In these pages, Campbell provides a useful comparison of themes in the passages that make up 2:1-10:27. His distinction between passages with a "soldierly focus" and those with a "sacral focus" shed light on two motifs that, while not in competition, can be viewed separately.

The larger question his observations serve is how the author(s) anticipated these materials would be used. He addresses this question occasionally throughout these pages, but focuses on it on pp. 41-42, which I'll address in class.

The following notes and definitions should facilitate your appreciation of his points:

P. 27
"a form-critical optic must be used in reading." Form-criticism is the practice of recognizing the difference in the forms in which various materials are cast. It is not the same as recognizing different genres, inasmuch as the latter is more concerned with whole works, whereas "forms" are smaller units (such as passages within larger works) that follow a recognizable pattern. In this case, he is using "form-critical optic" to distinguish 10:28-12:24 as "list material" rather than the narrative style of what precedes it.

P. 28
The suggestion is not that these were complementary accounts of how Israel's occupation of Canaan happened, but rather complementary articulations of how that occupation of Canaan is to be understood. --- I.e., these are not different traditions that have been passed down, but two different ways of conceptualizing or explaining the conquest: either through the LORD's enabling of the army or his direct intervention without the need for an army.

P. 29
Top: (The "king of Jericho" rings a trifle pretentiously . . . that we do not have.) --- This could be better stated (in my humble opinion) as "moderns" not understanding that cities were often city-states, so that their rulers were kings.

Bottom: The reference in verse 2 to "the soldiers" . . . is regarded by many as a gloss, since it lacks any connectives . . . . --- A gloss is a comment inserted by a scribe to define a term or phrase in the text that might prove problematic for the reader. However, some scholars use "gloss" loosely to designate any insertion by a scribe, which seems to be how Campbell is using it here. I.e., many scholars consider "the soldiers" to be a late insertion, since the soldiers play no role in the story.

P. 30
(first full ¶) V. 2 in itself and in its conjunction with 8:2 and 10:1 together point unmistakably to a different story from what follows in Josh 6:3-27. --- The collection of verses he cites are these:

Josh. 6:2 The LORD said to Joshua, “See, I have handed Jericho over to you, along with its king and soldiers.”

Josh. 8:2 You shall do to Ai and its king as you did to Jericho and its king; only its spoil and its livestock you may take as booty for yourselves. Set an ambush against the city, behind it.”

Josh. 10:1 When King Adoni-zedek of Jerusalem heard how Joshua had taken Ai, and had utterly destroyed it, doing to Ai and its king as he had done to Jericho and its king . . . .
His argument is, in essence, that the original form of the story, which focused on a military event, has been replaced by a sacral story. He may be right, but I consider this far too slim of evidence to secure his argument, especially since (as he will make clear) the story that follows in chapter 6 shows its own marks of being composite.

(Bottom) There is no reference to any prior failure until, in verses 5-6, “as before” occurs twice, clearly referring to the failure narrated in chapter 7. It is possible that the two phrases come from editorial work blending both sacral and military focuses into a single composition. While it is possible that the repeated phrase, "as before," is an editorial insertion to link this story to the (originally distinct) story of the defeat at Ai (7:1-5), it is also possible that 8:1 followed immediately on 7:5 (note the LORD's command to take "all the fighting men" to Ai, whereas in chapter 7 Joshua sent just 3,000, assured that number would be sufficient for this city. It is possible that the story explaining Ai's surprising repulse of Israel's forces in 7:6-26 has been inserted into a story of original defeat followed by victory through the enablement of the LORD. (Indeed, why should Joshua need being told to "not be dismayed" [8:1] if he knows what caused the defeat and has ridded Israel of the problem? This encouragement is more likely if it follows directly on the defeat of 7:1-5.)

In any case, as with the story in chapter 6, there is enough complexity within chapter 8 itself that suggesting the relationship between chapters 7 & 8 is accounted for by the double addition of "as before" to link military and a sacral accounts seems (to me) tenuous.

P. 31

However, a repetition in the text may signal another strategy. --- What Campbell is pointing out is more clearly perceived by reading the two versions of the setting of the ambush:

3So Joshua and all the fighting men set out to go up against Ai. Joshua chose thirty thousand warriors and sent them out by night 4with the command, “You shall lie in ambush against the city, behind it; do not go very far from the city, but all of you stay alert. . . . 9So Joshua sent them out; and they went to the place of ambush, and lay between Bethel and Ai, to the west of Ai; but Joshua spent that night in the camp.

10In the morning Joshua rose early and mustered the people, and went up, with the elders of Israel, before the people to Ai. 11All the fighting men who were with him went up, and drew near before the city, and camped on the north side of Ai, with a ravine between them and Ai.

12Taking about five thousand men, he set them in ambush between Bethel and Ai, to the west of the city. 13So they stationed the forces, the main encampment that was north of the city and its rear guard west of the city. But Joshua spent that night in the valley.

Notice that these two verse units present two different descriptions of the stages involved in the attack: 1) two reports of the approach to Ai; 2) two groups (30,000 and 5,000 men, respectively) are placed in ambush; 3) each set of events concludes with a report of where Joshua spent the night, whether in the camp or in the valley.

Most strikingly, these activities occur on successive days, according to the phrase "in the morning" at the start of v. 10.

P. 32

The most important thing to note about his conclusion to this discussion is his idea that the text's overlaps and contradictory elements are intended as signals to the reader/story-teller. He will elaborate on this more on pp. 41-42.
P. 33
Skip his discussion of the different numbers found in the Septuagint. Resume reading with his first full paragraph on p. 34: "Back to the battle."

P. 34
(Bottom) "Holy war" --- a technical term for battle in which the LORD alone accomplishes the victory. Campbell's proposal is that the complete destruction of all captured may not have been regularly associated with such war, but may have been only part of a "bargain" assumed with the LORD: "you defeat our enemies and we'll offer all of them to you as sacrifices."

P. 35
(Top) --- The terms "deuteronomic" and "deuteronomistic" are used variously. I agree with Campbell that "deuteronomistic" should be used only for activities and editors associated with the "Deuteronomistic History." However, I think "deuteronomic" is better used for themes and activities associated with another literary work, Deuteronomy. Assigning these terms to literary pieces avoids the peculiarity of using one term for a literary work and one for a historical era.

P. 37
(Bottom) Tension in the text suggests the possibility of two stories. --- Campbell astutely notes the difference in location between v. 15 and v. 21:

At the end of the battle against the collation, reports v. 15: Then Joshua returned, and all Israel with him, to the camp at Gilgal. --- This was after Israel had chased all the enemy "as far as Azekah and Makkedah" (v. 10).

V. 16 then opens a new scene: "Meanwhile, these five kings fled and hid themselves in the cave at Makkedah." Joshua orders the caves sealed up and adds, "do not stay there yourselves; pursue your enemies, and attack them from the rear. Do not let them enter their towns, for the LORD your God has given them into your hand" (v. 19). And yet, this is supposedly after all the people returned with Joshua to Gilgal after chasing their enemies "as far as Azekah and Makkedah." Who's left to chase and who's still out there doing the chasing?

That question does not afflict the unfolding narration, however, which notes that after chasing all the enemies, "all the people returned safe to Joshua in the camp at Makkedah" (v. 21). Here is another return of the forces and, this time, they return to camp at Makkedah rather than Gilgal, even though Makkedah was earlier the furthest extent of their pursuit of the enemy before their return to Gilgal earlier.

The narrative becomes even more involved with the report of the capture of Makkedah and its king in v. 28 and the report of v. 29 that the people passed on from there to their next conquest. Campbell concludes his observation by writing, "A story-teller could easily blend the two operations; the text does not, but leaves open the option of closing at v. 15." This seems to me a most peculiar notion, since the segue to the next battle in v. 29 requires setting off from Makkedah and leads to the sequence of battles from Libnah to Lachish and beyond. That more than one story is involved is beyond doubt, but the way Campbell sees them functioning is within the range of doubt.

Pp. 39-40
The list of incongruities and backtrackings in the narrative is detailed and (without following the biblical text at every step) hard to follow. Suffice it to say that Campbell correctly detects indications of diverse traditions being employed in this story and reports that perplexity over the
complexities of this passage abound. What matters for us is his use of this to discuss his proposal of how to understand the function of this literature anticipated by the author(s).

Pp. 42-43

(Bottom of p. 42) Two contrasting patterns of behavior are evident in the Jericho text. These could be a little more evident to you if he laid the relevant passages side-by-side:

The introductory verses describe a silent march for six days, culminating in a seventh day march with the priests blowing their "trumpets" (rams' horns): 3You shall march around the city, all the warriors circling the city once. Thus you shall do for six days, 4with seven priests bearing seven trumpets of rams' horns before the ark. On the seventh day you shall march around the city seven times, the priests blowing the trumpets. 5When they make a long blast with the ram’s horn, as soon as you hear the sound of the trumpet, then all the people shall shout with a great shout; and the wall of the city will fall down flat, and all the people shall charge straight ahead."

8As Joshua had commanded the people, the seven priests carrying the seven trumpets of rams’ horns before the LOR D went forward, blowing the trumpets, with the ark of the covenant of the LOR D following them. 9And the armed men went before the priests who blew the trumpets; the rear guard came after the ark, while the trumpets blew continually. . . . 15On the seventh day they rose early, at dawn, and marched around the city in the same manner seven times. It was only on that day that they marched around the city seven times. 16And at the seventh time, when the priests had blown the trumpets, Joshua said to the people, “Shout! For the LOR D has given you the city.”

In the first account, the priests blow their horns only on the seventh day and it is "a long blast" that will signal the time for the attack. In the second, the priests blow their trumpets continually each day and the signal to attack is given by Joshua with a shout.

These differences, intertwined create a confused narrative if you take time to try to coordinate every feature, although (as Campbell notes) “none of this matters much when we realize that the story . . . is summed up in Joshua's words: ‘For the Lord has given you the city’ (v. 19).”