

JOSHUA 24 IN THE LXX: SOME LITERARY AND THEOLOGICAL REMARKS

Johan Wildenboer

Research Associate, Department of Old Testament Studies

University of Pretoria

P. O. Box 16573

Pretoria North, 0116

South Africa

E-mail: johan.wildenboer@gmail.com

(Received 08/03/2016; accepted 15/09/2016)

ABSTRACT

The differences between the MT and LXX texts of Joshua 24 are numerous and complex. In this essay, I will discuss these differences from a theological viewpoint. I will start with the assumption that the MT of Joshua 24 displays a distinctive pro-Samaritan attitude. The aim of this essay is to determine the theological viewpoint of the LXX of Joshua 24 regarding the attitude toward the Samaritan question. I will argue that the LXX of Joshua 24 displays an anti-Samaritan attitude and that it embeds the covenant of Joshua 24 in the broader narrative of apostasy and fall, in sharp contrast to the MT of Joshua 24.

INTRODUCTION

In a previous essay (Wildenboer 2015:484–502), I interpreted Joshua 24 as a text that displays a conciliatory tone toward Samaritans.¹ To put it in perspective, I proposed that the intention of Joshua 24 was to remind Judeans and Samaritans of the prophetic hope of restoration for all of Israel.² This hope lay in the covenant, depicted in Joshua 24. This covenant implied faith in Yahweh, rather than political alliances. I also argued that Joshua 24 interrupts a Deuteronomistic link between Joshua 23 and Judges 2:6–10ff (Römer 2010:97). Joshua 23 embodies a farewell speech by Joshua in the tone of an exhortation to forego contact with the other people of the land. The book of

¹ Nihan (2007:187–223) and Schmid (2012:41–42) has proposed this hypothesis in different ways.

² Joshua 24:2 contains the prophetic formula *כִּי־אָמַר יְהוָה*.

Judges serves as an explanation of the consequences of mixing with other people. Joshua 24 interrupts this sequence to bring a conciliatory attitude toward Samaritans. I based this interpretation of Joshua 24 on the fact that the text is an address to all of Israel,³ the shared traditions⁴ between Judeans and Samaritans in the text, the presence of the *Torat elohim* (תּוֹרַת אֱלֹהִים) rather than the *Torat Moshe* (תּוֹרַת מֹשֶׁה),⁵ and the role of Shechem⁶ in Joshua 24.

Joshua 24 and the Samaritan question

In this essay, I will discuss the role of the other apparent pro-Samaritan texts (Deut 27:4–8, 11–13; Jos 8:30–35) in relation to Joshua 24. I will then focus my attention on the LXX text of Joshua 24 in order to determine its function in the role and function in this debate.

In this section, I will rely heavily on the work done by Nihan (2007:187–223). In his seminal essay, he makes a clarifying and stimulating statement that the Torah was not intended for one group only. From the onset, it was meant for both Judeans and Samaritans (2007:223). He expands this comment with a thorough study of Joshua 24,

³ Joshua 24 is addressed to the כָּל שְׁבֵטֵי וְכָל הָעָם. This implies the northern and southern tribes. At this stage the dating of the text becomes an issue. Although some scholars (Perlitt 1968; Koopmans 1990:401–413; Noort 1998a; Konkel 2008; Frevel 2011) still postulate an early date for the composition of Joshua 24, the majority of scholars prefer a late dating (van Seters 1984; O’Brien 1989; Blum 1990, 1997; Anbar 1992; Schmid 1999). Schmid (2012:41–42) argues that the similarities with priestly vocabulary leads to a conclusion that Joshua 24 should be dated after the priestly document. According to Schmid the priestly document should be dated in the early Persian period. He further argues that Nehemiah 13 corrects the pro-Samaritan stance in Joshua 24, and therefore Joshua 24 should be dated between the priestly document and the book of Nehemiah. This means that Joshua 24 was composed in the Persian period (6 B.C.–4 B.C.). In terms of the addressees of the text, this late dating implies that the text addresses the provinces of Yehud and Samaria in the Persian period.

⁴ The shared traditions include the several references to the Jacob and especially the Joseph narratives, as well as the emphasis on Eleazar, an important figure in Samaritan priestly lineage.

⁵ I propose that the term תּוֹרַת אֱלֹהִים is used in opposition to the תּוֹרַת מֹשֶׁה found in Joshua 23 and other Deuteronomy-inspired texts.

⁶ It is important to note that the LXX reads Shiloh instead of Shechem.

Deuteronomy 27, and Joshua 8:30–35. I will briefly discuss Nihan's contribution.

Two issues dominate the study of Deuteronomy 27 – the composite character of the text, and the divergence between the Masoretic Text (MT) and the Samaritan Pentateuch (SP) regarding the location of the covenant. In the latter case, the SP refers to the location of the covenant as Gerizim, while the MT reads Ebal. Much of the debate surrounding the composition of the text centres on the apparent doublet in vv. 2–3a and 4–8. Verses 2–3a do not refer to the location of the covenant, while 4–8 read Ebal in MT and Gerizim in SP. According to Nihan (2007:203), verses 4–8 are dependent on verses 2–3A. When this textual issue is settled, he postulates two traditions behind Deuteronomy 27: verses 1–3, 9–10 on the one hand, and verses 4–8, 11, and 13 on the other hand. It is important to note that Nihan (2007:208) views the first redaction as a late insertion between Deuteronomy 26:16–18 and Deuteronomy 28.⁷ Furthermore, verses 1–3 correlate with Joshua 4. In other words: the redactor composed verses 1–3 with Joshua 4 in mind. Another crucial point in Nihan's argument is the fact that verses 5–7 (which form part of the second redaction) correspond with Exodus 20:24–26, which forms part of the Covenant Code. This leads Nihan (2007:212) to propose that the Covenant Code and the book of Deuteronomy were not separate entities any more during the time that Deuteronomy 27 was composed. In other words: Deuteronomy 27 was composed after the composition of the Pentateuch. In terms of the reference to mount Ebal in the MT, Nihan (2007:214) concludes that the SP probably retained the original reading. If the SP indeed represents the original reading, it reflects a concession made to Yahwists residing in Samaria at the time of the redaction of the Torah (Nihan 2007:214). Nihan argues that,

⁷ Several scholars support the thesis of Deuteronomy 27 as a late insertion. Albrecht Alt (1978:250–275) already proposed this thesis in a seminal study on the book of Deuteronomy. According to Otto (2000:230–231), Deuteronomy 27 is covered by the Covenant Code which mentions several places of worship (Nihan thus follows Otto in this regard). Fabry (2000:35–52) interprets Deuteronomy 27 as a late attempt by a Judean scribe to reconcile Judeans and proto-Samaritans. Na'aman (2000:141–161), like Nihan, examines Deut 11, 27; Jos 8:30–35 and Jos 24 in relation to each other. He concludes that an Ephraimite scribe composed these texts to support the claim of Shechem as a legitimate place of worship.

because the second redaction of Deuteronomy 27 correlates to the Covenant Code, the covenant on mount Gerizim was legitimate, but only in the sense that the Torah preserves a law authorising multiple sanctuaries that coexists with the centralisation law of Deuteronomy 12. This argument is based on the fact that the Covenant Code does not subscribe to the notion of one sanctuary, but indeed proposes multiple sanctuaries, in stark contrast to the law of centralisation in Deuteronomy 12. The reference to the Covenant Code ignores the issue of the sanctuary, and is thus viewed as a compromise between the two groups over the contentious issue of the legitimate place of worship.

Nihan's comprehensive study takes into account the critical issues, as well as the historical and compositional issues of the text. However, his thesis is challenged by Schorch (2011:23–37) and Schenker (2010:105–121). Schorch challenges the assumption that Deuteronomy 27 is a late insertion into the book of Deuteronomy. He further questions the assumption that Deuteronomy designates mount Gerizim as one possible place of worship. In fact, Schorch proposes that Deuteronomy 27 was composed with the centralisation law of Deuteronomy in mind. Schenker turns his attention to the centralisation formula in Deuteronomy 12 and notes the divergence between the verb בחר "He has chosen" (SP) and יבחר "He will choose" (MT). In the SP Yahweh has chosen one place of worship, and in Deuteronomy 27:4 the specific place of worship is identified with mount Gerizim. Schorch also uses this argument to propose that the proto-MT text changed the verb from past to future tense only in Hasmonean times when the place of worship became an issue. Schorch and Schenker propose that the book of Deuteronomy was composed in the north in order to legitimise mount Gerizim as a place of worship. After the Assyrian invasion, the book of Deuteronomy found its way to the south where it achieved an authoritative status. The ensuing struggle over the legitimate place of worship in Hasmonean times forced the scribes to change the verb in Deuteronomy 12 from the past to future tense. The same scribes also changed the original reading of Mount Gerizim in Deuteronomy 27:4 to Ebal, in order to legitimise the role of Jerusalem as the legitimate place of worship. The problem with this proposal is twofold:

- The hypothesis of Deuteronomy 27 as a late insertion seems to be well grounded. Deuteronomy 27:9–10 repeats Deuteronomy 26:16–18 in reverse order, thereby strengthening the case for a *Wiederaufnahme* (Nihan 2007:207). The point of this *Wiederaufnahme* is probably to introduce additional material in Deuteronomy 27. Furthermore, Deuteronomy 27:1–3 correlates with Joshua 4. In fact, it seems to reinterpret the account of Joshua 4.⁸
- If the centralisation formula of Deuteronomy 12 does not leave the issue of the place of worship open (as the future tense suggests), the reforms of King Josiah (based on the centralisation formula) become untenable. The reforms only make sense in the context of the future tense (יבחר). The proposal put forward by Schorch and Schenker, that the SP represents the original reading, and that the past tense (בחר) was only changed to future tense (יבחר) around 2 B.C. seems improbable on historical grounds.

Nihan's claim that Deuteronomy 27 introduces a conciliatory attitude toward the Samaritans seems well-founded. He expands this thesis with reference to Joshua 8:30–35. In Joshua 8:30–35 the covenant, which includes the Levites and the ark, is consummated on Mount Ebal. Several scholars (Hölscher 1922:220; Noth 1953:51; Nielsen 1955:75–80; Rudolph 1938:198–199; Rofé 1994:76; Noort 1998b:140–141; van der Meer 2004:498–511) view Joshua 8:30–35 as a later text than Deuteronomy 27, and therefore they conclude that it is from a different hand than Deuteronomy 27.⁹ Joshua 8:30–35 follows the instructions of Deuteronomy 27, but introduces several priestly motives. The public reading of the ספר התורה, and the allusion that it was preserved in the ark, corresponds to Deuteronomy 31:24–26. Nihan proposes that the

⁸ The interpolation of Deut 27:1–3 and 9–10 means that the stones are to be inscribed with the Torah of Moses (דברי התורה הזאת). This concept is absent in Joshua 4. Nihan proposes that the first redaction of Deut 27 brings the account of the erection of the stones in Jos 4 in line with the ancient practice of claiming one's rights over an estate. Deuteronomy then becomes a legal document that legitimises Israel's claim over the land (Nihan 2007:208).

⁹ Na'aman (2000:155, 159) takes the opposite position. He argues that the perceived pro-Samaritan texts (Deut 27; Jos 8:30–35; 24) are all from the same hand. This position seems untenable, because Jos 24 seems to contradict the Deuteronomistic term תורת משה with תורת אלהים. The relationship between these pro-Samaritan texts seems to be more complex.

location of the covenant at mount Ebal functions as an anti-Samaritan claim. At this late stage, no more concessions are made to the Samaritans. Not only is Joshua 8:30–35 composed from a Jerusalem position, it serves as the origin of the Ebal tradition. In other words: the change of Gerizim to Ebal in Deuteronomy 27 is based on Joshua 8:30–35.

Nihan succeeds in relating Joshua 24, Deuteronomy 27 and Joshua 8:30–35 on textual and historical levels. He shifts the focus from the composition of these texts to the late scribal redaction. Joshua 24 embodies an attempt to reconcile the Judeans and the Samaritans, but as the relationship between these groups deteriorated, the texts that followed became more anti-Samaritan in nature. Although this approach explains the role and function of Joshua 24 in relation to other texts, it still does not address the question regarding the role and function of the LXX version of Joshua 24. This question forms the next part of this study.

JOSHUA 24 IN THE LXX: METHODOLOGICAL ISSUES

The striking differences between the MT and LXX versions of the book of Joshua are well attested.¹⁰ This holds true for Joshua 24 where many differences between the MT and LXX occur.¹¹ When interpreting these differences, the particular viewpoint of the exegete plays an important and decisive role. Traditionally the discussion regarding the LXX falls within the methodological framework of textual criticism. As Tov

¹⁰ The differences between the LXX and MT versions of the book of Joshua are not as comprehensive as in the book of Jeremiah, but the differences in the book of Joshua results in two different books. It is important to note that 4QJosh^b, found in Qumran, also differs considerably from the MT version.

¹¹ These differences include the following:

- The LXX does not mention Moses and Aaron in verse 5.
- The LXX names Shiloh as the location of the covenant in Chapter 24, not Shechem as in the MT.
- Verse 25 (LXX) alludes to idol worship. This reference is absent in the MT.
- The reference to the flint knives in verse 31a reinforces the idea of idolatry.
- The LXX adds the extensive plus in verse 33b.

(1999:385) observes, however, the particular role and function of textual criticism is rather ambiguous. So, for instance, the LXX is often relegated to a mere textual witness. This means that the role of the exegete is to determine the priority of one textual witness over the other. Some scholars (Dillman 1886; Margolis 1931; Soggin 1972; Woudstra 1981; Butler 1983) argue that the MT of the book of Joshua represents the more original text, while others regard the LXX as preserving an earlier, more original Hebrew *Vorlage* (Holmes 1914; Orlinsky 1969:187–195; Auld 1998; Rofé 1993:87–85; Mazor 1994:28–39). The methodological approach of using textual criticism to determine the oldest, most reliable text is in line with the traditional definition of textual criticism (Waltke 2001:42). However, according to Tov (1999:385), this definition is not only too narrow, but it is used in a very inconsistent and incoherent way. He argues that most scholars devaluate the role of the LXX in the book of Joshua to textual criticism only, and therefore they ascribe most divergence in the LXX to haplography and *homoioteleuton*.¹² He states: “The approach of these scholars is eclectic: some deviations in the LXX are ascribed to the translator, while some are recognised as reflecting possible original readings, especially when they comply with the scholar’s views on the original form of the book” (Tov 1999: 385).

Tov (1999:385) takes a different approach to this problem. He states that the LXX version of Joshua is not only relevant in terms of textual criticism, but also for literary criticism.¹³ He concludes his detailed study with the hypothesis that the differences

¹² Some scholars define the LXX deviations in the context of textual corruption (Dillmann 1886; Margolis 1931), while others view the LXX as a product of scribal activity (van der Kooij 1998:228–229; Bieberstein 1995; Rösel 2002:5–23). In the latter instance, there is a tendency to describe redaction criticism in the context of scribal activity.

¹³ This view is strengthened by studies from Rofé (2000:462–474) and Mazor (1988:1–26). Rofé’s investigation into the extensive plus in the LXX of Joshua 24:33b leads him to conclude that the LXX preserves a more original link between the books of Joshua and Judges. In terms of literary criticism, this means that the books of Joshua and Judges were once connected. The MT does not preserve the original link, in order to separate the books. In another study (Rofé 1985:131–147, on the cities of refuge in Jos 20:4–6), Rofé concludes that the LXX only preserves a reference to the priestly code in Num 35:9–34, while the MT adds a reference to Deuteronomy 19:1–13. Mazor (1988:1–26) provides new insights on the literary growth of the book of Joshua by investigating several passages in the book of Joshua with emphasis on the difference between the MT and LXX versions.

between the MT and LXX do not constitute textual differences, but rather point to different editions of the book. Furthermore, Tov (1999:395) proposes that the MT expanded a shorter text, similar to the LXX. Tov's views on different editions of the book of Joshua, and especially his comment regarding the role of the LXX for literary criticism, is supported by Dozeman (2011:185–211). According to Dozeman (2011:185) the identification of literary works has become the most important aspect in Old Testament exegesis. Throughout the modern era the attention has shifted from the hypothesis of a Hexateuch¹⁴ to a Deuteronomistic History¹⁵, and today there is new emphasis on a literary Hexateuch,¹⁶ albeit in a different form than previously. Dozeman rightly observes that the book of Joshua plays an important role in all the literary contexts.¹⁷ He also expands Tov's comments on the value of the LXX for literary criticism by espousing the shift towards redaction criticism to identify the literary contexts of the Old Testament. Whereas source criticism, tradition criticism, as well as transmission history focussed on the growth of the text, redaction criticism starts with the "given text" (Dozeman 2011:187). In the context of the book of Joshua, Dozeman uses redaction criticism to determine the relationship between the book of Joshua and the Former Prophets. At the same time this endeavour can bring new

¹⁴ This hypothesis of a Hexateuch was built on source criticism. In other words: the sources (J, E, P, and D) which presumably shaped the literary character of the Pentateuch, continue into the book of Joshua.

¹⁵ The hypothesis of a Deuteronomistic History, originally postulated by Martin Noth in 1943, has diminished in modern times, although Römer (2007) has made a very convincing case for a revised hypothesis of Noth's thesis.

¹⁶ Otto (2000), Römer & Brettler (2000:2010), and Achenbach (2005:122–154) offer new insights into the concept of a Hexateuch. Their respective theories, which show some agreement, build on the concept of shifting realities of a Pentateuch (which ends with Deuteronomy) and a Hexateuch (which ends in Joshua). This Hexateuch is dated to the Persian era, and shows post-priestly and post-Deuteronomistic influences.

¹⁷ According to Kratz (2005:133–149), Joshua 2 provides the end of a conquest narrative which started in Exodus. Schmid (1999) interprets Joshua 24 as a hinge between Israel's *Heilsgeschichte* (the Pentateuch) and its *Unheilsgeschichte* (the historical books), thereby creating an Enneateuch. Blum (2006:89–106; 2011:43–71) regards Joshua 24 as a weak attempt to create a Hexateuch (Torah of God) in reaction to the Torah of Moses. Knauf (2007:217–224) and Nihan (2012:105–109) identify a conquest narrative which starts in Exodus and ends in Joshua 10 and 11 respectively.

perspectives on the growth and composition of the larger literary works (Pentateuch, Hexateuch, and Deuteronomistic History). The question is whether it is possible at all to determine the final form of a text.¹⁸ This leads Dozeman to the same conclusion as Krüger (2007:57–58) and Becker (2006:46–47), namely that the study of the final form of a text should include a hybrid approach which acknowledges textual criticism as part of the process, rather than an isolated and preliminary step.

Dozeman's study corroborates that of Tov, in the sense that Dozeman supports Tov's statement regarding the merging of textual and literary criticism. Dozeman also expands Tov's second statement regarding the fact that the LXX and MT versions of a text can represent different editions of a book, each with a unique theological viewpoint.¹⁹ In this case Dozeman (2011:205–206) points to different portraits of Moses, as well as divergent views on the authority of the Torah. This leads Dozeman to define the role of editors as creative authors. In the traditional sense of the word, a redactor is someone who preserves old traditions. According to Dozeman's broader definition, scribes and redactors were actively and creatively involved in the composition of the text (Dozeman 2011:204).

This discussion reaffirms the importance of the LXX in the book of Joshua. The concept of two different editions of a book, rather than mere textual differences between textual witnesses, will also be explored in this study. The aim of this study is to determine the position of the LXX in Joshua 24 regarding the attitude toward the Samaritans in relation to the MT of Joshua 24 which seems to exhibit a positive and even reconciliatory attitude toward the Samaritans. The differences between the MT

¹⁸ Krüger (2007:57–58) notes that any redaction critical study based on the “final form” of a text must include the use of textual criticism, a once separate field of study to “identify the *Tendenz* of the late editors or authors”. Becker (2006:46–47) concurs with his comment that a final redaction of the book of Joshua merges textual and literary criticism, because of the divergent readings in other textual witnesses such as the LXX and Dead Sea Scrolls

¹⁹ According to Ulrich (1996:89–90), textual criticism is part of the process that results in different editions of the book. He describes variant literary editions as texts or even whole books that appear “in two or more parallel forms ... which one author, major redactor [or] major editor completed and which a subsequent redactor or editor intentionally changed to a sufficient extent that the resultant form should be called a revised edition of that text.”

and LXX of Joshua will be explored, as well as the context(s) of the scribes or redactors behind these texts.

JOSHUA 24 IN THE LXX: EXEGETICAL ISSUES

I would like to propose that the LXX version of Joshua 24 represents an anti-Samaritan tendency, as opposed to the MT version of Joshua 24. I am of the opinion that anti-Samaritan claims can be traced in the composition and content of the LXX version of Joshua 24. I would like to expand this hypothesis with the following discussion:

- The emphasis on Shiloh (LXX) as location of Joshua 24, as opposed to Shechem (MT).
- An allusion to idolatry in Joshua 24:26 (absent in MT).
- The divergence between the MT and LXX regarding the sequence of events in verses 28–33 and extra content, which include references to the burial of the flint knives, the burial of Phineas (absent in the MT) as well as a reference to the ark of the covenant (absent in MT).
- Minor pluses and minuses in the LXX, which include the omission of the names of Moses and Aaron, as well as the omission of verse 19–22, which forms an important part of the MT version of the covenant ceremony.

The emphasis on Shiloh

Several scholars (Rösel 2002:19; Hjelm 2002:1–12; Anbar 1992:30) hold the opinion that the LXX reading of Shiloh in Joshua 24:1, 25 exhibits an anti-Samaritan attitude. This view is strengthened by the observation that Shiloh is always presented in a negative light by Samaritan literature (Hjelm 2002:1). Although one can argue that the LXX reference to Shiloh serves to harmonise Joshua 24 with Joshua 18:1; 19: 51; 21:2; 22:9, 12 and Judg 18:31; 21:12–24, the LXX is the only text witness that refers to Shiloh. Although the matter of determining the original reading is a contentious issue, it is worth noting that Joseph's bones are buried at Shechem in the LXX, as is

the case in the MT version of Joshua 24. Knauf (2008:195) notes that it is logical to assume that the renewal of the ceremony would take place at the place where Joseph's bones have been buried. The theological motive of the Shiloh reading is important. The LXX reading of Shiloh makes sense when one considers the idea that Shiloh was elected by Yahweh, but later supplanted by Jerusalem due to the apostasy practised (Psalm 78; Jer 7). According to Jeremiah 7, the curse against Shiloh can only be removed by a return to the Law.²⁰ The negative role of Shiloh is explicitly alluded to in 1 Samuel 1–4, after which the ark eventually found a place in Jerusalem. This is strengthened by the reference to σκηνης τοῦ θεοῦ Ἰσραηλ in Joshua 24:25 (absent in the MT) which links to the book of Samuel, where Shiloh functions as the legitimate place of worship before the move to Jerusalem (Rösel 2002:19). This amplifies the hypothesis that the covenant in Joshua 24 and in the LXX, as well as in this case the reference to Shiloh, requires to be read in a broader framework of a negative narrative of apostasy and fall.

Allusion to idolatry in Joshua 24:26

In Joshua 24:26, Joshua takes a large stone and erects it under the holy oak tree as a sign of the covenant. Although the MT does not use the term מצבה, it is implied. This is problematic, because this creates the impression that Joshua takes part in covenant-making on a high place, which denotes the prohibited practice of idolatry in Deuteronomy and the Former Prophets. The covenant takes place in a sanctuary (יהוה בקדש). The LXX however, implies that the ceremony takes place before a statue of Jahweh (ἀπέναντι κυρίου) which is of course prohibited in the Decalogue (Exod 20:4; Deut 5:8). Pakkala postulates that the Hebrew *Vorlage* originally read לפני יהוה, because the MT in Joshua 24:1 reads לפני יהוה, where the LXX equivalent reads ἀπέναντι κυρίου. According to Pakkala (2013:198), this implies that the MT omitted

²⁰ Ps 78 is described as a משכיל. This is often interpreted as a wisdom or even didactic term (Tate 1990:33). In Ps 78:2 the term משל is used. This reinforces the idea that the Psalm functions as a lesson or a parable (Tate 1990:281) In Joshua 24, Shiloh seems to be used as a polemic against any place of worship other than Jerusalem. This of course can be interpreted as a hidden polemic against Shechem.

the offensive allusion to idolatry in Joshua 24:26. Although Pakkala makes a compelling case, I would like to propose that the references to idolatry in Joshua 24:26 falls in the same category as the flint knives in verse 31a, namely that they aim to put the covenant in a negative light. Put differently, the events of Joshua 24 play an important role in the history of apostasy that follows in the book of Judges, and even Kings.

Sequence of events and extra material in Joshua 24:29–33b

The following table (Dozeman 2011:197–198) illustrates the difference between the MT and LXX versions of Joshua 24:29–33b in terms of sequence and content:

Joshua 24:29–33 (MT)

Joshua 24:29–33(LXX)

28	Departure of the Israelites Joshua sent the people away to their inheritances	28	Departure of the Israelites. Iesous sent the people away and they went each to his place.
		29	Faithfulness of the Israelites And Israel served the Lord all the days of Iesous and all the days of the elders during the time of Iesous and who knew all the work of the Lord, which he did for Israel.
29	Burial of Joshua And after these words, Joshua the son of Nun the servant of YHWH died. He was one hundred and ten years old.	30	Burial of Iesous And it happened after these things, Iesous the son of Naue the servant of the Lord died, one hundred and ten years old.
30	And they buried him in the territory of his inheritance in Timnath-serah, which is in the highland of Ephraim, north of Mount Gaash.	31	And they buried him at the border of his allotment in Thamnatharaschara in the highland of Ephraim from the north of Mount Gaas.
		31a	There they placed with him in the tomb in which they buried him, the flint knives with which he circumcised the sons of Israel at Galgala, when he led them out of Egypt as the Lord commanded them. And there they are until this day.

31	<p>Faithfulness of the Israelites Israel served YHWH all the days of Joshua and all the days of the elders whose days extended beyond Joshua, and who knew the work that YHWH did for Israel.</p>		
32	<p>Burial of Joseph’s Bones 32 The bones of Joseph that the Israelites brought up from Egypt were buried in Shechem in the section of the field that Jacob bought from the sons of Hamor, the father of Shechem for one hundred Qesitah. They belonged to the sons of Joseph as an inheritance.</p>	32	<p>Burial of Joseph’s Bones And the bones of Joseph the sons of Israel brought up from Egypt and buried in Sikima in the part of the field which Jacob brought from the Amorites who dwelt in Sikima for one hundred ewe-lambs. And he gave it to Joseph as a portion.</p>
33	<p>Burial of Eleazar And Eleazar the son of Aaron died. And they buried him in Gibeah of Phinehas his son, which was given to him in the highland of Ephraim.</p>	33	<p>Burial of Eleazar And it happened after this, Eleazar the son of Aaron, the high priest died and was buried in Gabaath of Phinees of his son, which he gave him in the highland of Ephraim.</p>
		33a	<p>Burial of Phinees 33a On that day the sons of Israel took the ark of God and carried it around in their midst. And Phinees was priest after his father Eleazar until he died and was buried at Gabaath, which belonged to him.</p>
		33b	<p>Departure of the Israelites 33b The sons of Israel departed each to his own place and to his own city.</p>
			<p>Unfaithfulness of the Israelites And the sons of Israel worshipped Ashtaroth and the gods of the nations around about them. And the Lord gave them over to the hand of Eglon the king of Moab. And he ruled over them for eighteen years.</p>

The difference between the two, apart from the extra burial in the LXX, namely that of Phineas, concerns the order of events. In the LXX the people are dismissed twice, and we have a reference to the faithfulness of Joshua’s generation as well as a note on the unfaithfulness after the death of Eleazar and Phineas.

Dozeman (2011:185–209) expands these comments in the following way. His study includes a comparison of the LXX version and MT versions with regard to sequence and content. Because Dozeman is interested in the literary contexts of the MT and LXX versions, the redactional-critical aspect which undergirds an investigation into the sequence of events is of little importance to him.²¹ Instead, Dozeman remains focussed on the difference in content between the respective versions. In terms of content, Dozeman interprets the difference between the versions in terms of the faithfulness of Joshua's generation versus the unfaithfulness of the subsequent generation. The MT version ends with the burials of Joshua and Eleazar, while the LXX extends the timeline to include the burial of Phineas. After the burial of Phineas the people are dismissed for a second time to their tribal lands, and then follows a story of unfaithfulness which leads to oppression under king Eglon (Judges 3:12). According to Dozeman (2011:2014–206) the final form of the MT of Joshua 24 seems to disassociate the books of Joshua and Judges, but the double report of Joshua's death (Jos 24:28–31; Judg 2:6–9) provides a link between the books.²² This link, however, is limited once again to the faithfulness of Joshua's generation, which is coloured in a positive manner. This is in sharp contrast to the LXX, which ties the books of Joshua and Judges closer together.²³ The LXX adds the reference to the ark, which forms a link to Judges 20:28 where Phineas and the ark are once again mentioned together. The reference to the flint knives (v. 31a) further reinforces the idea of apostasy and even idolatry. Rofé (1994:24–25) interprets the LXX plus as original, while the MT removes it because of the offensive nature of relic-worship.

²¹ Other scholars focus extensively on the redaction and literary-critical context which is important in determining the priority of one version over the other. Nelson (1997:281), for instance, deems the MT sequence of events to be original. First he points to the introduction to verse 29 (LXX) which reads “after these events”. This sequence seems improbable, because “after these events” links logically to verse 28, but seems out of place after verse 32. The words “after these events” is also absent in Judges 2:8.

²² According to Levin (2011:138) the books of Joshua and Judges were once connected. In other words: the double report of Joshua's death aims to disassociate books that were once linked, not the other way around as suggested by Dozeman.

²³ Dines (2004:16) confirms this theory in a detailed study of the Septuagint.

Nelson (1997:281) takes the opposite view. He states that these folkloric and midrashic elements are to be expected in later expansions. I would like to postulate that the reference to the flint knives aims to expand the negative view of the covenant in Joshua 24. I am convinced that this is in line with the following books, which amplify the narrative of apostasy and fall.

Dozeman (2011:197–199) also mentions that the difference in sequence makes sense in the respective contexts of the MT and LXX editions. The topic of apostasy and loyalty is central to the book of Judges, and therefore it is important to raise the topic after the people's dismissal and before the death of Joshua. The MT text however, links the faithfulness of the people directly to the person and leadership of Joshua, and therefore it is mentioned after Joshua's death.

I would like to expand Dozeman's comments by adding that the content of the plus of Joshua 24:33b not only ties the link with the book of Judges and the subsequent story of apostasy and fall,²⁴ but that the sequence of events also serves to elevate the position of Phineas in the LXX version. It is worth noting that Phineas plays an important part in the lineage of the Samaritan high priests (Babota 2013:281). In fact, the temple at Gerizim, the cultic calendar, and the office of the high priesthood seems to be rooted in the figure of Phineas.²⁵ The MT version of Joshua 24, in sharp contrast to the LXX, ends with a reference to Eleazar, but this reference paints Eleazar, who also plays an important part in Samaritan history, in a positive light. The emphasis on the role of Phineas in the LXX seems to associate the Samaritans with the broader story of apostasy and fall.

²⁴ According to Dozeman (2011:209) the literary horizon of the LXX could easily stretch as far as the book of Maccabees. In other words, the LXX forms a continuous history that stretches far beyond the parameters of a Pentateuch, Hexateuch or Enneateuch.

²⁵ Phineas' important position in the Samaritan history and cult is probably based on the passages in the Samaritan Torah where he is depicted as the only grandson of Aaron via Eleazar (Exod 6:23–26; Num 25:1–13).

Minor pluses and minuses in Joshua 24:1–33b

The minus in the LXX version of Joshua 24:5, where the reference to Moses and Aaron is absent, furthers the link between Joshua 24 and the *Unheilsgeschichte* that follows, and at the same time disassociates it with the preceding books, which represents Israel's *Heilsgeschichte*, which is represented by the generation of Moses and Aaron.

The minus in Joshua 24:22 is more complex. Several scholars (Aurelius 2003:100; Römer 2010:98) argue that verses 19–21 (MT) constitute a late insertion, because Joshua's warning of the people's inability to adhere to the covenant negates the whole idea of the covenant in the first place. In terms of the LXX, these verses link Joshua 24 to the unfaithfulness of the book of Judges and the rest of Israel's history of apostasy, which led to the Babylonian exile. Verse 22, which displays the people's confirmation of the covenant, is missing in the LXX. This reinforces the idea that the people were never committed to the covenant, and furthers the negative view of the covenant in LXX of Joshua 24.

CONCLUSION

This study confirms the complex textual history of Joshua 24. The MT and LXX offer different versions of the book of Joshua, while 4QJoshua^a seems to offer a third edition. I followed the direction of Dozeman (2011:209) who states that the critic has to decide which version of the final form of Joshua will be the starting point to determine the composition of the book and its relationship with the Pentateuch and Former Prophets. However, I chose to interpret Joshua 24 in the theological and literary context of the broader question of the relationship between Judeans and Samaritans. This study, with emphasis on Shiloh as the location of the covenant, as well as the plus in Joshua 24:33b and the various minor pluses and minuses, confirms the fact that the LXX version of Joshua 24 exhibits a negative attitude toward Samaritans. Furthermore, the scribes responsible for this specific version of Joshua 24

did their best to tie this chapter to the broader narrative of apostasy and fall, thereby casting a judgement on the Samaritans and their religious practices.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Achenbach, R 2005. Pentateuch, Hexateuch und Enneateuch. Eine Verhältnisbestimmung, *ZAR* 11:122–154.
- Alt, A 1978.⁴ Das Heimat des Deuteronomiums, in Alt 1978⁴:250–275.
- Alt, A 1978⁴. *Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, 2. Band. München: Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung.
- Anbar, M 1992. *Josué et l'alliance de Sichem (Josué 24:1–28)* Beiträge zur biblischen Exegese und Theologie 25. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.
- Anderson, G W (ed.) 1968. *Congress volume: Rome 1968*. VTSup 17. Leiden: Brill.
- Auld, A G 1998. *Joshua retold: synoptic perspectives*. OTS. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.
- Aurelius, E 2003. *Zukunft jenseits des Gerichts: Eine redaktions-Geschichtliche Studie zum Enneateuch*. BZAW 319. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Babota, V 2013. *The institution of the Hasmonean high priesthood*. Supplement to the Journal for the Study of Judaism vol. 165. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- Barrick, W B & Spencer, J R (eds) 1984. *In the shelter of Elyon: essays on ancient Palestinian life in honour of GW Ahlström*. JSOTSup 31. Sheffield: JSOT Press.
- Becker, U 2006. Endredaktionelle Kontextvernetzungen des Josua-Buches, in Witte, Schmid, Prechel and Gertz 2006:139–161.
- Bieberstein, K 1995 *Josua-Jordan-Jericho. Archäologie, Geschichte und Theologie der Landnahmeerzählungen Josua 1–6*. OBO. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Blum, E 1990. *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*. BZAW 189. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter.
- _____ 1997. Die Kompositionelle Knoten am Übergang von Josua zu Richter: Ein Entflechtungsvorschlag, in Lust and Vervenne 1997:181–212.
- _____ 2006. The literary connection between the books of Genesis and Exodus and the end of the book of Joshua, in Dozeman and Schmid 2006:80–106.
- _____ 2011. Pentateuch-Hexateuch-Enneateuch, in Dozeman, Römer and Schmid 2011:43–71.
- Brooke, G J (ed.) 1994. *New Qumran texts and studies. Proceedings of the First Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies*. STDJ 15. Leiden: Brill.
- Butler, T C 1983. *Joshua*. WBC 7. Waco, Texas: Word Books Publisher.
- Dahmen, U, Lange, A & Lichtenberger, H (eds) 2000. *Die Textfunde vom Toten Meer und der Text der Hebräischen Bibel*. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchen Verlag
- Dillman, A 1886. *Die Bücher Numeri, Deuteronomium und Josue*. Leipzig: Hirzel.
- Dines, J M 2004. *The Septuagint*. New York: T&T Clark.
- Dozeman, T B 2011. The Book of Joshua as intertext in the MT and LXX canons, in Dozeman, Römer and Schmid 2011:185–211.
- Dozeman, T B & Schmid, K (eds) 2006. *Farewell to the Yahwist? The composition of the Pentateuch in recent European discussion*. SBL Symposium Series 34. Atlanta: SBL.
- Dozeman, T B, Römer, T C & Schmid, K (eds) 2011. *Pentateuch, Hexateuch, or Enneateuch. Identifying literary works in Genesis through Kings*. SBL 8. Atlanta: SBL.

- Fabry, H J 2000. Der Altarbau der Samaritaner-ein Produkt der Text-und literaturgeschichte?, in Dahmen, Lange & Lichtenberger 2000:35–52.
- Flint, P W (ed.) 2001. *Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and related literature*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Frevel, C 2011. Die Wiederkehr der Hexateuchperspektive. Eine Herausforderung für die These vom Deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerk, in Stipp 2011:13–53.
- Frey J, Schattnner-Rieser, U & Schmid K (eds) 2012. *Die Samaritaner und die Bibel: Historische und literarische Wechselwirkungen zwischen biblischen und Samaritanischen Traditionen*. Studia Judaica/Studia Samaritana 7. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter.
- Garcia Martinez, F & Noort, E (eds) 1998. *Perspective in the study of the Old Testament and early Judaism: a symposium in honour of Adam S. van der Woude on the occasion of his 70th Birthday*. VTSup 73. Leiden: Brill.
- Hjelm, I 2002. Shiloh and Shechem: competing traditions? Paper for SBL Berlin 2002. Available: www.theSamaritanUpdate.com. [Accessed 2015/03/01.]
- Hölscher, G 1922. Ursprung des Deuteronomiums, ZAW 40:161–255.
- Holmes, S 1914. *Joshua: the Hebrew and Greek texts*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Knauf, EA 2007. Buchschlüsse im Josuabuch, in Römer and Schmid 2007:217–224.
 _____ 2008. *Josua*. ZBKAT 6. Zurich: Theologischer Verlag.
- Knoppers, G N & McConville, J G (eds) 2000. *Reconsidering Israel and Judah: recent studies on the Deuteronomistic History*. SBTS 8. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.
- Konkel, M 2008. *Sünde und Vergebung: Eine Rekonstruktion der Redaktionsgeschichte der hinterein Sinaiperikope (Ex 32–34). Vor dem Hintergrund aktueller Pentateuchmodelle*. FAT 88. Tübingen: Mohr.
- Koopmans, W T 1990. *Joshua 24 as poetic narrative*. JSOTSup 93. Sheffield: JSOT Press.
- Kratz, R G 2005. *The composition of the narrative books of the Old Testament* (trans. J. Bowden). New York: T&T Clark.
- Krüger, T 2007. Anmerkungen zur Frage nach den Redaktionen der Grossen Erzählwerke im Alten Testament, in Römer and Schmid 2007:47–66.
- Levin, C 2011. On the cohesion and separation of books within the Enneateuch, in Dozeman, Römer and Schmid 2011:127–154.
- Levinson, B M & Knoppers, G N (eds) 2007. *The Pentateuch as Torah: new models for understanding its promulgence and its acceptance*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.
- Lust, J & Vervenne, M (eds) 1997. *Deuteronomy and Deuteronomistic literature*. BETL 133. Leuven: Peeters.
- Margolis, A 1931–36. *The book of Joshua in Greek*. Paris: Geuthner.
- Mazor, L 1988. The origin and evolution of the curse on the rebuilder of Jericho – a contribution of textual criticism to biblical historiography, *Textus* 14:1–26.
 _____ 1994. The Septuagint translation of the book of Joshua. Abstract of thesis submitted for the degree Doctor of Philosophy to the Senate of the Hebrew University, Jerusalem. BIOSCS 27.
- Mckenzie, S L & Römer, T C 2000. *Rethinking the foundation: historiography in the ancient world and in the Bible. Essays in honour of John van Seters*. BZAW 294. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Merklein H, Müller, K & Stemberger, G (eds) 1993. *Bibel in jüdischer und christlicher Tradition: Festschrift für Johann Maier zum 60. Geburtstag*. BBB 88. Bonn: Hahn.
- Mor, M & Reiterer, F V (eds) 2010. *Samaritans: past and present. Current studies*. Berlin: de Gruyter.

- Na'aman, N 2000. The law of the altar in Deuteronomy, in Mckenzie and Römer 2000:141–161.
- Nelson, R D 1997. *Joshua: a commentary*. OTL. Louisville: Westminster John Knox.
- Nielsen, E 1955. *Shechem: a traditio-historical investigation*. Copenhagen: Gad.
- Nihan, C 2007. The Torah between Samaria and Judah: Shechem and Gerizim in Deuteronomy and Joshua, in Levinson and Knoppers 2007:187–223.
- _____ 2012. The literary relationship between Deuteronomy and Joshua: a reassessment, in Schmid and Person 2012: 79–114.
- Noll, K L & Schramm, B (eds) 2010. *Raising a faithful exegete: essays in honour of Richard Nelson*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.
- Noort, E 1998a. Zu Stand und Perspektiven: Der Glaube Israels zwischen Religionsgeschichte und Theologie, der Fall Josua 24, in García-Martinez 1998:82–108.
- _____ 1998b. 4QJosh^a and the history of tradition in the book of Joshua, *JNSL* 24/2:127–144.
- Noth, M 1953.² *Das Buch Josua*. HAT 7. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- O' Brien, M A 1989. *The Deuteronomistic History hypothesis: a reassessment*. OBO 92. Fribourg: Éditions. Universitaires/Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Orlinsky, H M 1969. The Hebrew Vorlage of the Septuagint of the Book of Joshua, in Anderson 1969:187–195.
- Otto, E 2000. *Das Deuteronomium im Pentateuch und Hexateuch. Studien zur Literaturgeschichte von Pentateuch und Hexateuch im Lichte des Deuteronomiumrahmens*. FAT 30. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Pakkala, J 2013. *God's word omitted: omissions in the transmission of the Hebrew Bible*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Parry, D W & Ricks, S D (eds) 1996. *Current research and technological developments on the Dead Sea Scrolls: conference on the texts from the Judean Desert, Jerusalem, 30 April 1995*. STD 20. Leiden: Brill.
- Perlitt, L 1968. *Bundestheologie im Alten Testament*. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag.
- Rofé, A 1985. Joshua 20 – historico-literary criticism illustrated, in Tigay 1985:131–147.
- _____ 1993. The piety of the Torah-disciples at the winding-up of the Hebrew Bible: Josh 1:8; Ps 1:2; Isa 59:21, in Merklein, Müller & Stemberger 1993:78–85.
- _____ 1994. The editing of the book of Joshua in the light of 4QJosh^a, in Brooke 1994:73–80.
- _____ 2000. Ephraimite versus Deuteronomistic history, in Knoppers and McConville 2000:462–474
- Römer, T C & Brettler, M Z 2000. Deuteronomy 34 and the case for a Persian Hexateuch, *JBL* 119/3:401–419.
- Römer T C 2007. *The so-called Deuteronomistic History: a sociological, historical and literary introduction*. London: T&T Clark.
- _____ 2010. Book-endings in Joshua and the question of the so-called Deuteronomistic History, in Noll and Schramm 2010:85–99.
- Römer, T C & Schmid, K (eds) 2007. *Les dernières rédactions du Pentateuque, de l'Hexateuque, et de l'Henneatuege*. BETL 203. Leuven: Peeters.
- Rösel, M 2002. The Septuagint version of the book of Joshua, *SJOT* 16:5–23.
- Rudolph, W 1938. *Der "Elohist" von Exodus bis Josua*. BZAW 68. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Schenker, A 2010. Textgeschichtliches zum Samaritaniscsher Pentateuch und Samareitikon: Zur Textgeschichte zum Pentateuchs im 2. Jh.v.Chr, in Mor and Reiterer 2010:105–121.
- Schmid, K 1999. *Erzväter und Exodus: Untersuchungen zur doppelten Begründung der*

- Ursprünge Israels innerhalb der Geschichtsbücher des Alten Testaments*. WMANT 81. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag.
- _____ 2012. Die Samaritaner und die Judaer. Die biblische Diskussion um ihr Verhältnis in Josua 24, in Frey, Schattner-Rieser & Schmid 2012:21–49.
- Schmid, K & Person, R (eds) 2012. *Deuteronomy in the Pentateuch, Hexateuch, and the Deuteronomistic History*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Schorch, S 2011. The Samaritan version of Deuteronomy and the origin of Deuteronomy, in Zsengellér 2011:23–37.
- Soggin, J A 1972. *Joshua: a commentary*. OTL. London: SCM.
- Stipp, H J (ed.) 2011. *Das deuteronomistische Geschichtswerk*. ÖBS 39. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Tate, M E 1990. *Psalms 51–100*. WBC 20. Waco, Texas: Word Books.
- Tigay, J H (ed.) 1985. *Empirical models for biblical criticism*. Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia Press.
- Tov, E 1999. *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: collected essays on the Septuagint*. VTSup 72. Leiden: Brill.
- Ulrich, E 1996. Multiple literary editions: reflections toward a theory of the history of the biblical text, in Parry and Ricks 1996:78–105.
- Van der Kooij, A 1998. Perspectives on the study of the Septuagint: who are the translators?, in Garcia Martinez and Noort 1998a:214–229.
- Van der Meer, M N 2004. *Formation and reformulation: the redaction of the book of Joshua in the light of the oldest textual witnesses*. VTSup 102. Leiden: Brill.
- Van Seters, J 1984. Joshua 24 and the problem of tradition in the Old Testament, in Barrick and Spencer 1984:139–158.
- Waltke, B K 2001. How we got the Hebrew Bible: the text and canon of the Old Testament, in Flint 2001:27–50.
- Wildenboer, J 2015. Joshua 24: some literary and theological remarks, *JSem* 24/2:484–502.
- Witte, M, Schmid, K, Prechel, D & Gertz, J C (eds) 2006. *Die Deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerke: Redaktions- und religionsgeschichtliche Perspektiven zur "Deuteronomismus"- Diskussion in Tora und vorderen Propheten*. BZAW 365. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Woudstra, M H 1981. *The book of Joshua*. NICOT. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans.
- Zsengellér, J (ed.) 2011. *Samaria, Samaritans, Samaritans: Studies Bible, history and linguistics*. Berlin: de Gruyter.