Q522 (4QapocrJosh^{c}) 9 i (and other fragments), due to the similar form of both lists and their mentioning of Joshua. This group of four documents is then expanded to six, but with a lesser degree of certainty due to the fragmentary nature of the two additional documents, MasParaJosh (= Mas apocrJosh?) and 4QpaleoParaJosh (= 4Qpaleo apocrJosh^{d}?).

The *Assumption of Moses*, also known as the *Testament of Moses to Joshua,* containing a long farewell speech by Moses to Joshua, is a related work, though not connected with this apocryphon.

I. *4Q378–379 (4QapocrJosh^{a,b})*

Two copies of a composition rewriting the book of Joshua have been preserved, albeit very fragmentarily, and were published by Newsom.[1]

Many of the fragments of 4Q378–379 reflect speeches, blessings, and prayers by Joshua not contained in the biblical book. These sections in 4Q378–379 are built on the model of Joshua's speeches in chapters 1, 18–21, and 23–24, and also on those of Moses in Deuteronomy chapters 1–3 and 28–31. 4Q522 contains a similar speech by Joshua probably delivered not far from Jerusalem.

4Q378 (4QapocrJosh^{a}; previously named 4QpssJosh^{a}), dating to the Herodian period, covers the earlier part of Joshua's life. It probably started off with the Israelites' mourning for Moses (frg. 14), and contained an account of the transferal of leadership from Moses to Joshua (frg. 3). Several other fragments contain speeches of Joshua to the people (cf. Joshua's speeches scattered throughout the biblical book, especially in chapters 18–21). The incident of Achan (Joshua 7) is probably described in frg. 6 i, the ruse of the Gibeonites (Joshua 9) in frg. 22, Joshua's restraining of the sun (chapter 10) in frg. 26 (cf. especially line 5), and a summary of the conquests in accordance with God's plan (Josh 21:42-43) in frg. 11. The covenant with the patriarchs is mentioned three times (11 3; 14 4; 22 i 4). It is noteworthy that the *Assumption of Moses*, also known as the *Testament of Moses to Joshua*, also refers frequently to this covenant (e.g., 3:9; 4:5).

4Q379 (4QapocrJosh^{b}), dating to the Hasmonean period, follows the biblical text of the book of Joshua more closely. It contains a description of the crossing of the Jordan (frg. 12 and probably additional fragments) and of the curse pronounced on the rebuilder of Jericho (Josh 6:26), together with a prophetic vision of the identity of that rebuilder (frg. 22 ii). The blessings mentioned in frgs. 15–16 reflect the ceremony on or opposite Mt. Gerizim (Josh 8:30-35), even though Newsom connects it with the crossing of the Jordan (chapter 3) and the assembly at Gilgal (chapters 4–5). A summary of Joshua's victories over the inhabitants of Canaan is reflected in frg. 3 (parallel to Joshua 13). Frg. 17 probably reflects Joshua's final speech (cf. line 4 with Josh 24:4-5).

II. *4Q522 (4QapocrJosh^{c})*

The thirteen fragments of 4Q522, the largest of which was numbered frg.

[1] C. Newsom, *DJD* XXII, 237–88.

9 i–ii by Puech,[2] were dated to the mid-first century BCE by Puech, 689. All the fragments reflect the same handwriting, including three fragments containing parts of Psalm 122.[3] In light of the following discussion, it would probably be best to rename all the fragments of 4Q522 as 4QapocrJosh^{c}, based on the model of 4QapocrJosh^{a,b} with which 4Q522 has several elements and motifs in common. This composition was previously named "La pierre de Sion" (Puech, *RB* 99), "Prophétie de Josué (4QApocrJosué?)" (Puech, *DJD* XXV), and "Joshua Cycles" (Qimron).

The left column of the largest fragment, frg. 9 ii, was published preliminarily by Puech in 1992 and described by him as dealing with "David and his son as well as the temple and tabernacle." This topic was, according to Puech, the reason for the inclusion of the "Jerusalem Psalm," Psalm 122, in that composition. The same scholar published the three fragments containing parts of that Psalm in 1978.[4] The 1992 study by Puech also contains a long exposition on the Rock of Zion and the place of the altar. An ancient text focusing on these issues would not be out of place in the Qumran corpus, in which we find, for example, 4QFlor containing a *pesher* dealing with the building of the temple. That text was renamed 4QMidrEschat^{a} by Steudel, and joined with other fragments that according to Steudel belonged to the same composition.[5]

Reacting to this publication, Qimron republished the text of frg. 9 ii with several new readings and reconstructions, all based on the photograph that also formed the basis for Puech's work (PAM 43.606).[6] Qimron proposed a completely different interpretation of this column, describing it as a fragment of a treatise dealing with what he named "Joshua Cycles." In this interpretation, Qimron was actually preceded by Eisenman and Wise (not mentioned by Qimron), who were probably the first to recognize the true meaning of this document.[7] A comparison of the publications by Puech and Qimron is a veritable exercise in the

[2] É. Puech, "La pierre de Sion et l'autel des holocaustes d'après un manuscrit hébreu de la grotte 4 (4Q522)," *RB* 99 (1992) 676–96, finalized in *DJD* XXV. In the original study, this fragment was named "frg. 9," but Puech's revised numbering system (*DJD* XXV) is followed here. Otherwise, reference is made to Puech's article.

[3] The name given to 4Q522 in Tov–Pfann, *Companion Volume*, "Work with Place Names," is imprecise since it only pertains to col. i of frg. 9.

[4] É. Puech, "Fragments du Psaume 122 dans un manuscrit hébreu de la grotte IV," *RevQ* 9 (1978) 547–54.

[5] Steudel, *Der Midrasch*.

[6] E. Qimron, "Concerning 'Joshua Cycles' from Qumran," *Tarbiz* 63 (1995) 503–8 (Heb. with Eng. summ.).

[7] R. H. Eisenman and M. Wise, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Uncovered* (Shaftesbury, Dorset: Element, 1992) 89–93.

method of comparing the exegesis of small Qumran fragments in which scholars necessarily read much into the lacunae. While adopting Qimron's view, we advance the discussion of this and other fragments of 4Q522, suggesting that they are part of 4QapocrJosh, that is, 4QapocrJosh^{c} in our nomenclature. We also attempt to analyze the theology and background of this composition.

The descriptions of frg. 9 ii by Puech and Qimron are very different, and therefore one should first try to locate the identifiable elements in this column. Most of these elements pertain exclusively to the figures of David and Solomon, the temple, and the Jebusites (hence Puech's explanation). In Puech's explanation, they feature as the central elements of this document, while for Qimron they are a mere digression in a document containing the memoirs of Joshua. Indeed, only a few of the identifiable elements pertain exclusively to the period of Joshua. In the course of our analysis, the other fragments of 4Q522 are also taken into consideration.

According to Puech, "Pierre de Sion," 4Q522 contains a midrashic prophecy by God, with apocalyptic and messianic elements, addressed to the prophet Nathan, the seer Samuel, or the seer Gad, in the third and first person (Puech, "Pierre de Sion," 690). In the main, this prophecy is based on 1–2 Samuel and 1 Chronicles, although to some extent it also continues 4Q378–379. Although Puech was aware of some links between 4Q522 and the period of Joshua, he nevertheless related it more to the period of David and Solomon, and made reconstructions accordingly (see the reconstructed lacunae in lines 4, 6, 8, 12, 13).

A note on the reconstructions is in order. Puech's reconstructions presuppose a much longer line length than those of Qimron. Qimron based the shortness of his reconstructions on the preserved text of lines 9–10, in which probably only a single word needs to be reconstructed following the extant text (Qimron, "Joshua Cycles," 505). We concur with this view for lines 9–10 but not with regard to the other lines. The printed reconstruction is probably somewhat misleading. The photograph shows that the last preserved word of line 9, והכנענ֯י, as well as those of the adjacent lines is far to the left of the remnants of the other lines. Even if only a single word were to be added at the ends of these two lines, we need to extend the reconstruction of the other lines to more or less the same point. Therefore, Qimron's reconstruction of several lines is too short (lines 11–14, and probably also lines 2, 3). For yet a different edition, "based on PAM 41.948 and PAM 43.606, and the respective editions of Puech and Qimron," see Dimant, "*Apocryphon*," 183.

4Q522 (4QapocrJosh^{c}) 9 ii[8]

1 [ ] ○ ○ ○ [ ]
2 לוֹא [נו]כֹל לבוא לצי[וֹן] להשכין שם את אהל מוֹע[ד עד קץ]
3 העתים כי הנה בן נולד לישי בן פרץ בן יהו[דה וילכוד]
4 את סלע ציון ויורש משם את כל־האמורי פֹּן [לוא יניחוהו]
5 לבנות את־הבית ליהוה אלוה ישראל זהב וכסף [ונחושת יכין]
6 ארזים וברושים יבֹא [מ]לבנון לבנותו ובנו הקטן [יבננו וצדוק]
7 יכהן שם ראישון מן [חסֹ]ד יבואנו [ואותו [יר]צה ו[יברכהו]
8 [מן המ]עון מן השמים כי [ידיד יהו[ה] ישכון לבטח ו[כול]
9 [ה]ימים עמו ישכון לעד ועתה האמורי שם והכנעני בהר
10 יושב אשר החטיונו אשר לוא דרשתי את מ[שפט ה]אורים
11 מאתכה והשלוני וה[נ]ה נתתיו עבד ע[ולם לישר]אל?
12 ועתה נ[ש]כינה את א[הל מו]עד רחוק מן ה[כנעני בשלה וישאו]
13 אלעזר [וישו]ע את א[הל מו]עד מבית [אל לשלה
14 ישוע[ן שר צבא מע]רכות ישראל
15 ○ ש[ ] ל[ ]ל[

4. פֹּן [לוא The remains of the letters on the leather do not seem to fit this reconstruction.

7. חסֹ]ד יבואנו[The remains of the letters on the leather do not seem to fit this reconstruction.

1. *Exclusive connection with David and Solomon*

3. כי הנה בן נולד לישי בן פרץ בן יהו[דה. This phrase exclusively reflects the period of David and Solomon, although it does not necessarily imply that the composition pertains to that period. If the phrase is translated as "behold, a son *will* be born . . .," it could reflect a prophetic vision of what is to happen generations later. Thus J. T. Milik in *DJD* III, 179 and Qimron, "Joshua Cycles," 506. On the other hand, if the phrase is translated as "for behold, a son *was* born to Jesse son of Peretz son of Ju]dah" (Puech, "Pierre de Sion," 678: "un fils est né à Jessé"), the phrase must be connected exclusively with the period of David and Solomon.

A parallel for the understanding of הנה as referring to a future event (thus Milik and Qimron) is provided by Joshua's prophecy in 4Q175, line 23: איש ארור אחד בליעל עומד להיות פו]ח י[קוש (= הנה) אנה (behold a cursed man, one of Belial, has arisen to be a fow[ler's t]rap).

[8] With a few exceptions, the text reproduced here follows the reconstruction of Qimron. For further reconstructions, see H. Eshel, "A Note on a Recently Published Text: The 'Joshua Apocryphon'," in *The Centrality of Jerusalem—Historical Perspectives* (ed. M. Poorthuis and Ch. Safrai; Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1996) 89–93 and Dimant, "*Apocryphon*," 183.

4.]את סלע ציון. "... the rock of Zion." This phrase, otherwise unknown from the Bible, probably refers to the mountain area that David bought from Aravna (Samuel)/Ornan (Chronicles) the Jebusite, on which he planned to establish the temple (2 Sam 24:18-24; 1 Chr 21:18-22). The reconstruction at the end of the preceding line probably contained a verb such as וילכוד (Qimron, "Joshua Cycles," 505), for which cf. Num 21:32, 32:39 and 2 Sam 5:7 or ויקח (Puech, "Pierre de Sion").

4. ויורש משם את כ]האמורי. "and he [*scil*. David] expelled from there all the Amorites." For the phrase, cf. Num 21:32, but the situation is that of the expulsion of the Jebusites from Jerusalem by David, described in 2 Sam 5:6-9.

5.]לבנות את הבית ליהוה אלוהי ישראל זהב וכסף ן. "to build the temple for the Lord, God of Israel, (made of) gold and silver." This phrase, referring to the building of the temple, does not occur exactly in this way in the Bible, but for similar formulations, cf. 1 Chr 22:6; 1 Kgs 5:17, 19; 8:17, 20, all referring to David. The similar phrase in 2 Chr 3:1 refers to Solomon. Since David did not actually build the temple, a task later accomplished by Solomon, the key to the understanding of this phrase must be sought in the lacuna at the end of the previous line, 4. The contents of that lacuna, together with the reading of the last two letters on the line, differ in Puech's and Qimron's reconstructions, but both of them assume that David is the subject of the verb at the beginning of line 5.

6.]ארזים וברושים יבֹא [מ]לבנון לבנותו. "He will bring [from] Lebanon cedars and cypresses to build it." For David's preparations for the building of the temple, see especially 1 Kgs 5:20, 22; 1 Chr 22:4.

6. ובנו הקטן ן. "and his little son." In this context, after the mentioning of David, this phrase undoubtedly referred to Solomon, who was to build the temple (cf. 1 Chr 22:5; 2 Chr 6:9).

8.]ידיד יהו[ה ישכון לבטח ון. "the beloved of the Lo[rd] will dwell safely and[." The phrase refers to Solomon, who is described as the beloved of God (ידידיה) in 2 Sam 12:24-25. Puech refers to Sir 47:12, where a similar phrase is applied to Solomon: שלמה מלך בימי שלוה ואֵל הניח לו מסביב.

The aforementioned elements were accepted by both scholars as exclusively connected with the period of David and Solomon. Zion is mentioned in line 2 and "the rock of Zion" in line 4. David expels the Amorites from Zion (line 4) and lines 5–6 describe in detail the building of the temple by David's son, Solomon.

As a result, there are rather compelling reasons for connecting the column as a whole with the period of David and Solomon, as suggested by Puech, but there are a few details in the text that are questionable in this context and that lead to a different explanation.

2. *Connection with any period*

Some elements in the text fit any period in the history of Israel.

2. לצין̇ן̇.

2. להשכין שם את אהל מו̇עֵ̇ד. "to set up there the Tent of Meeting." This phrase, which recurs in line 12 (see below), may refer to several periods in the history of Israel, from the time of Moses until the period of the Israelite kings. At the same time, the combination of השכין in the *hiph'il* or in another conjugation and the "Tent of Meeting" occurs only in Josh 18:1, where it is used with regard to the setting up of the tent of meeting at Shiloh: וישכינו שם את אהל מועד. In the present context, however, "there" refers to Jerusalem (Zion), where for various reasons the Tent of Meeting could not be established, and the reasons are specified later on in the text.

7. יכהן שם ראישו̇ן̇ מן. "he will officiate there first." The subject of the verb, which is crucial for the understanding of the context, was found in the lacuna at the end of the previous line, reconstructed by Puech as either Solomon or David, and by Qimron as Zadok, David's priest who brought the ark from Qiryat Yearim to Jerusalem (2 Sam 15:24-37). The verb refers to the religious officiating of priests, which could include Zadok, and by extension also David, who sacrified offerings at the altar of Aravna in 2 Sam 24:25, and Solomon.

14. ש[ר̇ צבא מע̇רכות ישראל. The phrase ש[ר̇ צבא could fit several persons; the longer phrase, as reconstructed by Qimron, fits Joshua (cf. 5:14, 15).

3. *Absence of connection to David and Solomon*

While the above-mentioned details in 4Q522 9 ii refer to the period of David and Solomon, the detail listed below does not. By the same token, it is hard to find a link between the period of David and Solomon and the list of geographical names in col. i of that document. Likewise, the details mentioned in section (4), positively linking 4Q522 with the book of Joshua, negatively affect their connection with the period of David and Solomon.

9. ועתה האמורי שם והכנע̇נ̇י. "but now the Amorite is there and the Canaani[te." It is unclear why 4Q522 would stress that during the period of David and Solomon the Amorites and the Canaanites were *now* there, for they had been there since time immemorial. Because of this difficulty, it seems that this phrase does not refer to the period of David and Solomon. According to Puech, "Pierre de Sion," 687, this phrase introduces a new topic "relating to another aspect of the presence of Israel in the midst of the indigenous peoples of the land, most probably including Jerusalem." But the connection between the different issues in

4Q522 is very clear. In line 4, the speaker says that in the future David will expel the Amorites, but he reminds the listeners that at this juncture the Amorites and Canaanites are present in the land.

4. *Exclusive connection with Joshua and the book of Joshua*

Several details in the text refer exclusively to the period and book of Joshua.

12. ועתה נ[ש]כינה את אהל מו[ע]ד רחוק מן ה̇ן. "and now let us set up the Ten[t of Mee]ting far away from . . . [." The minute remains of the last word were read by Puech as a *qoph* yielding a restoration ק̇[ריה יערים, and by Qimron as a *he*, yielding a restoration ה[כנעני. Even though the connection of the preceding lines with the period of David and Solomon is obvious, it is rather difficult to explain this phrase within the framework of that period in view of the words, "far away from . . .." Since the Tent of Meeting was located in what was to become the center of the empire, why would that locality be described as being far away from something or someone? On the other hand, the cultic actions of Joshua occurred far away from places that afterwards were considered central. Line 12 could therefore be understood in light of line 9 שם והכנענ[י ועתה האמורי, "but now the Amorite is there and the Canaani[te," as referring to the distance ("far away") from these peoples. It therefore seems that because of the presence of the Amorites and Canaanites in Jerusalem, Joshua (partial subject of the first verb in line 12, נ[ש]כינה) realized that he had to move the center of the cult temporarily far away from Jerusalem.

The phrase used in line 12 as well as in line 2, that occurs in the Bible only in Josh 18:1 with regard to the installing of the Tent of Meeting at Shiloh, וישכינו שם את אהל מועד, "they installed there the Tent of Meeting," further strengthens the connection with the book of Joshua. 4Q522 used exactly the same phrase for the setting up of the Tent of Meeting in an unnamed place, probably Shiloh, to be read in the lacuna at the end of line 12. Qimron's reconstruction does not include any name at this place in the lacuna, but such a name is necessary. Firstly, since the next line mentions the moving of the Tent of Meeting from Beth[el] to another location (mentioned in the lacuna at the end of line 13), that location would probably have been mentioned in Joshua's speech. Secondly, the reconstructed line 12 would be too short if no name appeared in the lacuna (cp. the length of the reconstructed lines 9 and 10, the longest preserved lines, for which a plausible reconstruction was suggested, with line 12). A parallel to the text of line 12 appears in 4Q379 26 2–3, on which see below.

13. אלעזר֯ן. "Eleazar." This name, preserved without any context, probably represents the most disconcerting element in Puech's explanation; he regards this Eleazar as the son of Abinadab (read in the lacuna in line 13) of Qiryat Yearim (read in the lacuna in line 12). Indeed, an Eleazar son of Abinadab was made custodian of the ark in 2 Sam 7:1. However, it is more logical to interpret this name as the well-known figure of Eleazar in light of Qimron's plausible reading of אלעזר֯ ו[יש]ע in this line, and even more so because of the occurrence of the name of Joshua in the next line. It should further be remembered that the related document 4Q379 17 5 also mentions Eleazar.

14. The first word of the line is ישוע֯ן, which, however, was read by Puech as ישוע֯ן ישראל. A corroborating argument for reading here the name of Joshua is the occurrence of the same name as והיה ישוע֯ן in 5Q9, a document whose list of geographical names resembles the list of the names in 4Q522 9 i. Note that 4Q378 22 i 2–3 also refer to Joshua as ישוע.

The latter details in particular are not compatible with the view that the document as a whole is connected with the period of David and Solomon. The references to David and Solomon should therefore be viewed as a digression within a text connected with Joshua.

There are two further groups of supporting evidence that strengthen the position that 4Q522 pertains to Joshua.

α. *4Q522 (4QapocrJosh^{c}) 9 i and small fragments*

a. The list of geographical names preceding frg. 9 ii is connected with the person and book of Joshua (thus without details, Qimron, "Joshua Cycles," 507). Three of the small fragments in photograph PAM 43.606 and frg. 9 i contain a list or lists of geographical names all of which immediately precede col ii. Because of its position in the scroll, this list must have had some relevance to the speech in col. ii. This relevance seems to be remote if the fragment is ascribed to the period of David and Solomon, but is very pertinent to the book of Joshua, which contains many long lists of geographical names.

The list in frg. 9 i and the smaller fragments can be subdivided into two groups of data: (1) a list of localities, partly within tribal territories, probably presented as conquered by Joshua; and (2) areas that had not been conquered by Joshua.

(1) *Lists of localities, partly within tribal territories*

The nearly complete names in this column are based on my own readings, improving on those of Eisenman-Wise and García Martínez:[9]

[9] This list was published preliminarily, and with many mistakes, by Eisenman-Wise (see n. 7) and F. García Martínez, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated* (Leiden/New York: E. J. Brill,

1. ʿAin Qeber[
2. Baki?, Beth Zippor
3. the whole valley of Miṣwa'
4. Heykhalim, Yaʿapur
5. Makku, ʿAin Kober
6. Ḥaduta', ʿAi of . . .
7. [Ma]don which is . . .
8. Ashqelon
9. Galil and two . . . [ ]? of the Sharon
10. [for/in Ju]dah: Be'er Sheba [and] Beʿalot
11. Qeʿilah, ʿAdullam
12. Gezer, Temni, Gimzon
13. ?]ḥiqqar, Qiṭr[on] and 'Efranim, the fields of . . .
14. Upper and Lower Beth-Ḥoron
15. Upper and Lower Gulot

The wording of frg. 2 3 also reminds us of the tribal lists in Joshua, as it contains a standard formula in the description of borders (cf. e.g. Josh 15:3):]◦ר אשר יצא◦[.

Frg. 4 2 contains a phrase ן מן ומחציתם ◦ל[, reminding us of Josh 21:25 וממחצית מטה מנשה, and probably referring to half of the tribe of Manasseh.

The list in frg. 9 i mentions names of places, all of them preceded by את or ואת. This list was probably preceded by a verb such as ויכוד, "and he [*scil.* Joshua] conquered," listing the various localities conquered by Joshua. Only in this way is the beginning of the preserved text of line 10 understandable: ל/בי]הודה את באר שבע[ן ואת בעלות, [in/for Ju]dah: Be'er Sheba [and] Beʿalot. In other words, in the area that subsequently became the territory of Judah, Joshua conquered Be'er Sheba and Beʿalot. This wording also makes it likely that a sequence such as [חקר וקטר]ון ואפרנים in line 13 implies that these localities were in close proximity, unless the scribe was inconsistent and forgot to precede each locality by את.

The names in this list were probably grouped in a certain way, each unit starting with את, for otherwise the interchange of את and ואת is not understandable. This explains for example the relation between the items in lines 4–6.

Although the details in the list are unclear and the text is fragmentary, a certain logic is visible. The list starts with the north: [Ma]don (cf. Josh 11:1; 12:19) as well as additional names of locations not mentioned in the

---

1994) 227–9. My own readings were improved in a few cases by L. Mazor's identifications (see next note).

Bible. It continues with the territory of Judah; the cities known from the Bible are: Be'er Sheba (Josh 15:28), Be'alot (Josh 15:25; cf. also Josh 15:9, 28 Ba'alah), Qe'ilah (Josh 15:44), 'Adullam (Josh 15:35), Temni (cf. Josh 15:10, 56 Timnah), Upper and Lower Gulot (Josh 15:19; Judg 1:15). Finally, the list contains cities from the tribe of Joseph: Gezer (Josh 16:3, 10) and Upper and Lower Beth-Ḥoron (Josh 16:3, 5).

The list includes several names not mentioned in the Bible, but known to be connected with the three areas just mentioned. All these data have been analyzed in detail in a valuable study by L. Mazor.[10]

(2) *Areas not conquered by Joshua*

A few fragments seem to list areas that had not been conquered by Joshua. This understanding is based on frg. 8, which lists the four tribes of Sim'[on], Dan, Issachar, and Asher and also contains a segment of a narrative in line 2: ודן לוא הכה גם הוא אן[ת, ("nor did Dan conquer . . .") for which cf. Judg 1:34-35. In the lacuna, this fragment may have mentioned Har-Ḥeres, which Dan did not conquer according to Judges 1. Line 3 of the same fragment, ◦ [ת]וישכר את בית שן ואשר אן[, should probably be understood as "[nor] did Issachar [conquer] Beth Shean, [nor] did Asher [conquer] . . .." There is no exact biblical parallel for this statement, but one is reminded of Judg 1:27, according to which Manasseh did not conquer Beth Shean. It is also possible that this fragment reflects Josh 17:11, according to which Manasseh possessed a few areas within the allotments of Issachar and Asher, namely Beth Shean and other localities: בישכר ובאשר בית שאן ובנותיה.

Frg. 3 2 mentions the Canaanite, signifying that it probably deals with cities that were not conquered by Joshua. The fragment also mentions "]from the valley of Akhor" (in Josh 15:7 that valley is mentioned as belonging to the tribe of Judah).

Frg. 11 probably deals with incomplete conquests (see line 1) and frg. 5 contains the phrase "these people," probably referring to those who were not destroyed by Joshua (for the phrase and idea, cf. Josh 23:3, 4, 12, 13).

b. The second type of support for the view that 4Q522 is related to Joshua derives from a few allusions to phrases in the book of Joshua (for the wording of lines 10–11 והשלוני החטיוני, and cf. the biblical text of 9:22 למה רמיתם אתנו). The text of line 11 has to be reconstructed as נתתיו עבד עו]לם לישר[אל on the basis of Josh 9:23 (thus Qimron).

β. *Interpretation of 4Q522 as 4QapocrJosh^c*

4Q522 9 i (and small fragments) lists names of places conquered by the

[10] L. Mazor, "The Description of the Land According to 4Q522," forthcoming.

Israelite tribes in the north of the country and in the territories of Judah and Joseph, and it further contains lists of areas that had not been conquered.

It so happens that in the parallel to these lists in the biblical book of Joshua, at the end of the tribal list of Judah, the one city that the Judahites were unable to conquer, namely the city of Jebus, is mentioned specifically (15:63): "But the people of Judah could not drive out the Jebusites, the inhabitants of Jerusalem; so the Jebusites live with the people of Judah in Jerusalem to this day." A similar note is appended to the description of the tribe of Benjamin in Judg 1:21. It stands to reason that 4Q522 followed a similar procedure, moving from the lists of Judah and Joseph (note that the majority of the surviving names in col. i pertain to the tribal list of Judah) to the fate of Jerusalem and the subsequent building of the temple in that city.

The second column of this fragment starts off with Zion (line 2), probably continuing the description begun at the end of the previous column and in the first line of the present column. The logical link between the two columns could be the mentioning of the cities that were conquered and of Jerusalem, which was not conquered. The fact that this city had not been conquered is the link with the discussion regarding why the ark was not brought there. The situation depicted gives the impression that Joshua delivered his speech not far from Jerusalem, close to Bethel (cf. lines 12–13), after deciding not to bring the ark to Jerusalem.

The text of col. ii continues with Joshua's speech explaining why he was unable to conquer Jerusalem (line 2): first a negation (לוא) and afterwards the fragmentary text continues with להשכין שם את אהל מועד, "to install there the Tent of Meeting." At the time of Joshua, that city was still inhabited by the Jebusites, but he foresaw that in the future the city would be conquered by David, that the Tent of Meeting would be transferred there, and that eventually the temple would be established there. The reason for the need of an expulsion of the Amorites is probably the fear that they might disturb the building of the temple (just as the building of the Second Temple was disturbed by others).

The prophetic vision of what would happen in the future is clad in the form of a speech by an unnamed person, in the first person, and sometimes changing to the first person plural (line 12). This speaker can only have been Joshua himself.

Joshua also turns to someone in the second person singular (lines 10–11: "That I did not demand from you the decision of the Urim and Tummim" (אשר לוא דרשתי אֹת משפט ה[אורים]/מאתכה). The wording of these lines should be seen in light of Josh 9:14 ואת פי יהוה לא שאלו with reference

to the ruse of the Gibeonites.

Joshua gives three reasons for not bringing the tabernacle to Jerusalem, and by implication, for not building the temple there:

a. In the future, David will conquer Jerusalem and expel the Amorites from there. This statement implies that Joshua knew that in the future Jerusalem would become the central site of worship. He could only have known this if he was gifted with prophetic inspiration, since this is not stated explicitly in the Torah. The tradition that Joshua was a prophet is not universal, and among other things was implied in Joshua's curse on the rebuilder of Jericho, which was to be implemented many generations later, in the time of Ahab, according to the story of 1 Kgs 16:34 (see chapter 26*). Joshua's exhortatory-prophetic character is also at the base of his final address in chapters 23–24 of the biblical book. In no case, however, is Joshua's mantic character as clear as in 4Q522 and in 4Q379 22 ii, which may therefore have belonged to the same composition. In the latter fragment, Joshua not only cursed the rebuilder of Jericho, but also foresaw that someone would actually rebuild the city.

Traditions that Joshua was gifted with prophetic power are also known from various *midrashim*.[11]

b. Although realizing that Jerusalem was chosen to be the future center for worship, Joshua was compelled not to bring the tabernacle to Jerusalem, since the place was still occupied by the local inhabitants.

c. The local inhabitants deceived Joshua, and by implication were not worthy of the honor of having the Tent of Meeting in their midst. This argument is not spelled out, but implied. More specifically, Joshua says that the Canaanites caused him to sin (line 10 החטיונ֯י,[12] "they have caused me to sin") and that they misled him (line 11 והשלוני, "they deceived me"); the reference must be to the Gibeonites' ruse that misled and deceived Joshua into allowing them to remain in the midst of the Israelites. For the formulation of lines 10–11, cf. the biblical text of 9:22 למה רמיתם אתנו. Joshua blames himself for not having turned to the device of the Urim and Tummim administered by the High Priest, who must be the person referred to in lines 10–11 (לוא דרשתי אֹ֫[ת מ]שפט ה֫[אורים] מאתכה).

The first person plural in line 12 may refer to either Joshua and the people or Joshua and Eleazar.

Acting on the basis of his prophetic vision of the future, Joshua decided not to install the Tent of Meeting in Jerusalem. This move is actually not surprising, since there was no reason to install the Tent of

---

[11] See L. Ginsberg, *The Legends of the Jews* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1967) 7.266 and Sir 46:1.

[12] This form equals החטיאוני with a glide added (cf. Qimron, "Joshua Cycles," 506).

Meeting in Jerusalem in accordance with the requirements of the book of Deuteronomy, as that city had not yet been conquered and the name of God could therefore not be installed there. Only in retrospect did this failure to come to Jerusalem pose a problem, prompting Joshua's apologetic speech in 4Q522. It is not impossible that this aspect reveals the identity of the author of this composition as someone belonging to the priestly Jerusalem circles; they may have wished to explain why the Tent of Meeting was not brought to Jerusalem at an earlier stage.

Joshua decided to install the Tent of Meeting in a place unnamed in 4Q522. The exact location of the Tent of Meeting at the time of Joshua's speech is not clear from the remains of the manuscript, but it was probably in Bethel (cf. lines 12–13). According to the different biblical traditions, the Tent of Meeting or the tabernacle (different terms are used) moved in different ways in Canaan. It transversed the Jordan with the Israelites according to Joshua chapter 3, and it was with the Israelites in Gilgal and Jericho (chapters 6–7). Afterwards the Israelites turned to Ai and Bethel, facing Jerusalem. According to the story, at that point Joshua faced the decision of whether to bring the ark to Jerusalem (not in accordance with the Torah, but in accord with what we know of the subsequent history of the Israelites) or to another place. Because of the aforementioned reasons, according to 4Q522, Joshua then decided to take the ark to another location, probably Shiloh.

This reasoning is based on the fact that line 13 mentions the moving of the Tent of Meeting from Beth[el] to an unnamed place. It seems to us that the name of Shiloh should be inserted in the lacuna at the end of line 12. Meanwhile, the fact that the ark was found at Bethel is reflected in the LXX in Judg 2:1ff. where it is stated that the angel of the Lord came from Gilgal to Bochim and Bethel (MT Bochim). More explicitly, according to the tradition of Judg 20:26-28, Phineas son of Eleazar ministered before the ark at Bethel: ". . . Bethel [27]. . . for the ark of God's covenant was *there* in those days, [28]and Phineas son of Eleazar son of Aaron the Priest ministered before Him in those days . . .." It is not impossible that 4Q522 somehow reflects the various biblical traditions embedded in the books of Joshua and Judges regarding the ark, explaining how the ark arrived at Bethel and was later moved from there to Shiloh, where it was indeed found at a later stage according to Joshua 18.

There is a chronological problem in the combination of these traditions, since Eleazar was a contemporary of Joshua, while his son Phineas is mentioned in the tradition in Judges 20. It is not impossible that this Phineas was mentioned in the lacuna in 4Q522 9 ii 12-13, "[Phineas son of]Eleazar," but it is more logical to assume that the text

mentioned Eleazar himself, since he was Joshua's associate in this action as well as on other occasions. Thus, when Moses was about to die he commissioned Joshua before Eleazar (Num 27:18-23), and Eleazar (always mentioned first) and Joshua distributed the regions of Canaan to the tribes of Israel (Num 32:28; 34:17; Josh 14:1; 17:4; 19:51; 21:1). Likewise, 1QDM I 11–12 mentions Eleazar together with Joshua.

One of the key words in col. ii is the root שכן. Joshua was unable to set up (להשכין) the Tent of Meeting in Jerusalem (line 2), so he decided to set it up far away from that city (line 12 ועתה נ[ש]כינה, "and now let us set up"). At the same time, Solomon will "dwell forever," ישכון לבטח (line 8).

γ. *4Q522 is closely linked with the composition contained in 4Q378–379*

In many ways, 4Q522 9 i–ii runs parallel to 4Q378–379, which have been named 4QapocrJosh^{a,b} (olim: 4QpssJoshua^{a,b}). The following arguments make it likely that they actually reflect the very same composition:

a. All three texts present a similar paraphrase of the book of Joshua, sometimes staying close to the biblical text, and sometimes diverging from it. The type of paraphrase is that of the book of Jubilees, the second half of the Temple Scroll, 4QparaGen-Exod (4Q422), and several other fragmentary compositions. In some sections, the rewritten text is close to that of the Bible; for example, 4Q379 12, narrating the crossing of the Jordan, is rather close to the biblical text of Josh 3:13-16. More frequently, however, the Qumran texts move away from the biblical text.

b. All three texts reflect a more hortatory and exhortatory version of Joshua than that of the biblical book, whose deuteronomistic layer already has an exhortatory character. Many of the sections of 4Q378–379 reflect speeches by Joshua, and likewise 4Q522 9 ii contains such a speech. These speeches are built on the model of those in Joshua chapters 1, 18–21, 23–24, and also on those of Moses in Deuteronomy 1–3, 28–31.

c. Joshua's prophetic character is evident in 4Q522 9 ii, in which he foretells the birth of David, knows that the ark will be brought to Jerusalem, and that the temple will be built there. This prophetic character is also visible in 4Q379 22 ii in which Joshua knows in advance that someone will actually rebuild Jericho. This feature is not prominent in the biblical book of Joshua, in which he merely utters a curse.

d. In all three texts, although not in all fragments, Joshua speaks in the first person. See 4Q522 9 ii 2, 10, 12 as well as 4Q379 10 3, 4; 17 5; 18 4, 5, 7; 22 i 4.

e. 4Q378 22 i 2–3 refers to Joshua as ישוע. The name of Joshua appears with this spelling also in 4Q522 9 ii 14 as well as in 1QDM I 12.

f. 4Q379 17 5 mentions Eleazar, who is also referred to in 4Q522 9 ii 13. Furthermore, the prayer in 4Q378 22 i 2–3 that mentions Joshua in the

third person could be by Eleazar (thus Newsom); this fragment would be further support for connecting 4Q378 with 4Q522, since in the latter text Eleazar is probably spoken to in the second person (see above).

g. 4Q379 1, referring to the Levitical cities, mentions the tribes within which the Levites were to receive these allotments (cf. Joshua 21). These tribes are listed in the same way as in 4Q522 9 i and 5Q9, enumerated as ואת . . . את(ו).

h. The motif of guilt is prominent in these texts:

In 4Q522 9 ii 10–11 (with regard to the ruse of the Gibeonites), Joshua blames himself for not having turned to the device of the Urim and Tummim administered by the High Priest. See further above.

4Q378 6 i 4]א תפלה על חטאתינו "a prayer on behalf of our sins" and ibid., line 7 אן]שמכה הוי אחי עליכמה "your [g]uilt. Woe to you my brothers." This fragment may refer to the sins of the people with regard to Achan's violation of the *ḥerem* in Joshu 7, but may also refer to the sins of the people as a whole on several occasions when they rebelled in the wilderness. The "testing" mentioned twice in col. ii of the same fragment may refer to either occasion.

4Q378 22 i 1 ולא הכחדתם באשמתם "and you did not destroy them in their guilt." Although the editor of this fragment, C. Newsom, believes that the episode referred to is that of the Golden Calf, it is more likely that the text refers to the ruse of the Gibeonites "which you have not destroyed, in their sin." The text also refers to "Joshua the servant of your servant Moses," to the transferal of power from Moses to Joshua (line 3), and to the covenant between God and Abraham (line 4). The covenant referred to is probably that of Genesis 15, according to which God promised the land of the Canaanites to Abraham and his offspring, with the implication that the Canaanites should be killed; Joshua did not do this.

4Q378 24 3,]ת אשמן, without any context.

i. 4Q379 26 2–3 mention Bethel without any context in line 2 and the verb רחקו in line 3, just as in 4Q522. Joshua suggests the moving of the Tent of Meeting "far away from . . ." (רחוק), while the next line mentions Beth[el]. The verb used in 4Q379 before the mentioning of Bethel is סבו, if the reading is correct (סַבּוּ בבית אל), a verb mentioned also elsewhere in the Bible with regard to the movements of the ark (1 Sam 5:8; Josh 24:33a LXX).

The relevance of the three fragments containing sections of Psalm 122 (see n. 4) to 4Q522 still needs to be established. Even if the handwriting of these fragments is identical to that of the main fragment on photograph PAM 43.606, they may have derived from a composition different from 4Q522, even though the connection with Jerusalem is

obvious. Since 4Q522 contained both a list of geographical names and an explanation as to why Joshua's central place of worship was not Jerusalem, one wonders whether there is room in this composition for a psalm of praise for Jerusalem when Jerusalem has not yet been conquered.

At the same time, there is physical room for this short psalm in the reconstruction of 4Q522 (4QapocrJosh^{c}), probably below the text of 4Q522 9 i. That fragment contained sixteen lines of text, and was probably followed by the continued list of geographical names as contained in frgs. 6–7 and the other fragments. If, together with these fragments, the column contained some twenty-two lines, there remained enough space to include Psalm 122 at the bottom of col. i (six lines in Puech's reconstruction). That would be a natural place for this psalm. The contextual link between the psalm and the context of 4Q522 was discussed above. The connection between the psalm and the situation of 4Q522 may be supported by the actual wording of the psalm. Since in verse 2 it reads: "Our feet stood inside your gates, O Jerusalem," 4Q522 could have argued that Joshua, when delivering his speech, was actually very close to Jerusalem, but decided not to conquer the city.

From a physical point of view, the link is possible since the psalm fragments share an important feature with the main text of 4Q522 (4QapocrJosh^{c}) 9 i–ii, namely that the text was not consistently suspended from the lines, as in the great majority of Qumran texts, but rather, in disregard of the ruled lines, appeared below, above, and through them.

III. *5Q9 (5QapocrJosh?), Previously Named "Ouvrage avec toponymes"*

A list of geographical names similar to that in 4Q522 9 i is known from the seven fragments of 5Q9, published by Milik in *DJD* III, 179 as "Ouvrage avec toponymes." The writing is described as late by Milik. As in 4Q522 9 i, this list mentions the figure of Joshua (frg. 1) and a list of geographical names (frgs. 1–7) from the same areas as covered by 4Q522. As in 4Q522 9 i, the names are preceded with את and ואת.

With one possible exception, the names mentioned in these fragments do not overlap with those listed in 4Q522 8 i, but they do refer to localities in the north of the country and from the tribes of Judah and Joseph. The preserved names include:

Qidah (1 2)
Ṣidon (2 1)
Beth Tap[uaḥ? (3 2; tribe of Judah: Josh 15:53)

ʿAin Ṣidon (4 1)
Kochabah (5 1)
שרדי (5 2; cf. Josh 19:10, 12 שריד; tribe of Zebulun)
The waters of Dan (5 3; cf. "the waters of Merom" in Josh 11:5, 7)
קטנ]ת (6 1; cf. Josh 19:15 Καταναθ LXX [MT קטת])
Ṣeredah (6 2), from the tribe of Efraim (cf. 1 Kgs 11:26).

As in 4Q522, 5Q9 combined the list of names with a narrative, of which the name Joshua (1 1) and the phrase [ויבאו כול (6 3) have been preserved.

One or possibly two details, however, are probably common to both lists:

4Q522 mentions (13) Qiṭr[on, possibly from the tribe of Zebulun, cf. Judg 1:30 (one of the places that was not conquered), for which cf. the detail mentioned in 5Q9: קטנ]ת (6 1). The name Qiṭron does not occur in the tribal list of Zebulon in Joshua 19, but קטת is mentioned there; hence the assumption that this is the same locality. The common identity of the two names is supported by an explanatory note on a place like Ḥeṣron, on which Josh 15:25 notes: "this is Ḥaṣor." On the other hand, Amir believes that the two names represent different localities.[13]

4Q522, line 7 [Ma]don may be read as Ṣi]don as in 5Q9 2 1.

In the first stage, a link was established between 4Q378, 4Q379, and 4Q522, named 4QapocrJosh[a,b,c], all of which are paraphrases of Joshua. In the second stage, this group of three texts is now expanded to four, to include 5Q9. The link with that text is made through the contents of the list of geographical names in 4Q522 8 i, the similar form of both lists, and their mentioning of Joshua.

IV. *MasParaJosh (= Mas apocrJosh?)*

MasParaJosh (= Mas1l; also known as Mas 1039–1211) may well reflect a fifth copy of the composition described here as apocrJosh. This composition, published by Talmon,[14] consists of two fragments, comprising altogether parts of ten lines, together with top and bottom margins, and probably with lacking intervening text between the two fragments. The script differs from that of 4Q522, but like 4Q522 8, the

[13] D. Amir, "Qitron," *Encyclopaedia Biblica* (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1976) VII.111.

[14] S. Talmon, "A Joshua Apocryphon from Masada," in *Studies on Hebrew and Other Semitic Languages Presented to Professor Chaim Rabin on the Occasion of His Seventy-Fifth Birthday* (ed. M. Goshen-Gottstein, S. Morag and S. Kogut; Heb.; Jerusalem: Akademon, 1990) 147–57; revised version: "Fragments of a Joshua Apocryphon—Masada 1039–211 (Final Photo 5254)," *JJS* 47 (1996) 128–39.

Masada fragment has words written through the lines (see lines A 4–5), which is rather unusual among the fragments from the Judean Desert. Talmon dates the script of this text to the end of the first century BCE or the beginning of the first century CE.

While Yadin described this text as reflecting a Samuel apocryphon, Talmon connects it with the book of Joshua, basing himself on a series of resemblances between the Masada text and Joshua's final speech in chapters 23–24. Likewise, 4Q379 17 reflects Joshua's final speech (cf. line 4 with Joshua 24:4-5), and that topic, together with the combination of speech and hymnic elements/prayer, makes it at least possible, if not likely, that 4Q379 and the Masada texts reflect the same composition. Talmon (pp. 156–7) likewise recognized certain similarities between this text and 4Q378–379 (4QapocrJosh^{a,b}), although according to him they do not reflect the same composition.

The text contains no identifiable name(s) connecting it with the book of Joshua, but the identification is made on the basis of the phrases used. The fragment reflects ideas from Joshua's last speeches, especially the idea that God helped his people in their struggle against the enemies:

Line 5 נ]לחם לעמו באויביהם ולוא[ן

Line 7 אשר] דבר עליהם בא להם ולוא[ן נפל] דבר ארצה

However, while the speeches in the biblical book are mainly hortatory and admonitory, the Masada fragment has a different tone. That text combines the speech with words of praise, and probably also with a prayer or hymn. The words אדוני יהו]ה, reconstructed by us on the last line, and continuing with a text that has not been preserved, were probably preceded by a closed paragraph, and would be a suitable beginning for such a hymnic unit. If this assumption is correct, one is referred for comparison to 4Q379 22 i and ii 5–7 that contain a similar hymnic unit that precedes Joshua's curse on the rebuilder of Jericho.

The spelling of מואדה on line A 8 of this document is identical to the writing of that word in several Qumran documents, and may indicate a Qumran origin for the manuscript as a whole.

The use of the divine appellations אל (line A 6), שם = "name" (line A 4), and אדוני (line A 8) rather than the Tetragrammaton also speaks for a Qumran sectarian origin.

V. *4QpaleoParaJosh (= 4Qpaleo apocrJosh^{d}?)*

Little is known about the very fragmentary 4QpaleoParaJosh (4Q123, published in *DJD* IX), dating to the last half of the first century BCE, which contains merely a few words and phrases from Joshua 21

(especially forms of מנרש), while deviating from the known texts of that chapter (cf. 2 1 וה ביד]משה עבדן presenting a slightly different form of Josh 21:2). This work may reflect yet another copy of the apocryphon of Joshua, as its fragmentary remains of Joshua 21 run parallel to 4Q379 (4QapocrJosh[b]) 1 and a small fragment of 4Q522 9 i, even though there are no verbal overlaps.

If indeed 4QpaleoParaJosh contains segments of the rewritten book of Joshua, it is significant to note that this work was written, among other things, in paleo-Hebrew characters.

VI. *Coverage of the "apocryphon of Joshua"*

The various fragments of the Joshua cycle possibly represent segments of the same composition, named here "apocryphon of Joshua." Segments of most chapters of the book of Joshua are represented in the following fragments:[15]

a. The earliest part of Joshua's career is probably represented by the Israelites' mourning for Moses, represented in 4Q379 14.

b. An account of the transferal of leadership from Moses to Joshua (Joshua 1) is contained in 4Q379 3–4.

c. The crossing of the Jordan (Joshua 3) is covered by 4Q378 12 and probably additional fragments of that manuscript.

d. Several aspects of the movements of the ark in the first chapters of Joshua are described in 4Q522 8 ii and probably also in 4Q379 26.

e. The curse on the rebuilder of Jericho (Josh 6:26) together with a prophetic vision regarding his identity is expressed in 4Q379 22 ii, preceded by hymns in 4Q379 22 i.

f. The Achan incident (Joshua 7) is probably alluded to in 4Q378 6 i.

g. The blessings mentioned in 4Q378 15–17 may reflect the ceremony on or opposite Mt. Gerizim (Josh 8:30-35), even though Newsom connects them with the crossing of the Jordan (chapter 3) and the assembly at Gilgal (chapters 4–5).

h. The ruse of the Gibeonites (Joshua 9) is reflected in 4Q522 9 ii and also in 4Q378 22 (see above).

i. Joshua's restraining of the sun in chapter 10 is reflected in 4Q378 26, cf. especially line 5.

j. A summary of Joshua's victories over the inhabitants of Canaan is reflected in 4Q379 3 (parallel to Joshua 13).

k. Segments of the tribal lists in Joshua 15–20 described as the

[15] The dimension of the rewriting of the biblical stories in 4Q522 is analyzed thoroughly by Dimant, "*Apocryphon*," 200–204.

conquests of Joshua, as well as of the lists of localities not conquered by Joshua, are contained in 4Q522 9 i as well as in smaller fragments of that composition. Similar lists are contained in 5Q9 (5QapocrJosh?) and in 4Q379 1. See also:

l. The Levitical cities in Joshua 21 are mentioned in 4Q379 1, in a small fragment ascribed to 4Q522 9 i, and in 4QpaleoParaJosh.

m. A summary of the conquests in accordance with God's plan, described in Josh 21:43-45 in God's words, are related in 4Q378 11, in Joshua's words. For line 2, cf. Josh 21:45 and for line 3, cf. Josh 21:44. The same episode is also reflected in Mas apocrJosh.

n. Joshua's final speech (chapters 23–24) may be reflected in 4Q378 19 ii and in 4Q379 17 (cf. line 4 with Josh 24:4-5). The same episode may be reflected also in Mas apocrJosh.

Beyond the aforementioned compositions devoted to Joshua, the figure of Joshua is mentioned only rarely in the Qumran texts: 1Q*Dibre Moshe* (1QDM) I 12; Damascus Document (CD) V 4.

VII. *Qumran Authorship?*

Because of the uncertainties concerning the relation between the six different manuscripts of the rewritten book of Joshua, the issue of their possible Qumran authorship has to be dealt with separately and may be answered affirmatively for some manuscripts, although the evidence is not clear.

Talmon considers 4Q378–379 and probably MasParaJosh to be Essene and accordingly he attempts to explain why the *yaḥad* would be interested in this biblical book.

Puech[16] considers 4Q522 to be an Essene document, and makes certain connections between the views of the Essenes and the content of that document. Likewise, Dimant claims that "several passages espouse ideas close to those expressed in works from the circle of the Qumran community."[17]

On the other hand, Eshel, in a brief study considers the Joshua apocryphon to be a non-Qumranic composition.[18]

There are a few signs of a possible sectarian authorship of some of the rewritten Joshua texts from Qumran and Masada:

a. An isolated phrase,]ולתת הון לן, occurs without context in 4Q378 20 ii 5.

---

[16] Puech, "Pierre de Sion," 691.
[17] Dimant, "*Apocryphon*," 181.
[18] No precise arguments were given by Eshel (see n. 8).

b. 4Q379 12 5 determines the date of the crossing of the Jordan according to the chronology of the jubilee years, which could suggest a sectarian origin (cf. 4QCommGen A col. I and the book of Jubilees).

c. That 4Q379 (4QapocrJosh^{b}) was held in high esteem at Qumran is shown by the fact that it was quoted by 4QTest, which is definitely a sectarian composition.[19]

d. Among the texts analyzed here, only MasParaJosh, found at Masada, seems to reflect the custom known from several Qumran compositions of avoiding the Tetragrammaton and using other divine appellations instead. See § IV above. On the other hand, 4Q378, 4Q379, and 4Q522 freely use the divine appellations יהוה, אלהים, and אלוה.

The Qumran scribal practice is reflected in three of the Joshua documents. However, these features do not render the manuscripts as being Qumran texts; it only is made probable that the texts were copied by Qumran scribes.[20]

4Q522 is written *plene*, including such typical Qumran forms as ראישׂוֹן in line 7, מאתכה in line 11, and עמכה in one of the fragments, but no additional forms typical of the Qumran scribal practice are found in these texts.

4Q378 contains a mixture of short second person singular forms, such as עמך, and long ones (such as עמכה), but the long ones are more frequent. It also contains forms of the קטלתה type. It contains a spelling מושה (3 ii and 4 5) as well as other features of the Qumran scribal practice.

The form מואדה on line 8 of MasParaJosh recurs in several Qumran documents, and may indicate a Qumran origin for the text as a whole.

VIII. *Date*

Beyond the paleographical dates of the manuscripts, which are not a good indication of the period of authorship, the curse against the rebuilder of Jericho in 4Q379 22 ii is probably the only datable element in the composition. Several scholars have suggested that the object of that

[19] A portion of this document (frg. 22 7–15) is quoted as the last section of 4QTest. On the other hand, according to H. Eshel, 4QTest quoted from 4Q379. Among other things, Eshel claims that 4Q379 (4QapocrJosh^{b}) quoted from 4QTest since the former includes no actualizing material similar to the curse. However, if the section is viewed as a prophecy, it is paralleled by the mantic character of 4Q522 9 ii, as noted below. See H. Eshel, "The Historical Background of 4QTest in the Light of Archaeological Discoveries," *Zion* 55 (1990) 141–50 (Heb.); idem, "The Historical Background of the Pesher Interpreting Joshua's Curse on the Rebuilder of Jericho," *RevQ* 15 (1992) 413–9. Against this view, see T. H. Lim, "The 'Psalms of Joshua' (4Q379 frg. 22 col. 2): A Reconsideration of Its Text," *JJS* 44 (1993) 309–12, esp. 309, n. 8.

[20] See *Scribal Practices*, 261–73.

curse is Simon or John Hyrcanus, in which case the composition should be considered anti-Hasmonean. If this assumption is correct, the composition would have been written either in the late second or early first century BCE.[21]

The theological discussion in 4Q522 as to why Jerusalem was not made a religious center in the days of Joshua may have been written from the point of view of the Jerusalem priesthood, but this element is not datable.

[21] See Eshel, "Historical Background" (see n. 19).