

WHOSE SPEECH IS IT ANYWAY? ON THE INTERPRETATION OF 4Q378 FRG. 3 II*

Summary

The highly fragmentary Qumran manuscript 4Q378, also known as 4QApcryphon of Joshua^a, features a rewritten version of the Joshua tradition as found in the books of Deuteronomy and Joshua. On frg. 3, to which the small frg. 4 may be joined, an account of the succession of Moses by Joshua is preserved. Part of this account, col. ii features a speech by a first-person plural subject which apparently is based on Josh 1:16–18, the Transjordanian tribes' response to Joshua. While there is broad agreement as to the identification of the biblical base text, substantial problems in the interpretation of the rewritten version have yet to be discussed, including the question of who is speaking. While Devorah Dimant and Ariel Feldman have argued that the response of the Transjordanian tribes is reworked by the scribe into an address by all Israel, the present paper makes the case for the Transjordanian tribes as the subject also in the rewritten version.

THE highly fragmentary Qumran manuscript 4Q378, or 4QApcryphon of Joshua^a, as in the DJD edition, features a reworked version of the Joshua tradition. (1) Provisionally labeled “The

* This paper was presented at the joint session of the Transmission of Traditions in the Second Temple Period and Deuteronomistic History units on the “Transmission of Joshua Traditions in the Late Second Temple Period” at the 2018 SBL Annual Meeting in Denver. Thanks are due to the chairs Sara Milstein and Mika Pajunen for the invitation to speak in this session; to Emanuel Tov for a helpful exchange on some material aspects of the fragment prior to the presentation; and especially to Ariel Feldman for his apt comments during the session and the readiness to engage in the discussion of his analysis.

(1) Carol Newsom, “4QApcryphon of Joshua^{a-b},” in *Qumran Cave 4.XVII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 3*, ed. George Brooke et al., DJD XXII (Oxford: Clarendon,

Psalms of Joshua” by John Strugnell, to whom the fragments of that manuscript as well as of 4Q379, or 4QApocryphon of Joshua^b, had originally been assigned, the editor, Carol Newsom, observed that their content was “largely narrative and hortatory rather than poetic,” leading her to suggest the now widely used designation as an “Apocryphon of Joshua.” (2) While the fragments reflect essential components of the canonical Joshua story as we know it from the books of Deuteronomy and Joshua, it strikes the reader that key discursive elements found in the biblical base text have been reworked into significantly expanded versions. Arguably the most notable example of this phenomenon is the account of the succession of Moses by Joshua preserved on 4Q378 frg. 3, to which the small frg. 4 may be joined, featuring two rather lengthy discourses. Devorah Dimant and Ariel Feldman have each discussed these discourses in detail. (3) Prompted by their analyses, the

1996), 237–288. See also the more recent edition in Elisha Qimron, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: The Hebrew Writings, Volume Two* (Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi, 2013).

(2) All quotes from Newsom, “4QApocryphon of Joshua,” 237. See also the preliminary editions in Carol Newsom, “The ‘Psalms of Joshua’ from Qumran Cave 4,” *JJS* 39 (1988): 56–73 and Carol Newsom, “4Q378 and 4Q379: An Apocryphon of Joshua,” in *Qumranstudien: Vorträge und Beiträge der Teilnehmer des Qumranseminars auf dem internationalen Treffen der Society of Biblical Literature, Münster, 25.–26. Juli 1993*, ed. Heinz-Josef Fabry, Armin Lange, and Hermann Lichtenberger, *Schriften des Institutum Judaicum Delitzschianum* 4 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996), 35–85, discussing this issue. Adopting the established term to describe his reconstruction of “the rewritten book of Joshua as found at Qumran and Masada” (on that putative composition, see note 3 below), Emanuel Tov, “The Rewritten Book of Joshua as Found at Qumran and Masada,” in *Hebrew Bible, Greek Bible, and Qumran: Collected Essays*, TSAJ 121 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 71–91, here 71 nevertheless notes: “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.”

(3) Devorah Dimant, “Two Discourses from the *Apocryphon of Joshua* and Their Context (4Q378 3 i–ii),” *RevQ* 23 (2007): 43–61; Ariel Feldman, *The Rewritten Joshua Scrolls from Qumran: Texts, Translations, and Commentary*, BZAW 438 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2014), 24–73, esp. 28–37. In the latter, this is part of the more far-reaching question as to the literary context, that is, whether 4Q378 and 4Q379 along with further manuscripts found at Qumran and Masada pertaining to the Joshua tradition, or presumed to do so (4Q522; 4Q123; 5Q9; Mas 1039–211; see the critical inventories in Florentino García Martínez, “Light on the Joshua Books from the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *After Qumran: Old and Modern Editions of the Biblical Texts—The Historical Books*, ed. Hans Ausloos, Bénédicte Lemmelijn, and Julio Trebolle Barrera, BETL 246 [Leuven: Peeters, 2012], 145–159, here 151–158; Florentino García Martínez, “The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Book of Joshua,” in *Qumran and the Bible: Studying the Jewish and Christian Scriptures in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. Norá Dávid and Armin Lange, CBET 57 [Leuven: Peeters, 2010], 97–109, here 103–108; Michaël N. van der Meer, *Formation and Reformulation: The Redaction of the Book of Joshua in the Light of the Oldest Textual Witnesses*, VTSup 102 [Leiden: Brill, 2004], 105–114),

present paper focuses on the second discourse, found in col. ii of frg. 3, and inquires into the subject of this speech and its bearing on the interpretation of the discourse itself.

1. 4Q378 Frg. 3 ii as Rewritten Bible

On 4Q378 frg. 3, two columns have been partially preserved: the left side of one column, commonly referred to as col. i, and the right side of the following one, col. ii, featuring fifteen and ten extant lines respectively. While the margin between these columns is well-preserved, there are neither top nor bottom margins. As to the content, col. i offers a speech which is reminiscent of Moses's great covenant speeches in Deuteronomy, particularly through the use of motifs best known from the curse section of Deut 28 and related passages. However, the subject of that discourse is most probably not Moses himself, as reference is apparently made to him in the third person (l. 4: ש[אִ] הַאֱלֹהִים). (4) Rather, the speaker appears to be Joshua, as has been plausibly surmised by Dimant, (5) followed by Feldman. (6) Col. ii contains the discourse under scrutiny here, uttered by a first-person plural subject. Although set in relative proximity to the address presumably given by Joshua in col. i, it cannot be established that this second discourse followed immediately after the first one; as already mentioned, neither the bottom margin of col. i nor the top margin of col. ii have been preserved.

The following table presents a reading based on PAM 43.193 (DJD 22, plate XVII) and informed by Newsom, Dimant and Feldman as well as the recent edition of Elisha Qimron and a comprehensive 2016 article by Émile Puech. (7) In light of these excellent treatments, the subsequent notes and comments are kept to a minimum, and are

testify to one single composition, as has been argued by Tov, "The Rewritten Book of Joshua as Found at Qumran and Masada," or not. For a comprehensive discussion, see Feldman, *The Rewritten Joshua Scrolls from Qumran*, 187–193. Most recently, see also Émile Puech, "Les manuscrits de Qumrân inspirés du livre de Josué: 4Q378, 4Q379, 4Q175, 4Q522, 5Q9 et Mas1039–211," *RevQ* 28 (2016): 45–116.

(4) See the comments on this line by Newsom, "4QApocryphon of Joshua," 244 and Dimant, "Two Discourses from the Apocryphon of Joshua and Their Context (4Q378 3 i–ii)," 49.

(5) Dimant, "Two Discourses from the Apocryphon of Joshua and Their Context (4Q378 3 i–ii)," 49.

(6) Feldman, *The Rewritten Joshua Scrolls from Qumran*, 66. See also *ibid.*, 31.

(7) Newsom, "4QApocryphon of Joshua," 245–46; Dimant, "Two Discourses from the Apocryphon of Joshua and Their Context (4Q378 3 i–ii)," 53–58; Feldman, *The Rewritten Joshua Scrolls from Qumran*, 34–37; Qimron, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 64; Puech, "Les manuscrits de Qumrân inspirés du livre de Josué," 50–51.

confined to issues of importance for the question at hand. It should be mentioned, however, that a certain reluctance regarding the reconstruction of nonextant text based on comparative material culled from the Hebrew Bible, which stands out especially vis-à-vis the work of Dimant, Feldman and Puech, is due to methodological considerations rather than thematic restraint; I will return to this point shortly. (8)

		וירצא] 3
[ככל אשר]	ועתה היום]	4
	שמענו למושה כן] נשמע אליכה	5
[שרי האלפים ושרי]	איש ישר וגדל]	6
	המאיות שרי הח' משים ושרי העשרות	7
[ולוא]	הלוטרים] [ל]	8
	ישמע ולוא]	9
[ולוא]	ואל תחת חזק וא] מץ כי את] ה תנחיל את]	10
	ירפכה ולוא יעזב] כה ועתה ת] חוקנה ידיך]	11
	למסע לנ]	12

Select Notes on the Reading

L. 5: There is a space at the beginning of the line, allowing for the addition of a *waw*. While noting that no traces of ink appear, Newsom opts to do so, (9) as does Qimron. (10) However, Dimant suggests that the space has been left uninscribed due to an unevenness of the parchment. In any case, a conjunction is not required syntactically, as she rightly remarks. (11)

L. 9: There is no space between the two extant words. Hence, one could read *ישמעו לוא*, although such a construction seems less likely from a syntactical point of view. (12)

Ll. 10–11: Following the proposal of Newsom, frg. 4 is perceived here also to exhibit parts of these lines. (13) Against her initial reconstruction, however, the beginning of the extant text of l. 10 on frg. 4 is restored to read *האת*. (14)

(8) See the comments on ll. 3 and 4–5 below as well as the paragraph concluding the present section.

(9) Newsom, “4QApocryphon of Joshua,” 245.

(10) Qimron, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 64.

(11) Dimant, “Two Discourses from the Apocryphon of Joshua and Their Context (4Q378 3 i–ii),” 53.

(12) Thus Newsom, “4QApocryphon of Joshua,” 245, followed by Dimant, “Two Discourses from the Apocryphon of Joshua and Their Context (4Q378 3 i–ii),” 54.

(13) See Newsom, “4QApocryphon of Joshua,” 245 in conjunction with plate XVII.

(14) With Dimant, “Two Discourses from the Apocryphon of Joshua and Their Context (4Q378 3 i–ii),” 53–54. Thus also Feldman, *The Rewritten Joshua Scrolls from Qumran*, 34; Qimron, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 64.

Translation

3 and he brought out[
 4 And now today [Just as]
 5 we obeyed Moses, s[^o we will obey you
 6 a man upright and great [the leaders of thousands and the leaders of]
 7 hundreds and the leaders of f[ifties and the leaders of tens
 8 and to the officers [] [Whoever rebels against your orders and does not]
 9 obey and does not[
 10 and do not be dismayed. Be strong and courageous, for you shall put in pos-
 session[and he will not]
 11 fail you or forsake [you. And now let] your hands be strong[
 12 to set out

Select Comments

L. 3: It indeed seems most likely that the preserved verbal expression וּיֹצֵא (“and he brought out”) is part of a reference to the exodus. Yet this hardly justifies reconstructing the line according to Deut 4:20, as Dimant, Feldman and Puech propose to do. (15) A scribe like the one responsible for this fine piece of biblical interpretation does not need a *Vorlage* in order to employ יֹצֵא Hiphil when presenting the exodus event. In other words, there is no way, in my view, from the remains of l. 3 to the original wording of that line. We simply cannot know what the text looked like here.

Ll. 4–5: In these lines, the situation is different. The text preserved at the beginning of l. 5 is significant both for its wording and in the present context. As it unmistakably echoes Josh 1:17a, the centerpiece of the Transjordanian tribes’ pledge of allegiance to Joshua in Josh 1:16–18, the latter part of l. 4 and its immediate continuation in l. 5 may be restored according to that verse. (16)

Ll. 6–8: The wording preserved in l. 7 invokes the tradition of Moses’ installation of subordinate officials in charge of any case that is not “too hard” for them (thus Exod 18:22, 26; cf. also Deut 1:17b); see Exod 18:21b, 25b and Deut 1:15 in their respective contexts. Deut 1:15bβ also mentions שְׁטָרִים in this context, and from the LXX version of the latter passage, καὶ γραμματοεισαγωγεῖς τοῖς κριταῖς ὑμῶν, one may

(15) Dimant, “Two Discourses from the Apocryphon of Joshua and Their Context (4Q378 3 i–ii),” 54; Feldman, *The Rewritten Joshua Scrolls from Qumran*, 35; Puech, “Les manuscrits de Qumrân inspirés du livre de Josué,” 51.

(16) With Dimant, “Two Discourses from the Apocryphon of Joshua and Their Context (4Q378 3 i–ii),” 56; Feldman, *The Rewritten Joshua Scrolls from Qumran*, 36, and already Newsom, “4QApocryphon of Joshua,” 245. On the interchange of the prepositions אַל and ל, see Feldman, *The Rewritten Joshua Scrolls from Qumran*, 35.

even reconstruct a reference to שפטים* here. (17) Unlike in Deut 1:15, however, in our fragment the mention of שוטרים does not follow the list of שרים immediately, and unlike the latter, it is construed with the preposition ל. In addition, it should be noted that שטרים are also mentioned in Josh 1:10–11. In light of these observations, reconstructing the end of l. 7 to read ללשופטים*, as proposed by Dimant, Feldman and already Newsom, (18) who refer to the fact that the “judges” and “officers” are also found in the lists in Josh 23:2 and 24:1, is not quite as well-founded as is their restoration of the list of שרים in ll. 6–7.

Ll. 8–9: In light of ll. 4–5, which echo the Transjordanian tribes’ pledge of allegiance to Joshua in Josh 1:16–18, the wording preserved in l. 9 is reminiscent of Josh 1:18, which details the consequences of that pledge. Hence the above restoration of l. 8, which follows that of Dimant and Feldman. (19) As for the remainder of l. 9, I remain more hesitant given the clear difference in syntax.

Ll. 10–11: There can be little doubt that these lines allude to the encouragement of Joshua as the new leader of Israel, which is part and parcel of Joshua’s succession of Moses as depicted in Deut 1–3, Deut 31, and Josh 1 (see especially Deut 3:28, 31:7–8, and Josh 1:5b–6; see also Deut 31:23). While the phrase חזק ואמץ alone is enough to evoke that context, there is a whole cluster of related phrases which are variably joined with it in the biblical passages just cited. Almost all of them reappear in ll. 10–11 of the fragment. The reconstruction of the wording itself is not too difficult, since most of the meaningful words are preserved at least in part. Yet there is a methodological problem regarding the identification of the alleged secondary base texts. (20) Considering the obvious flexibility with which the Deuteronomistic

(17) Cf. Feldman, *The Rewritten Joshua Scrolls from Qumran*, 36, note 171. See, however, the skeptical remark in Carmel McCarthy, *Deuteronomy*, BHQ 5 (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2007), 50*–51*, referring to Emanuel Tov, *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research*, 2nd ed., JBS 8 (Jerusalem: Simor, 1997), 140–141.

(18) Newsom, “4QApocryphon of Joshua,” 246; Dimant, “Two Discourses from the Apocryphon of Joshua and Their Context (4Q378 3 i–ii),” 56; Feldman, *The Rewritten Joshua Scrolls from Qumran*, 36.

(19) Dimant, “Two Discourses from the Apocryphon of Joshua and Their Context (4Q378 3 i–ii),” 56; Feldman, *The Rewritten Joshua Scrolls from Qumran*, 36. See further Qimron, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 64; Puech, “Les manuscrits de Qumrân inspirés du livre de Josué,” 50.

(20) For the latter term, see Armin Lange, “From Paratexts to Commentary,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Contemporary Culture: Proceedings of the International Conference Held at the Israel Museum, Jerusalem (July 6–8, 2008)*, ed. Adolfo D. Roitman, Lawrence H. Schiffman, and Shani Tzoref, STDJ 93 (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 195–216, here 207, who states that “paratextual rewritings” (including 4Q378) “rewrite a main base text but include secondary base texts into their re-narration as well.”

phraseology is used in the biblical account, it does not seem to be particularly productive to search for exact matches of certain forms or combinations and to try to determine precisely which passage of the succession account as we have it in Deuteronomy and Joshua is reused here. (21) Rather, the occurrence of these phrases should be taken to indicate *that* the tradition of Joshua's commissioning as Israel's new leader is taken up. This is also the function of חזק ואמץ in the Transjordanian tribes' response to Joshua (Josh 1:18) and their echoing of YHWH's assurance to be with Joshua as he was with Moses (Josh 1:17, taking up Josh 1:5b and Deut 31:8). In this way, Josh 1:16–18 emerges as part of the larger succession narrative.

Considering the above observations, 4Q378 frg. 3 ii has rightly been classified as an example of the broader category of "rewritten Bible," (22) the main base text being the Transjordanian tribes' speech in Josh 1:16–18. (23) In this regard, the evidence brought out by Dimant and Feldman, among others, appears to be conclusive. (24) In their approach, however, this insight comes with a further assumption that has far-reaching implications for the interpretation of that rewriting, namely, that the speaker in our fragment differs from the one in the biblical base text. While in Josh 1 the passage is construed as the Transjordanian tribes' response to Joshua's address to them, "it seems," according to Dimant, "that the speech of the Transjordanian tribes is adapted by the present Qumran author to form an address of the people of Israel as a whole." (25) If correct, this would be a most interesting reconfiguration of the biblical base text, as Feldman rightly notes (26)—particularly given that, according to recent scholarly discussions, Josh 1:16–18 exhibits an exegetical problem to which this presumed ancient "exegesis" seems to respond.

(21) Cf. e.g. Feldman, *The Rewritten Joshua Scrolls from Qumran*, 36–37.

(22) See already Newsom, "4QApocryphon of Joshua," 237, followed by Dimant, "Two Discourses from the Apocryphon of Joshua and Their Context (4Q378 3 i–ii)," 45–46 and Feldman, *The Rewritten Joshua Scrolls from Qumran*, 190–191. For a helpful theoretical discussion, see Lange, "From Paratexts to Commentary," 204–211, esp. 207.

(23) Dimant, "Two Discourses from the Apocryphon of Joshua and Their Context (4Q378 3 i–ii)," 58 and passim; Feldman, *The Rewritten Joshua Scrolls from Qumran*, 25 and passim. See also Qimron, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 64.

(24) By contrast, see the rather skeptical assessment in van der Meer, *Formation and Reformulation*, 108.

(25) Dimant, "Two Discourses from the Apocryphon of Joshua and Their Context (4Q378 3 i–ii)," 55. See also Feldman, *The Rewritten Joshua Scrolls from Qumran*, 66, citing Dimant, and already Newsom, "4QApocryphon of Joshua," 245: "it may be the whole people who reply."

(26) See the summary in Feldman, *The Rewritten Joshua Scrolls from Qumran*, 195.

2. The Biblical Base Text and Its Exegetical Problem

Taking up the thread where Deuteronomy has left off, the book of Joshua commences with YHWH's commissioning of Joshua as Moses' successor and Israel's new leader. The opening address in Josh 1:2ff. unmistakably harks back to the pertinent passages in Deut 3 (YHWH instructs Moses regarding his succession by Joshua, vv. 27–28) and Deut 31 (Moses instructs Joshua accordingly, vv. 2, 7–8). Thus having been commissioned to lead the people into the land west of the Jordan, Joshua first turns to the “officers of the people” (שטרי העם, Josh 1:10). In a brief, matter-of-fact order he tells them to tell the people to get their supplies ready (הכינו לכם צידה, v. 11), thus preparing to cross the Jordan. He then addresses Reuben, Gad and the half-tribe of Manasseh—the Transjordanian tribes who, according to Deut 3, have already been given their land east of the Jordan (Josh 1:12–15). The tone of this address is quite different. Carefully crafting his speech, and employing the theologically laden motif of the “rest” YHWH promised to give to his people, Joshua asks the Transjordanian tribes to join forces with their “brethren” (v. 14) and to support them in the imminent conquest of the land west of the Jordan. While putting particular emphasis on this request, Joshua does not pick his words freely. Rather, his address is a quotation of Moses' command in Deut 3:18–20, which he simply reiterates.

The immediate continuation of this address, Josh 1:16–18, reads as follows:

16 ויענו את יהושע לאמר כל אשר צויתנו נעשה ואל כל אשר תשלחנו נלך
 17 ככל אשר שמענו אל משה כן נשמע אליך רק יהיה יהוה אלהיך עמך כאשר
 היה עם משה
 18 כל איש אשר ימרה את פיך ולא ישמע את דבריך לכל אשר תצוו יומת רק
 חזק ואמץ

- 16 They answered Joshua: “All that you have commanded us we will do, and wherever you send us we will go.
 17 Just as we obeyed Moses in all things, so we will obey you.
 Only may YHWH your God be with you, as he was with Moses!
 18 Whoever rebels against your orders and does not obey your words, whatever you command, shall be put to death. Only be strong and courageous!”

“They answered Joshua”—who did? Read in context, that is, against the background of Joshua's address to the Transjordanian tribes, the subject seems to be self-evident, all the more so since the speech is explicitly marked as an answer (ויענו, v. 16). One could, however, sense a certain discrepancy between an ascription to the Transjordanian tribes

and the markedly programmatic character of this discourse. At any rate, it is presented as an address of the most general kind; every single statement contains the word כָּל. What is more, the address takes up YHWH's assurance to be with Joshua as he was with Moses (Josh 1:17b, echoing Josh 1:5b), thus adding to the solemn tone of the response.

In fact, this seeming discrepancy is increasingly perceived as a problem. A growing number of exegetes conjecture that Josh 1:16–18 should be read as a pledge of allegiance not of the Transjordanian tribes, but of the people as a whole. (27) As such, they argue, the piece promotes an “all Israel” ideology, that is, in the present narrative context, the notion that all twelve tribes together participated in the conquest of the land west of the Jordan. (28) However, while this reading seems to solve one problem, it also creates another, since the presumed subject has not been addressed in the previous context; in fact, the people have not even been introduced as an actor. Therefore, one would be hard-pressed to make a case for the people themselves speaking in vv. 16–18. (29) But what about the “officers of the people” mentioned in vv. 10–11? Could it not be they who, representing “all Israel,” (30) speak the people's mind?

In support of this increasingly popular view, two different approaches may be discerned. On the one hand, there is the literary-critical approach, which argues that Joshua's address to the Transjordanian tribes in vv. 12–15 should be judged as a secondary insertion. (31) On this understanding, the subject implied in the verb וַיַּעֲנוּ of v. 16 would indeed seem to be the officers (vv. 10–11) instead of the Transjordanian tribes (vv. 12–15). (32) But this analysis has been shown to be

(27) See e.g. the perusal of scholarship in Trent C. Butler, *Joshua 1–12*, 2nd ed., WBC 7A (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2014), 229–230. See also Thomas B. Dozeman, *Joshua 1–12: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 6B (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2015), 222.

(28) Thus, with particular emphasis, Christa Schäfer-Lichtenberger, *Josua und Salomo: Eine Studie zu Autorität und Legitimität des Nachfolgers im Alten Testament*, VTSup 58 (Leiden: Brill, 1995), 207 (“die Einheit im Handeln aller Stämme”).

(29) Pace Christoph Barth, “Die Antwort Israels,” in *Probleme biblischer Theologie: Gerhard von Rad zum 70. Geburtstag*, ed. Hans W. Wolff (Munich: Chr. Kaiser, 1971), 44–56, here 48–53. More recently, see also Hartmut N. Rösel, *Joshua*, HCOT (Leuven: Peeters, 2011), 27, 39.

(30) Schäfer-Lichtenberger, *Josua und Salomo*, 207 (“Vertreter aller Stämme”).

(31) Thus Klaus Bieberstein, *Josua—Jordan—Jericho: Archäologie, Geschichte und Theologie der Landnahmeerzählung Josua 1–6*, OBO 143 (Fribourg: Universitätsverlag, 1995), 98–100 and Ernst Axel Knauf, *Josua*, ZBK 6 (Zurich: Theologischer Verlag, 2008), 40, among others.

(32) See the interpretation of Josh 1 in Knauf, *Josua*, 40: “Die Investitur erfolgt in Form einer Gottesrede (2–9). Darauf gibt Josua seinem Stab den ersten Befehl (10–11), auf den die Heeresordner (oder das gesamte Kriegsvolk?) mit einer Akklamation

unfounded. (33) On the other hand, there is a somewhat elaborate syntactical interpretation, arguing that the answer of vv. 16–18 comes from both the officers of vv. 10–11 and the Transjordanian tribes of vv. 12–15. (34) In support of this view, the *w^e-x-qāṭal* opening of v. 12 is taken to indicate “simultaneous action.” (35) Thus, coming from both actors mentioned in the previous context, vv. 16–18 are construed as “all Israel’s response.” (36) Yet this interpretation hardly suits the syntax of v. 12, the most natural understanding of which is that the “[d]isjunctive word order foregrounds the eastern tribes as a new topic.” (37)

Thus, on a purely textual basis, the officers (שטרײ העם) hardly suggest themselves as the subject of the response in vv. 16–18. But even if spoken by them, to interpret the answer as “all Israel’s response” one also needs to presuppose that this rather obscure group of subordinate officials is in a position to represent the people as a whole. However, as far as the regrettably scarce evidence in the Hebrew Bible indicates, שטרײ were charged with specific, and hence limited, tasks. In the present context, that seems to be the mustering of troops for war (cf. Deut 20:5–9). (38) By contrast, there is nothing to substantiate the claim that they could act in place of the people, particularly not in a fundamental affair such as the solemn pledge of allegiance to the new leader. (39)

In short, Josh 1:16–18 is not a speech of all Israel. However, the various scholarly approaches arguing that case evince a sure intuition for the key exegetical problem of the pericope: Despite being a response

antworten (16–18), die seine ‘Legitimation von oben’ mit der ‘Akzeptanz von unten’ ergänzt. Der innere Zusammenhang und die logische Abfolge dieser drei Szenen wird in 12–15 durch das Sonderproblem der transjordanischen Stämme unterbrochen, so dass die Antwort von 16–18 nun Ruben, Gad und halb Manasse in den Mund gelegt wird.”

(33) See the detailed discussion in Joachim J. Krause, *Exodus und Eisodus: Komposition und Theologie von Josua 1–5*, VTSup 161 (Leiden: Brill, 2014), 119–120 and 126–127 (with further literature).

(34) David M. Howard, “All Israel’s Response to Joshua: A Note on the Narrative Framework of Joshua 1,” in *Fortunate the Eyes that See: Essays in Honor of David Noel Freedman in Celebration of His Seventieth Birthday*, ed. Astrid B. Beck et al. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 81–91. See further David M. Howard, *Josua*, NAC 5 (Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman, 1998), 94–96.

(35) Howard, “All Israel’s Response to Joshua,” 83–85, with the quote on 84.

(36) Howard, “All Israel’s Response to Joshua,” 81.

(37) Thus with Richard D. Nelson, *Josua: A Commentary*, OTL (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 1997), 35.

(38) Dozeman, *Josua 1–12*, 220–221.

(39) In support of that view, Schäfer-Lichtenberger, *Josua und Salomo*, 207 refers to Exod 20:19 and Deut 5:27–28. Yet aside from the fact that these passages have their own very special context, neither of them mentions שטרײ.

of the two and a half Transjordanian tribes, it indeed is “all Israel” that is at stake in this discourse. And that question, in turn, is only to be expected in connection with the critical transfer of leadership from the unmatched Moses to Joshua.

3. The Interpretation of 4Q378 Frg. 3 ii by Devorah Dimant and Ariel Feldman

Informed by this state of affairs regarding the biblical base text, we are now in a position to appreciate the interpretation of 4Q378 frg. 3 ii proposed by Devorah Dimant and Ariel Feldman. As already mentioned, they are of the opinion that, in the rewritten version, the speech of the Transjordanian tribes is reworked “into a full-blown address by the entire nation” (40): “the original tribal speech is converted into a discourse of the entire people of Israel.” (41) In so doing, this version emphasizes “the acceptance of Joshua’s leadership by the entire people of Israel,” (42) that is, “by all the tribes of Israel,” (43) Dimant further submits. Dimant and Feldman give various reasons in support of this interpretation. In what follows, these reasons are compiled and critically assessed.

First, and most fundamentally, Dimant refers to “the general context.” (44) While she does not elaborate on that point, behind it there seems to be a similar intuition as the one leading biblical scholars to ascribe the base text to the people as a whole. (45) Yet this intuition, sure as it may be, cannot be adequately appreciated as long as one does not ask the reverse question, namely, *why* the Transjordanian tribes, of all people, should be the subject of a most general pledge of allegiance; I will return to this point when giving my own interpretation. (46)

Second, it is argued by Dimant that the scroll “omits the issue of the Transjordanian obligation to share the conquest battles of Canaan, a theme which introduces their answer to Joshua in the biblical account

(40) Feldman, *The Rewritten Joshua Scrolls from Qumran*, 67.

(41) Dimant, “Two Discourses from the Apocryphon of Joshua and Their Context (4Q378 3 i-ii),” 58. As Feldman, *The Rewritten Joshua Scrolls from Qumran*, 35 puts it, “The scroll rewrites the reply of the Transjordanian tribes to Joshua [...] as if spoken by the entire nation of Israel.”

(42) Dimant, “Two Discourses from the Apocryphon of Joshua and Their Context (4Q378 3 i-ii),” 55.

(43) Dimant, “Two Discourses from the Apocryphon of Joshua and Their Context (4Q378 3 i-ii),” 59.

(44) Dimant, “Two Discourses from the Apocryphon of Joshua and Their Context (4Q378 3 i-ii),” 55.

(45) See section 2 above.

(46) See section 4 below.

(Josh 1:12–15).” (47) It is true that the issue of the Transjordanian tribes supporting their “brothers” in the conquest west of the Jordan is *the* critical question in the interaction of Joshua with these two and a half tribes according to Josh 1. Therefore, if it could be demonstrated that it was omitted, that would indeed be a strong indicator for a more general interpretation ascribing the discourse of frg. 3 ii to the people as a whole. However, the alleged omission seems to be beyond reach. In the biblical account, the address of the Transjordanian tribes (Josh 1:16–18) is preceded by Joshua’s request to them (Josh 1:12–15). While the preserved text of frg. 3 ii testifies to a reworking of that address, the previous context is lost. We simply do not know whether it featured Joshua’s request or not.

Third, in a comment on ll. 6–8, Dimant notes that “the leaders of all Israel are mentioned.” (48) Shortly afterwards she adds: “The Qumran text introduces Israelite officials who are not mentioned in the biblical narrative. [...] The reference to these officials shows that the entire people is involved.” (49) There is a whole set of problems with this argument. To begin with, at least the “officers” (שוטרים) mentioned in l. 8 do appear already in Josh 1, as we have seen. Admittedly, in the rewritten version they are now mentioned in close proximity with further officials, namely, the שרים or “leaders of thousands and of hundreds and of fifties and of tens” (ll. 6–7, partly reconstructed). Unfortunately, however, the preserved text does not indicate the function of either of these two groups. This is brought out quite clearly by Dimant herself when she conjectures: “Perhaps they are mentioned in this context to suggest that any disobedience to Joshua will be disciplined by them.” (50) In fact, as demonstrated by Feldman, the fragmentary remains do not even allow to determine with certainty whether

(47) Dimant, “Two Discourses from the Apocryphon of Joshua and Their Context (4Q378 3 i–ii),” 56.

(48) Dimant, “Two Discourses from the Apocryphon of Joshua and Their Context (4Q378 3 i–ii),” 55.

(49) Dimant, “Two Discourses from the Apocryphon of Joshua and Their Context (4Q378 3 i–ii),” 56.

(50) Dimant, “Two Discourses from the Apocryphon of Joshua and Their Context (4Q378 3 i–ii),” 56. Feldman, *The Rewritten Joshua Scrolls from Qumran*, 67 also tries another explanation: The scroll “refers to Moses’ appointment of the officers (Exod 18; Deut 1), apparently suggesting that Joshua is to be obeyed because he is also Moses’ appointee.” Apart from the fact that the fragmentary state of the text does not appeal to me as being particularly “apparent,” this presumed correlation of Joshua, whose introduction as the successor of Moses is one of the major themes of the narrative framework in Deuteronomy, and the scarcely mentioned subordinate officials strikes me as quite an unlikely exegetical initiative, even granted a rather creative reworking of the biblical tradition.

the speech is about these officials, spoken by them (51) or—as suggested by Newsom (52)—spoken to them.

At least as difficult is the fact that it is far from evident which function these officials possibly *could* have had, in other words, how much authority a scribe would have attributed to them. As concerns the שוטרִים and their limited responsibility according to the biblical tradition, suffice it here to recall the above discussion of Josh 1. (53) The case of the שרים drawn from Exod 18:21, 25 par. Deut 1:15 is even more clear-cut. According to these passages, which are employed by the scroll as secondary base texts, as Dimant, Feldman and already Newsom have convincingly shown, (54) there can be no doubt regarding their subordinate position. Consider Exod 18:26: “hard cases they brought to Moses, but any minor case they decided themselves.” Should our present scribe have envisioned these officials to have assumed the leadership of the people as a whole? And if so, how does that go together with the leadership role of Joshua? In a word, the subordinate officials mentioned in ll. 6–8 hardly suggest themselves as “the leaders of all Israel,” (55) especially given what is at stake at this critical crossroads.

Fourth, there is a strong new argument which Feldman has brought up for discussion, namely, the comparison with Pseudo-Philo’s account of the succession of Moses by Joshua found in LAB. (56) Thus, 4Q378 is located in its broader “exegetical context.” (57) It will be helpful to quote the pertinent passage from LAB 20 before discussing it. The following English translation comes from the commentary of Howard Jacobson, (58) also used by Feldman.

3 Joshua took the garments of wisdom and clothed himself and girded his loins with the belt of understanding. When he clothed himself with it, his mind was kindled and his spirit was aroused, and he said to the people, “Behold, the prior generation died in the wilderness because

(51) Feldman, *The Rewritten Joshua Scrolls from Qumran*, 36.

(52) Newsom, “4QApocryphon of Joshua,” 246.

(53) See p. 10.

(54) Newsom, “4QApocryphon of Joshua,” 246; Dimant, “Two Discourses from the Apocryphon of Joshua and Their Context (4Q378 3 i–ii),” 56; Feldman, *The Rewritten Joshua Scrolls from Qumran*, 36.

(55) To quote again Dimant, “Two Discourses from the Apocryphon of Joshua and Their Context (4Q378 3 i–ii),” 55.

(56) Feldman, *The Rewritten Joshua Scrolls from Qumran*, 67–69.

(57) Feldman, *The Rewritten Joshua Scrolls from Qumran*, 194–201, esp. 195.

(58) Howard Jacobson, *A Commentary on Pseudo-Philo’s Liber antiquitatum biblicarum: With Latin Text and English Translation*, vol. 1, AGJU 31 (Leiden: Brill, 1996), 124.

they opposed their God. Behold now, all you tribes, be aware today that if you go in the ways of your God, you will prosper.

- 4 If however you do not heed his voice and you be like your fathers, your affairs will be ruined and you yourselves will be crushed and your name will perish from the earth. [...] Now rise up and set your heart to walk in the ways of your Lord, and he will make you prosper.”
- 5 The people said to him, “Behold, we see today what Eldad and Medad prophesied in the days of Moses, saying, ‘After Moses’ death, the leadership of Moses will be given to Joshua the son of Nun.’ Moses was not jealous but rejoiced when he heard them. From then on all the people believed that you would exercise leadership over them and apportion the land to them. Now even if there is conflict, be strong and resolute, because you alone will be ruler in Israel.”

As aptly observed by Feldman, in contradistinction to the biblical account, LAB features a speech of principal importance concerning the future fate of Israel, which is delivered by Joshua upon assuming leadership and is addressed to the people as a whole. This certainly is an interesting parallel to the discourse preserved in col. i of our fragment. (59) Without denying this, it should be mentioned, however, that precisely the question of who is addressed by Joshua is not quite as unequivocal in LAB as one would wish. It is in the English rendering, “Behold now, all you tribes” (20:3). Yet this is not a translation of the Latin text as it has come down to us, but is based on a text-critical conjecture of Jacobson. The Latin text actually reads: “Et ecce nunc vos omnes *duces*.” (60) To be sure, Jacobson has made a good case for an original *כל השבטים* having been corrupted to either *שטרים* or, more likely, *שפטים*. (61) Nonetheless, it deserves to be noted that precisely regarding the problem of who Joshua interacts with, the textual history testifies to considerable confusion. (62)

In any case, more important for our present discussion is the answer Joshua receives in LAB 20:5. According to Feldman, it “recast[s] the Transjordanians’ reply to [Joshua] (63), ‘be strong and resolute’, as the entire nation’s response,” (64) thus providing a parallel also to col. ii of our fragment. (65) While Feldman is of course right that here

(59) Feldman, *The Rewritten Joshua Scrolls from Qumran*, 67, 195.

(60) Jacobson, *A Commentary on Pseudo-Philo’s Liber antiquitatum biblicarum*, 29 (my italics).

(61) Jacobson, *A Commentary on Pseudo-Philo’s Liber antiquitatum biblicarum*, 662.

(62) See also the comment on LAB 20:5^{init} “et dixerunt ad eum populi” in Jacobson, *A Commentary on Pseudo-Philo’s Liber antiquitatum biblicarum*, 666.

(63) Feldman, *The Rewritten Joshua Scrolls from Qumran*, 68 inadvertently reads “Moses” here.

(64) Feldman, *The Rewritten Joshua Scrolls from Qumran*, 68.

(65) Feldman, *The Rewritten Joshua Scrolls from Qumran*, 68, 195.

it is Israel as a whole that addresses Joshua, I remain more skeptical regarding the comparative value of LAB in this case. First of all, I hesitate whether, or to what extent, LAB 20:5 should be regarded as a rewritten version of Josh 1:16–18. On the one hand, the main point of contact with the biblical text is the phrase *וְהָיָה אִתְּכֶם*, which is certainly not specific to Josh 1:16–18. On the other hand, one could refer to the notion of Joshua's authority being at stake, (66) which does resonate with the issue of the Transjordanian tribes. (67) But even if one accepts Josh 1:16–18 as the point of reference, it has to be admitted that LAB 20:5 is a rather distinct composition. This is most obvious in the theme brought up by the people, namely, the content of the prophecy of Eldad and Medad. This is a Midrash-type exposition of the fact, recorded in Num 11:26, *that* Eldad and Medad prophesied. (68) While it proves LAB 20:5 to be an interesting point of comparison for similar expositions found in rabbinic literature, (69) this feature also cautions not to overstate the case for an alleged common “exegetical tradition” (70) regarding the transformation of the Transjordanian tribes' answer into an address of all Israel.

These quibbles aside, Feldman has produced a strong argument by bringing LAB 20 to the fore. In my view, this comparison could be used most profitably to bolster the result of an immanent analysis of 4Q378 frg. 3.

The fifth argument to be assessed here is probably the strongest, and in any case it is fundamental for the interpretation of Dimant and Feldman, even though they do not explicitly invoke it as an argument for their case but rather presuppose it. That argument is the assumed correlation of the second-person speech found in col. i, which has been plausibly ascribed to Joshua by Dimant and Feldman, and the first-person plural speech found in col. ii. To quote Dimant, “The speech [preserved in col. ii] appears to be pronounced in response to Joshua's address in column i.” (71) It indeed appears to be—when it is read in the context that has been preserved. However, a caveat is in order here, too. As it stands, we know that the two discourses found in cols. i and

(66) As does Jacobson, *A Commentary on Pseudo-Philo's Liber antiquitatum biblicarum*, 668.

(67) See section 4 below.

(68) See Jacobson, *A Commentary on Pseudo-Philo's Liber antiquitatum biblicarum*, 666.

(69) See the references to Tg. Ps.-J., Sifre, and Tanḥ. in Jacobson, *A Commentary on Pseudo-Philo's Liber antiquitatum biblicarum*, 666.

(70) Feldman, *The Rewritten Joshua Scrolls from Qumran*, 195.

(71) Dimant, “Two Discourses from the Apocryphon of Joshua and Their Context (4Q378 3 i–ii),” 58.

ii are set in relative proximity to each other, as they are preserved on two subsequent columns. Furthermore, we know that the two passages of text that have come down to us were not immediately connected. As noted above, neither the bottom margin of col. i nor the top margin of col. ii have been preserved. What we do *not* know is how much text has been lost in between. Here, it should be borne in mind that of the twenty-nine fragments of 4Q378, there are only two with a top margin (frgs. 22 i and 27) and none with a bottom margin. That is to say, we would be hard-pressed to estimate the amount of lost text. It might well have been substantial.

Given this state of affairs, the correlation of the two speeches, which is fundamental for interpreting the latter as a response to the former, cannot be taken for granted. It is an assumption and needs to be handled as such. The assumption is certainly possible, and it allows for an appealing interpretation. Yet it cannot provide the basis for that interpretation.

At this point, an interim conclusion can be drawn. While the reasons given by Dimant and Feldman for their interpretation of 4Q378 frg. 3 ii are of varying validity, none of them is conclusive in my view. Nevertheless, this interpretation might still be correct. That is to say, it can neither be proven nor disproven that our fragment testifies to a reworking which turns the answer of the Transjordanian tribes into a speech of the people as a whole. If it were the case, this reworking should probably be accounted for as some sort of early exegesis responding to the exegetical problem inherent in the biblical base text. (72) One might even be tempted to cite this “exegesis” in support of the view that Josh 1:16–18 itself should in fact be construed as an address of all Israel, thus doing justice to the “all Israel” ideology it promotes. (73)

4. An Alternative Interpretation

There is, however, yet another possibility, as the biblical base text also allows for an interpretation—in fact a more convincing one—according to which the answer recorded in Josh 1:16–18 comes from the Transjordanian tribes and at the same time accentuates the notion of “all Israel.” In other words, it can be demonstrated that this discourse, precisely as a pledge of allegiance by two and a half tribes, is also an affirmation of the unity of the people as a whole. (74)

(72) In this vein, see again Feldman, *The Rewritten Joshua Scrolls from Qumran*, 195.

(73) Cf. Feldman, *The Rewritten Joshua Scrolls from Qumran*, 67, note 239, citing Howard, “All Israel’s Response to Joshua.”

(74) As shown in Krause, *Exodus und Eisodus*, 122–124.

To expound this interpretation, we need to recall the context of Josh 1:16–18 as outlined above. (75) Immediately preceding our passage, there is Joshua's emphatic address (vv. 12–15) in which he requests the Transjordanian tribes to obey the pertinent command of Moses (Deut 3:18–20) also under his (Joshua's) new leadership, namely, to support their "brothers" in the conquest of the land west of the Jordan. Against the backdrop of the Deuteronomistic account in Deut 2–3, neither this support nor the acceptance of the new leader as *their* new leader is a matter of course for these tribes. Joshua is commissioned by YHWH to lead the people into the land west of the Jordan. But Reuben, Gad and the half-tribe of Manasseh have already received their lands east of the Jordan. Notably, these lands have been conquered under the leadership of Moses, and they also have been allotted to the two and a half tribes by Moses. This fact is stressed repeatedly. Note, for example, the distinction made in Josh 12:6 // 12:7:

12:6 *Moses*, the servant of YHWH, and the Israelites defeated them [i.e., Sihon and Og, the kings who ruled the land conquered by Israel east of the Jordan]; and *Moses* the servant of YHWH gave their land for a possession to Reuben, Gad and the half-tribe of Manasseh.

12:7 The following are the kings of the land whom *Joshua* and the Israelites defeated on the west side of the Jordan [...]—and *Joshua* gave their land to the tribes of Israel as a possession according to their allotments [...]

No less clear-cut, this distinction is also pronounced in the command of Moses quoted by Joshua. While the land both east and west of the Jordan is said to be given (נתן) by YHWH (Deut 3:18b, 20a, quoted in Josh 1:13b, 15a), when looking at the concrete circumstances of this gift, the wording is at pains to emphasize that the land east of the Jordan has been given (נתן) to the Transjordanian tribes by Moses (Deut 3:19b, 20b, quoted in Josh 1:14a, 15b). (76)

As a result, the Transjordanian tribes are no longer in a position in which they are dependent on Joshua. Rather, it is Joshua who is

(75) See section 2 above.

(76) Bieberstein, *Josua—Jordan—Jericho*, 92; Klaus Bieberstein, "Das Buch Josua und seine Horizonte," in *Das deuteronomistische Geschichtswerk*, ed. Hermann-Josef Stipp, ÖBS 39 (Frankfurt: Lang, 2011), 151–176, here 164. To be sure, LXX Josh 1:14a seems to avoid this notion. However, in light of the carefully crafted wording of the passage and especially the parallel with Deut 3:18–20, it does not commend itself to try and reconstruct a more pristine Hebrew version in this instance. For a full discussion and further literature, see Bieberstein, *Josua—Jordan—Jericho*, 91–92 with note 51 and van der Meer, *Formation and Reformulation*, 232–239.

dependent on them. (77) In any case, the requested support in the conquest west of the Jordan has been agreed upon between these tribes and Moses. Therefore, it is much more than a nice rhetorical move when Joshua quotes his predecessor's command. The word of Moses, which Joshua reiterates without any substantial addition of his own, is in fact the only argument he has. When giving orders for crossing the Jordan, as in Josh 1:11–12, Joshua does so by virtue of his own authority; when requesting the Transjordanian tribes to join this trek, he can only rely on the authority of his deceased predecessor. (78) In employing Moses' command for his own cause, however, Joshua now claims for himself the same all-encompassing authority formerly enjoyed by Moses.

Thus, in the case of the Transjordanian tribes, the acceptance of Joshua as the new leader and the unity of "all Israel" are two sides of the same coin; and both are called into question in light of the imminent conquest of the land west of the Jordan. Whether or not that conquest will be an operation of "all Israel" depends on the willingness of Reuben, Gad and the half-tribe of Manasseh to obey the command of Moses under the new leadership of Joshua. Both issues, the authority of Joshua and the unity of Israel, are resolved in Josh 1:16–18—if read as the response of the Transjordanian tribes. By virtue of their pledge to Joshua, "Just as we obeyed Moses in all things, so we will obey you" (v. 17a), Joshua is accepted as the new leader of *all* Israel, Trans- and Cisjordanian tribes alike; and this, by extension, guarantees that the Cisjordanian conquest will indeed be on operation of all twelve tribes. (79) In short, precisely as a pledge of allegiance of the two and a half tribes, the discourse in question is an affirmation of the unity of the people as a whole.

In light of this fresh reading of the biblical base text, the very same interpretation is also applicable to its reworked version as found on 4Q378 frg. 3 ii. Considering the vital importance of the Transjordanian tribes for the succession of Moses by Joshua as outlined above, it is possible and indeed plausible to reckon with them in the rewritten version of the succession account as well. According to this interpretation, the incompletely preserved discourse should indeed be construed as a response to Joshua, pronounced however by Reuben, Gad and the half-tribe of Manasseh.

(77) Schäfer-Lichtenberger, *Josua und Salomo*, 207.

(78) Schäfer-Lichtenberger, *Josua und Salomo*, 206–207.

(79) For the context and background of this interpretation, that is, for the Transjordanian tribes as an essential topic of the Deuteronomistic account of the Cisjordanian conquest, see again Krause, *Exodus und Eisodus*, 126–131.

Indicative of this alternative interpretation is also an issue which has been noted by Newsom but has not received much attention in the subsequent discussion. In view of ll. 10–11 and their unmistakable affinity with Joshua’s commissioning as new leader (see especially Deut 31:7–8 and Josh 1:5b–6), she rightly remarked that if these lines are understood as part of an address of the people as a whole to Joshua, one has to assume that “the relationship between the people and their leader is construed very differently than in the biblical text.” (80) As astutely observed by Newsom, in the plot of Joshua’s commissioning for the Cisjordanian conquest, which according to Deut 3:28, 31:7–8, and Josh 1:5b–6 is initiated by YHWH, carried out by Moses, and finally confirmed by YHWH, there is no place for such an active role of the people as a whole. In her own approach, Newsom sought to avoid this rather difficult assumption by suggesting a change of speaker “somewhere” in ll. 5–8, ll. 10–11 presenting Joshua as he himself “recalls the words of his commission and encouragement by Moses.” (81) At any rate, this would account for the preposition in l. 8. But in view of the content of ll. 10–11, I concur with Dimant that these words are unlikely in a speech by Joshua himself. (82)

Thus, the problem of how to account for the unexpected relationship between the subject of the discourse and Joshua remains, and it challenges the interpretation proposed by Dimant and Feldman. By contrast, the problem may be readily resolved once one reckons with the possibility that it is the two and a half Transjordanian tribes who address these solemn words to Joshua. For them, as distinct from the people as a whole, it is by no means self-evident that they should accept the authority of the new leader, still less that they, having conquered and taken their lands already, should participate in the imminent conquest on the far side of the Jordan. From them, one can and indeed should expect an address of this kind on the east bank of the Jordan.

5. Conclusion

To conclude, there are two main options for interpreting the piece of “rewritten Bible” found on 4Q378 frg. 3 ii. The first-person plural speech which is preserved in part in this column may be read either as a discourse of the people as a whole or as coming from the two and

(80) Newsom, “4QApocryphon of Joshua,” 246.

(81) Newsom, “4QApocryphon of Joshua,” 245–246.

(82) Dimant, “Two Discourses from the Apocryphon of Joshua and Their Context (4Q378 3 i–ii),” 57. See also Newsom’s comment on l. 9, which points out a further difficulty of her own suggestion: Newsom, “4QApocryphon of Joshua,” 246.

a half Transjordanian tribes. Due to the highly fragmentary state of preservation, neither of these options can be ruled out. However, a fresh reading of the biblical base text may indicate that the latter option is the more likely one.

Joachim J. KRAUSE
Eberhard Karls Universität Tübingen
Evangelisch-Theologische Fakultät