The Apocryphon of Joshua is the title given to a work represented by three or four copies of the Qumran scrolls, and perhaps another copy from Massada. It belongs to the genre of reworking the Bible, well documented at Qumran. The history of research into this Apocryphon illustrates the complex process through which the identification and understanding of an unfamiliar Qumran composition has to go. The Apocryphon was first identified in two copies, 4Q378 and 4Q379, published by Carol Newsom under the title the Psalms of Joshua.\(^{1}\) Another manuscript, 4Q522, was initially published by Émile Puech without any connection to Joshua.\(^{2}\) However, in a subsequent re-edition of 4Q522 9 ii Elisha Qimron identified the speaker of the discourse preserved therein as the biblical Joshua and noted its links to episodes related in the biblical Book of Joshua. In the absence of overlapping of this manuscript with 4Q378 and 4Q379, Qimron was reluctant to attribute it to the Psalms of Joshua. Instead he suggested assigning all the manuscripts related to Joshua to one group, which he labeled Joshua Cycles.\(^{3}\) Reviewing materials pertaining to Joshua at Qumran Emanuel Tov analyzed the phraseology and motifs shared by all three manuscripts and convincingly showed that their similarity
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\(^{1}\) Following John Strugnell. See her publication “The ‘Psalms of Joshua’ from Qumran Cave 4”, \(\textit{JJS} 39\) (1988): 56–73. But already there she noted that this title “is not entirely apt as a description of the whole work” (ibid., 58).


is sufficient to postulate that they are copies of one and the same work. He named this work the *Apocryphon of Joshua.* The analysis below lends additional support to this view and shows that the passage published by Puech is fully and correctly understood only in terms of the activities of Joshua. Another fragment with a list of toponyms, 5Q9, may have been torn from a list of toponyms of the same work, since it is very similar to the list of toponyms preserved in 4Q522 9 i. Lastly, a small fragment found at Masada perhaps came from a fifth copy of the *Apocryphon.*

---

4 Cf. E. Tov, “The Rewritten Book of Joshua as Found at Qumran and Masada,” in *Biblical Perspectives: Early use and Interpretation of the Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. M. E. Stone and E. Chazon; *STDJ* 28; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 233–56. This title is also adopted by Carol Newsom in a subsequent article, “4Q378 and 4Q379: An Apocryphon of Joshua”, in *Qumranstudies* (ed. H.-J. Fabry, A. Lange, and H. Lichtenberger; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996), 35–85. It is retained in her final publication, *Qumran Cave 4, XVII; Parabiblical Texts, Part 3 (DJD XXII; Oxford: Clarendon, 1996),* 237–88. Tov, ibid., 239–241, 247–250 demonstrates that 4Q522 9 ii is aligned with other Joshua materials, and rejects Puech’s attempt to center the passage on David and Solomon. See Puech, “La Pierre de Sion.” One of the most compelling arguments adduced by Tov is the list of toponyms in 4Q522 9 i, preceding the present passage about the Tent of Meeting. Toponym lists also appear in other fragments of 4Q522 (cf. esp. frg. 8). Tov points out that such lists are irrelevant to the context of David and Solomon, but are most pertinent to the conquests of Joshua. See comment on line 8.

5 In his final edition of this manuscript Émile Puech remains undecided and at times inconsistent regarding the identification of 4Q522 as a copy of the *Apocryphon of Joshua.* Cf. idem, *Qumrán Grotte 4.XVII; Textes Hébreux (4Q521–4Q528, 4Q576–4Q579) (DJD XXV; Oxford: Clarendon, 1998),* 55–62. On the one hand he argues that the absence of overlapping between 4Q522 and other copies of the *Apocryphon* (4Q378 and 4Q379) militates against such identification (cf. ibid., 71). On the other hand he admits that the biblical Book of Joshua furnishes the framework for 4Q522 and even suggests that Joshua may be the protagonist of this “pseudepigraphic work” (ibid., 57). By arguing against the identification of 4Q522 as a copy of the *Apocryphon of Joshua* Puech resorts to an even less likely hypothesis, namely, the presence at Qumran of two different, but very similar, works on the same topic.
