

**John Macdonald**  
**The Samaritan Chronicle No. II**



John Macdonald

# The Samaritan Chronicle No. II

(or: Sepher Ha-Yamim)

From Joshua to Nebuchadnezzar

Walter de Gruyter & Co.

Berlin 1969

**Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft**

**Herausgegeben von Georg Fohrer**

**107**

**Gedruckt mit Unterstützung der Deutschen Forschungsgemeinschaft**



**1969**

**by Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin 30, Genthiner Straße 13  
Alle Rechte des Nachdrucks, der photomechanischen Wiedergabe,  
der Übersetzung, der Herstellung von Mikrofilmen und Photokopien,  
auch auszugsweise, vorbehalten.**

**Printed in Germany**

**Satz und Druck: J.J. Augustin, Glückstadt**

**Archiv-Nr.: 3822697**

## Preface

One of the most outstanding discoveries about the Samaritans during the last few years of the modern revival in Samaritan researches has been the fact that they did not borrow from the Jews. This truth has become plain as a result of studies in their theology, biblical exegesis and exposition, language and religious custom. It is therefore all the more surprising that a text containing substantial parts of the Biblical books of Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings and Chronicles should have been in their possession.

The work is known commonly (though not originally) as *Sepher ha-Yamim*, and a separate discussion of the title is to be found at the beginning of the Introduction. There is considerable confusion over the Samaritan Chronicles. Until my classification appeared in *The Theology of the Samaritans* (1964) one had to refer to the name of the editor of any given text. Thus for *Asatir*, *Sepher ha-Yamim*, *Tolidah* (or Neubauer), *Sepher Yehoshua*, etc., we may now refer to Chronicles I, II, III, IV, etc. respectively. Since these chronicles are now arranged in chronological order of composition, it is much easier for the student of Samaritan chronologies and chronicles to work synoptically and comprehensively, with consequent reliability and accuracy.

The text published in this book is unique in that it appears to exist *in extenso* in only one copy. Many questions are raised by its discovery and some of these are discussed in the Introduction. It is possible that some questions of purely Old Testament interest will be raised, but to do more than merely refer to these would go beyond the scope of a Text and Translation volume.

A significant finding of our study of Chronicle II is that for the period David to Jesus Christ the Samaritans possessed an astonishingly accurate chronology even by modern standards. A specific Appendix has been reserved for this. It is perhaps true to say that this is the first chronology of its kind to come from a people descended from the Israelites.

I am indebted to my friends and colleagues Dr. B. S. J. Isserlin and Rabbi S. Lowy for many helpful suggestions and sometimes answers to questions on topographical and linguistic matters. I wish to express my thanks also to Professor G. Fohrer, who has maintained an interest in this chronicle ever since it was first proposed to prepare it for publication and who has been very helpful as editor of *BZAW* in making its production possible.

*The University of Leeds*

John Macdonald

March 1966.



## Contents

### Introduction

|     |   |    |
|-----|---|----|
| I   | (a) The title <i>Sepher ha-Yamim</i> .....          | 3  |
|     | (b) The Joshua part of Chronicle II .....           | 9  |
|     | (c) The other chronicles available for comparison . | 10 |
| II  | The content of Chronicle II .....                   | 14 |
|     | (a) In relation to the biblical text .....          | 14 |
|     | (b) In comparison with the LXX .....                | 36 |
|     | (c) In relation to the other chronicles .....       | 38 |
| III | (a) The basic text (H 1) .....                      | 69 |
|     | (b) The Joshua MSS of Chronicle II .....            | 70 |
|     | (c) Modus operandi of the text edition .....        | 72 |

### The Translation

|                                |     |
|--------------------------------|-----|
| Joshua .....                   | 77  |
| Judges .....                   | 101 |
| I Samuel .....                 | 113 |
| II Samuel .....                | 132 |
| I Kings I-XI .....             | 143 |
| I Kings XII-XXII .....         | 152 |
| II Kings – II Chronicles ..... | 168 |

### Appendices

|     |   |     |
|-----|---|-----|
| I   | The <i>Shobhach Legend</i> .....                | 194 |
|     | A. Text .....                                   | 194 |
|     | B. Translation .....                            | 200 |
|     | C. Comparative notes .....                      | 204 |
| II  | Omissions and variants mached in the Septuagint | 208 |
| III | Variants to the Masoretic Text .....            | 209 |
| IV  | High Priests, Princes and Tudges .....          | 216 |
| V   | Dates derived from the chronologies.....        | 220 |
|     | Abbreviations .....                             | 224 |
|     | List of Samaritan Chronicles .....              | 225 |
|     | Bibliography .....                              | 226 |

## The Text

|                                |    |
|--------------------------------|----|
| Joshua .....                   | 5  |
| Judges .....                   | 34 |
| I Samuel .....                 | 42 |
| II Samuel .....                | 54 |
| I Kings I-XI .....             | 61 |
| I Kings XII-XXII .....         | 68 |
| II Kings - II Chronicles ..... | 79 |



## Introduction



## I (a) The title *Sepher ha-Yamim*

The title *Sepher ha-Yamim* (rarely *Sepher Dibhre ha-Yamim*)<sup>1</sup> poses a problem in that it could have reference to a work of that title, or it could have a generic purpose indicating no more than 'Annals'. Was there a work of that title?<sup>2</sup> One might gain the impression that there was such a composition if one were to judge by the statements of Sam. writers from late mediaeval times on.<sup>3</sup> It is possible that they regarded the earliest 'Annals' as an independent work of that title, not realizing that the words *sepher ha-yamim* could simply mean 'annals' or 'a chronicle'. If so, we can understand the use to which the title is put by various writers. For example, the basic text edited herein (H1) is entitled *Sepher ha-Yamim*, but so are the Jos MSS which represent the Jos part of our chronicle; these may have existed separately as 'Joshua Annals'.

For convenience we may refer to the chronicle printed herein as Chron. II, following my arrangement as listed in *The Theology of the Samaritans*, London 1964, pp. 44ff.<sup>4</sup> *Sepher ha-Yamim*, as a title, represents a *form* of Chron. II, perhaps close to the earliest arrangement. MS H2 — see I (c) below — likewise is a *form* of Chron. II, but further removed from the earliest. MSS A1,2 (*at-Ta'rikh*) are an Arabic version of the H2 type. The J MSS also form a version of the same Chron., but only of the Jos part of the work. This last may well have existed separately because Joshua was the Sams.' greatest hero and saviour after Moses. It is a well known characteristic of the northern literature of the OT (particularly of the so-called E document) that Joshua was the supreme figure of the early northern traditions in the period subsequent to the death of Moses. Be that as it may, it is not at all unlikely that the Sams., before Roman times, had a book — uncanonical but valued — which chronicled the deeds of Joshua during the period of the Divine Favour (Rahuta).<sup>5</sup> Some evidence that

<sup>1</sup> This title is probably explained in (*e.g.*) the John Rylands MS of the Gaster Collection numbered 863, where we have the full title: **זה ספר הימים ומצא בו דברי הימים**, *i.e.* 'this is the chronicle containing the events of the period ...'.

<sup>2</sup> Corresponding to the Judaist title **דברי הימים** (= chronicles?). In Chron. VII, p. 205, we find possible evidence that the later Sams. believed that such a work existed in ancient times: 'Are not all the acts which Eli did recorded in *sepher ha-yamim*?'.

<sup>3</sup> Even the much earlier H2 version, fol. 62, with ref. to Samson can state: 'We have not found any information about him *in the writings of our forefathers*, but they say that he came at the end of the Era of Divine Favour'. See also the preceding n.

<sup>4</sup> For the convenience of readers the list is given below after the list of Abbreviations.

<sup>5</sup> Support for this view is provided by the caption in p. 10 of the Juynboll edition (§ 9) of Chron. IV, where we read: 'The beginning of the Book of Joshua the son of Nun, disciple of the lord Moses the prophet.' The chronicler thus knew that the Joshua saga (not the bibl. account of the Book of Joshua) had a proper starting-point, though he himself add. prefaced and supplementary material. Rahuta = Raḥûtâ (Aram.).

this may have been the case is furnished by the fact that in the colophons of some J MSS the work is described as *qādōš* (Aram. *qaddiš*). It is highly unlikely that any Sam. family (and Sam. MSS can only be classified and evaluated in terms of the families which produced the various scribes) would have 'canonized' the Jos part of Chron. II by describing it as 'sacred', especially in view of the fact that the Judahites (later Judaists) possessed a canonized or canonical Book of Joshua, unless it had acquired the sanctity of great antiquity.

It is possible too that because of Joshua's unceasing popularity some families copied the Jos part of Chron. II for their own private reading or worship; an example of this procedure is found in the existence of separate copies of the Joseph saga of the SP. However, as we shall observe below, the former view is much more likely, *viz.* that there was a version of the Joshua story, *verbatim* in parts with the BT, which may have been the base of what became known as *Sepher ha-Yamim*. The *Asatir* (Chron. I) and *Memar Marqah* were ancient and major works covering the period Adam to Moses and Moses respectively. It would be natural to regard the life of Moses' successor and disciple as worthy of a book to itself, the more so since the Judahites had one!

Another reason for believing that Chron. II is a *version*, the oldest extant, of *Sepher ha-Yamim* is that AF in his Preamble does not mention a work of that title. Here are the works which he claimed to have seen or known:

- (a) Qit' al-Baladay (Arab.)
- (b) Ta'rikh Qit' al-Baladay (Arab.)
- (c) An unnamed Chron. containing the  
'Book of Joshua' (Arab.)<sup>6</sup>
- (d) Three *short* Chrons. from Damascus (Heb.)
- (e) A 'chain' recording the origin of the  
Sams. (Arab.)
- (f) Some loose sheets written by High  
Priest Phinehas (14th century) (language unknown)
- (g) Sadaqah's Chron. (not used by AF) (?)

This list may be consulted in the Vilmar edition of Chron. VI, pp. 5-6, and in R. Payne-Smith's translation.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>6</sup> A careful analysis by synopsis of the relevant Chrons. suggests that Chron. IV itself may be an expansion of an earlier (Arab.) Book of Joshua. It was perhaps to the earlier form (with less Islamic stylized formulae) that AF ref.

<sup>7</sup> *The Samaritan Chronicle of Abu' l-Fatah [sic], the Arabic text from the Manuscript in the Bodleian Library with a Literal English Translation.* Bodleian Library, Oxford, Heb. Periodicals e 6, vol. 2.

The work known as *Sepher Yehošua* to most students of Samari-tana is not the same work as the Jos part of Chron. II — indeed it is a far cry from it — and must never be confused with it.

### The Nature of Chronicle II

Chron. II cannot be dated. The oldest MS I have found is that of the basic text H<sub>1</sub>, from the 17th century A.D. Like the other ancient works of the Sams. (excluding of course the SP) such as the Targum(s), *Memar Marqah* and Chron. I, Chron. II has not been copied often. This fact cannot be due to the passing out of use of Aram. (about 11th century) since Chron. II is entirely in Heb. It may be due to the fact that only one family, probably the Danafi, which preserved the superior texts of the Targum(s) and *Memar Marqah*, possessed a copy of the work, or had a tradition (written or oral) which could supplement the BT.

Some hint that our text of Chron. II is a late version of a much older, lost work is provided by the fact that in several places [see II (a) below] there is a lacuna which the scribe made no attempt to fill. On the other hand, the missing passages or words are reflected, if not actually quoted, in H<sub>2</sub>. H<sub>2</sub>, therefore, is of great importance for the study of the structure of the basic text H<sub>1</sub>.

Chron. II, as surviving in H<sub>1</sub>, contains extensive passages of the BT. The major oms. of BT are discussed in II (a) below.<sup>8</sup> The material add. to the BT is compared with the material of the other Chrons. in II (c).<sup>9</sup>

One may, after a cursory glance at our text, decide that H<sub>1</sub> is a copy of the BT, from a copy of the MT borrowed or otherwise acquired from the Judaists (e.g. from Karaites), the BT having been reduced where it contained material unacceptable to the Sams. That such a judgment would be unwarrantable is proved by the fact that in many places the H<sub>1</sub> version of Chron. II, like the other Chrons., contains passages far from complimentary to the Northern Kingdom or the Sams. In places too, the Chron. directly condemns the rulers of the North and the Sams. generally for actions they had done or attitudes they had adopted. While there may be passages where bias is manifest — and bias may well be manifested in the choice of BT passages om. — there are many where self-criticism is equally in evidence.

---

<sup>8</sup> Minor oms. are recorded in the notes to the Text and the significance of these is briefly discussed in the notes to the Translation.

<sup>9</sup> Minor adds. and substitution of synonyms are discussed in the notes to the Translation.

The fact that H1 & H2, the only two complete representatives of Chron. II,<sup>10</sup> differ on place and proper names and sometimes the course of events suggests that there was no overall Sam. bias against the BT passages which were unacceptable. What must here be borne in mind is that there is no *one* Sam. tradition. The evidence of MSS copying, language, benedictions, orthography, etc. (not to enter into the vexed question of sects) makes it abundantly clear that each great family-system had its own traditions and no doubt documents as well. It is to be remembered that Samaria was divided into twelve regions from the 4th century A.D. after Baba Rabba's reorganization of the land, and the evidence of the Chrons. for the period even before the 722/21 B.C. exile suggests that a similar land administration may have been in force. A glance at APP. IV B, listing the Twelve Princes of the early high priests, will suggest to anyone versed in Semitic names and topography (see the appropriate text for the latter) that these names are probably genuine. The inter-family relationships (consult both lists in APP. IV B) are clearly no fabrication. One does not fabricate such lists, especially when there is no profit to be gained — not even an anti-Judahite one!

Some non-bibl. passages are in a Heb. that is later than that of the BT, but much less late than the latest (Priestly) material.<sup>11</sup> Here we have a Heb. that is classical — with not many deformities — and the only classical Heb. outside of the SP which the Sams. have preserved. It is simplified and possibly dialectal classical Heb. It is almost entirely free of the Aramaisms and Arabisms found so frequently in the liturgies and in the Heb. used since the 17th century to render works from Aram. and Arab. The ST corresponding to the BT herein contains vars. to MT Ketibh and Qerê, which may mean that the ST is an independent version of the BT — independent in the sense that it was held in pre-Masoretic times in northern hands. With this factor is to be associated the interesting ST oms. of BT and passages also om. in LXX.<sup>12</sup> For these see APP.II.

The chief characteristics of the Heb. of H1 (add. passages mainly) are as follows:

- i. The regular appearance of the fem.sing.suff. in 7<sup>י</sup> — (even in BT passages).
- ii. Substantial vars. in the use of *matres lectionis* (see APP. III B).

<sup>10</sup> Apart from the Arab. A1,2 versions.

<sup>11</sup> An attempt to analyze the composition of the Chron. has been made on linguistic and content grounds. In the notes to the Translation the add. passages are assigned to one or other of the sources discussed at the end of this Intro. §.

<sup>12</sup> See II (b) below where the question of LXX influence is considered.

- iii. Different usages of prepositions (see APP.III C).
- iv. Frequent differences in spelling and order of numerals (see APP.III C).
- v. Special usage of *na* with subject or replacing a repeated prep. (see APP.III E).
- vi. Vars. in introductory formulae, such as *na* + verb for BT Waw Consec. Imperf. (and *vice versa*). See notes to Text *passim*.
- vii. Many other kinds of orth.vars. (see APP.III D).
- viii. Spelling of forms noted in MT under Ketfbh and Qerê (see APP.III A).
- ix. Frequent synonyms for BT words (see relevant notes to Translation).

We cannot know when the Sams. first possessed a version of Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings & Chronicles so closely similar to the BT in extensive quantities. I had always believed that they should have possessed a history of the kings of Israel and Judah on the obvious ground: Why should only the Judahites possess a history of the Israelite monarchy? It was this belief that led me to discover that the MS of our basic text was not the same as the Jos text published by M. Gaster (see Bibliography), although there was a very real and direct association with it.

The decision, if one is ever reached, on the question whether Chron. II reflects a pre-MT may centre on the relationship of the *varia* of the ST to the BT as listed in the APPs. M. Gaster believed<sup>13</sup> that his Jos text was pre-MT, one of his reasons being that the *Passeq* or note-line in the MT coincided with ST differentia. This is a doubtful procedure and even after the excellent work of J. Kennedy<sup>14</sup> on the note-line, much study is still required before any alleged ST differentia can be proved to have been alluded to by the (pre-MT?) originator of the note-line. I have not personally been able to confirm Gaster's belief that some of these differentia 'often agreed with the LXX'; but there seem to be a surprisingly large number of instances where a note-line occurs in BT (MT) just where there is a Sam. var. Some of the more obvious examples are recorded in the notes.

We may summarize the foregoing thus: *Sepher ha-Yamim* as a title refers to a work which exists in more than one version, e.g. Chron.II or the Jos part of Chron.II. Chron.II may have existed originally as a Book of Joshua, which is in no way connected with *Sepher Yehoshua* (Chron.IV), but may have contained large tracts of

<sup>13</sup> *The Samaritans* (Schweich Lectures 1923), 1925, p. 136.

<sup>14</sup> *The Note Line in the Hebrew Scriptures, commonly called Pāsēq or Pēsīq*, Edinburgh 1903.

the BT. Chron.II, as represented by MS H1, is basically a very old chron. of unknown date, possibly *derived* from a pre-MT version of the BT possessed by one or more north Palestinian (Samaritan) families. There are several clear indications that it is fundamentally a substantial excerpt from the BT which could have been held by northern as well as southern Israelites. Affinities of such a text with the LXX are discussed below in II (b).

To the original text underlying Chron.II as we now know it was later add., perhaps after the 4th century A.D. reorganization of life and worship, some of the material in non-bibl. classical Heb. This last was probably arranged in terms of high priestly reigns, and indeed the whole Chron. has been framed in that way.<sup>15</sup> As was the case with other chron., still further material was add. or inserted, with a few resultant doublets, in a decadent (imitative) form of classical Heb. Finally the Chron. was brought 'up to date' century by century (until the 17th) by successive scribes who wrote in post-classical (but never liturgical) Heb. with increasing appearances of Arabisms. Fortunately it is not wholly impossible for us to isolate some strata in the early part of the fully grown Chron. as we now have it.

I have succeeded in identifying, on grounds of language (grammar, syntax, vocabulary & style) and content, two basic sources for the add. material. The oldest I have described in the notes to the Translation as the secular (non-Priestly) source. This source may be further stratified, but it is not possible to say with confidence how many strata there are. I have claimed in the notes the existence of a Pro-David secular source, which quite patently looks upon David as a hero. After all, he was the king of the North as well as of the South in a way that Saul never was. Even Solomon does not receive the quiet acclaim which David receives.

Another stratum of the secular source is much later. The clue to the existence of this is (apart from the inferior Heb.) the manner and format of ref. to the Sams. and the high priests. Yet another, possibly very old in origin, of the secular type may underlie certain traditions which appear *passim* throughout H1 (and in similar format in H2, A1,2), such as the story of the Egyptian attack under King SNYS (Chron.VI SFYN) at the end of II Kgs — II Chr.

Much easier to isolate is the Priestly source or sources. I have pointed out frequently in the notes to the Translation the nature of this source — concern for the cultus, genealogies, facts and figures and names: anti-David in the severest manner, equally anti-Solomon. The general thesis underlying this source is that the Judahite Jerusa-

<sup>15</sup> There is some evidence that whole passages (lists of high priests, princes, etc.), which had already existed either as independent lists or as parts of early chron., were simply inserted at the appropriate point in BT. See the notes to the Translation *passim*.



lem cult was a direct successor of the Shiloh cult. In the Priestly material the language is almost decadent at times and there are signs of Arab. influence.

We may assume the existence of a BT-type possessed by northern families, as well as other (secular) annals and lists (of high priests and princes). The chronicler, as I have called him simply, created Chron.II out of these sources. Subsequent editors, secular or lay and Priestly, add. and inserted at various points, until the text as we have it was achieved. It is not possible to claim the existence of oral tradition, but it is clear that written tradition from many periods existed (earlier than the documents seen by AF). It is reasonable to assert that the Sams. had their own documented data and lists, mostly lost during persecutions, and that they, by the same right and interest as the Judahites, possessed a version of the composite 'Former Prophets', the material of which concerned the North so much.

#### I (b) The Joshua part of Chronicle II

Five MSS (J1-5) of the Jos part of Chron.II have been collated and these are discussed below in III (b). J1-3,5 represent one version, J4 another (the H1 version). The existence of such MSS, some having the description in their colopha of 'sacred book', leads one to suppose that the two text traditions exhibited by them may have led an independent existence, prior to the add. of Judges, Samuel, Kings and Chronicles. As has been said above in I (a), it would in no way occasion surprise that a book of Joshua existed in early, possibly pre-Christian times. This part of Chron.II not only deals with salvation-history in the same way that Marqah, with interpretation and exegesis, wrote a soteriological study of Moses' life, but includes the part played in that history by the first high priests of the period after the Entry into Canaan. High priest and king are intimately related in the Northern Israel tradition in a way that is hardly paralleled in Southern Israel and later Judaist tradition.

The chief difference between the J1-3,5 and J4 versions is that the former includes parts of the BT not found in H1 and J4. Much of this extra material, derived from the SP in part, concerns the land allotments of the twelve tribes. Here we may have a clue to the work ref. to by AF and called *Qit' al-Baladay*. It may be that we have to regard the J1-3,5 version as the ancestor of AF's *Ta'rikh Qit' al-Baladay*. We cannot be certain about this, however, since these titles quoted by AF could equally have ref. to the land divisions of Baba Rabba in the 4th century A.D. Yet we cannot ignore the possibility that H1 (Jos §), J4 derived from (or is) a version of Joshua's conquest of Canaan, with later add. material, and J1-3,5 is an original Heb.

version of *Qit' al-Baladay* expanded to include the conquest — thus becoming the original of AF's *Ta'rikkh*, and subsequently longer than J4 (and H1 Jos §). I set out these suggestions at the risk of being accused of oversimplification, for it must be recognized that further study of this problem is required, though without new MS finds this can only be founded on speculation and hypothesis.<sup>16</sup>

Some confusions in H1, J4 are explained by J1-3,5. *E.g.* Jos § N ix 9ff. is clarified by our insertion of the J1-3,5 (= BT) material. BT material om. in H1, J4 is likewise supplied from J1-3,5; *e.g.* § N ix 13, 16, 18-25. Some of the extra material is extensive; *e.g.* § P xi 1-23, § R xiii 7/8 — § T xxii 6 (the last within double square brackets, other inserts within single square brackets). On the last mentioned ref. see the pr. paragraph.

There are adds. to H1. J4 in the non-bibl. sections too. Seeing that J1-3,5 almost always agree in this against H1, J4, we may suppose that they represent the original version of the expanded form of *Qit' al-Baladay*, which derived from a family which had no copy of the other (shorter) version. Though the title *Qit' al-Baladay* is in Arab. and AF stated that it was written in Arab., we may as stated above assume our J1-3,5 to exhibit a version of the Heb. (some of it = BT) original. It is interesting to observe in this connection that AF ref. to the *Ta'rikkh* as 'written in Hebrew characters, but in the Arabic language'. This statement suggests that the copy which AF saw was written at a time when Arabic was still not completely in widespread literary use. *Qit' al-Baladay* and the longer *Ta'rikkh* probably existed, therefore, in their Arab. form in fairly early Islamic times. Since Joshua was so fundamental in Sam. soteriology it is more than likely, if not certain, that a much earlier Heb. version existed.<sup>17</sup> That it should for the most part equate with the BT as represented in the Judaist (pre-MT?) version confirms its antiquity. There is no evidence from linguistic, historical, theological or exegetical studies that the Sams. ever borrowed from the Judaists.

### I (c) The Other Chronicles available for Comparison

The following are the Chrons. available for comparison with Chron. II as represented in the basic text H1. H2 (a later version of

<sup>16</sup> See also the brief discussion (in Heb.) by D. Yellin in *Jerusalem*, Band VI, Heft 3, ed. A. M. Luncz, Jerusalem 1903, p. 203-4.

<sup>17</sup> See M. Gaster's discussions in "The Samaritan Hebrew Sources of the Arabic Book of Joshua", "On the Newly Discovered Samaritan Book of Joshua", "The Samaritan Book of Joshua and the Septuagint", "Das Buch Josua in hebräisch-samaritanischer Rezension", and A. D. Crown "The Date and Authenticity of the Samaritan Hebrew Book of Joshua as seen in its Territorial Allotments" — all as listed in the Bibliography.

H1), Chron. III (Tolidah), IV (*Sepher Yehošua*), V (Shalshalat), VI (AF), VII, H3 (a more modern Heb. version of AF, A1,2 (Arab. versions of H2)).

Of these the only ones which concern us here are the H2 version of II, and Chrons. III–VII; H3, A1,2 serve only to assist in the solution of problems of orth. and place and proper names, priestly and princely lists, etc.

**H 2**, found in the John Rylands Library, Manchester, no. 1168 of the Gaster Collection. It covers the period from the Death of Moses to late Muslim times in Palestine. Unfortunately there is no colophon, so that we do not know the date of copying. Prefixed to the Jos. account is a section on the Death of Moses, entitled חלק בזכרון מות אדנן משה which would appear to be an Arab.-type caption = فصل في ذكر وفاة موسى (so A1). Characteristics of H2 are very distinctive and mostly unique even among Sam. writings. It seems likely that this Chron. II version was possessed by a lesser known family, possibly not living in the Nablus area, but certainly under the influence of Arab., though at a time when that language had not yet been totally assimilated by the Sams.

*Characteristics:* (1) Lacks most of the later Islamic-style benedictions and pious sentiments found e.g. in Chron. IV and to some extent in VI.

(2) Uses נאם יהוה very frequently in place of ויאמר יהוה. This is quite unique.

(3) Describes each high priest as מוקיד (cf. Qumran *pōqēd*) & the same root PQD provides the verb almost always used for 'making / appointing' a high priest the next overseer.

(4) Uses גדלות as a construct abstract noun in the sense of 'his excellency/majesty', a possible survival from Graeco-Roman times. The term may be compared with *magnitudo* or some equivalent of that in Greek or Latin. There is also the possibility that the Arab. حضرة or جلالة underlies the expression, but there are so few clear Arabisms in the version that the influence of Arab. here is unlikely.

(5) 'Solomon' is spelled שלה consistently throughout, either by err. or by association with Shiloh (there being only one Heb. letter difference between 'Solomon' & 'Shiloh').

(6) The dates given are always nearer those of H1 than the later Chrons. III–VII.

(7) In the mg. throughout the word מדרש appears when a new topic begins. The word is ff. by a n. on the subject. *Midrash* is not thus used by scribes of the well known families.

Some indication that H2 is based on *Sepher ha-Yamim* is found in fol. 185a: 'There is mention of . . . Baba Rabba in *sepher ha-yamim* which our ancestors possessed, written in the sacred Heb. language'. It seems likely that the scribe is ref. to H1 or a closely similar version of Chron. II.

The version begins with the year 2974 A.C. (= 1490 B.C.),<sup>18</sup> the traditional Sam. dating for Moses' Death, and goes on to the 13th century A. H. Isaac & Solomon, sons of Amram the son of Solomon.<sup>19</sup> The Jos part of H2 begins in fol. 9. A1,2 (British Museum Or. 7927 Part 2 and Or. 10861 respectively) are 18th century Arab. versions of H2 in exceptional calligraphy, particularly useful for correcting occasional scribal errs., supplying lacunae, and giving add. information on proper names.

**Chron. III:** the *Tolidah*, the best known of the Chrons., thought to have been composed (earliest portion) in the 12th century A.D. by Eleazar son of Amram. It begins, like VI & VII, with Adam and ends at 1149 A.H. There are some supplements<sup>20</sup> to the Tolidah available in MS form, but these are mostly derived from VI. Like the Shals-halat (V) and Chron. VII it is not a true chron., being primarily a list of high priests and other notables from Adam on, with notes on the chief events of or during the lifetime of each high priest. The Tolidah should be edited critically, now that many MSS are available. Neubauer's text was a copy by a mid-19th century scribe, Jacob son of Aaron.

We cannot derive much from such a late work which is chiefly concerned with high priests and the Sams. themselves, but occasionally information may be gleaned that is of assistance in the studies summarized in II (c) below.

**Chron. IV:** *Sepher Yehošua*, later than III, but existed before VI. It is characterized throughout by its extensive Muslim type expressions and by its gross hyperboles. There is little sign in the work that it derived from or was translated from Heb., although it is stated (Juynboll, p. 2) that it was rendered from Heb. into Arab. This is not so straightforward a statement as may appear at first sight, since the whole cast of the work — and the original mould? — is thoroughly Arab., with Islamic overtones.

The composer was clearly dependent on H2 or a similar version of Chron. II, but not on the H1 type recension. A close comparison of H2-IV-VI reveals that some of AF's knowledge of *Sepher ha-Yamim* is gained from IV, itself selective though hyperbolic. The Jos account begins properly in p. 10 (§ 9) of the Juynboll text. The pr. §§ concern (1) introductory remarks on the nature and scope of the work: (2) Joshua's accession: (3) Balaam and the king of Moab: (4) Balaam and the Israelites: (5) Midian: (6) the disclosures made by Moses before

<sup>18</sup> For this equation see APP. V.

<sup>19</sup> For the family see A. E. Cowley, *The Samaritan Liturgy*, Vol. II, p. xlvii. Isaac was born in 1271 A. H., Solomon in 1280 A. H.

<sup>20</sup> The best known is by Jacob son of Ishmael in 1346 A.D.

his death: (7) Joshua's statement and the Death of Moses: (8) after Joshua's return to the people.

**Chron. V:** the *Shalshalat* (*Salsalet*), ascribed to the High Priest Eleazar the son of Phinehas of the 14th century. Only one complete version has been published, that of M. Gaster (see Bibliography). It covers the period from Adam to the 13th century High Priest Jacob the son of Aaron. It is, as the name indicates, a 'chain' of high priests. This catena is clearly derived from the earlier chron., especially III, but it is possible that there was a much more ancient *salsalet* (Aram?) as there was an ancient chron. *sepher ha-yamim*. Since the Sams. were so often severely persecuted, they would obviously have kept a list of their high priests, as they kept the Passover Pilgrimage Festival and preserved their Torah version — these being the identifying marks of the 'true Israel' as they believed themselves to be. The work lists the high priests from Adam to Jacob the son of Amram the son of Shalmah, *i.e.* to the year 1306 A.H., the date of the chron. This list is supplied with appropriate brief notes mainly dealing with purely Sam. matters, but occasionally ref. to wider political matters.

**Chron. VI:** *Abu 'l-Fatih*, one of the best known and — unfortunately — relied upon chron. It is the only chron. that is manifestly selective — unhappily too selective! The sources of AF have been listed in I (a) above. The work was composed in 1355 A.D. at the 'command' of High Priest Phinehas. As is usual in the case of Dana'i writers, the work is well constructed and systematic, but it lacks large sections of the history of Israel which we would have been glad to have. AF's own part of the extant version (published by Vilmar) continued from Adam to the year 756 A.D. and was add. to by various chroniclers up to the year 1853. The Jos account begins in p. 8 of the Vilmar text.

VI is not based on H1, but on H2 (as IV is). Many of AF's quotations are directly from IV,<sup>21</sup> but he has other quotations which seem to be from H2 or a version of that type. One may wonder about the relationship between H2 and the three short chron. from Damascus, which AF claimed were written in Heb. and used by him. A possible relationship may well exist, since AF's other declared sources were in Arab., except perhaps the 'loose sheets' written by his high priest in a language not specified. The Damascus chron., being in Heb., may well be parts of a version of Chron. II and therefore we may suppose that most of AF's quotations which were not from IV, but match passages in H2 (sometimes *verbatim*), came from some such source as the Damascus chron.

**Chron. VII:** published by Adler & Séligsohn, the latest of the chron., clearly dependent on III & V. It was copied 'by command of' the 19th

<sup>21</sup> See the comparative notes throughout II (c) below.

century High Priest Jacob the son of Aaron. Séligsohn<sup>22</sup> lists the works on which his chron. is based as the *Tolidah*, AF, *Sepher Dibhre ha-Yamim*. This last we may assume to be a generic title which does not ref. to Chron. II and merely connotes some old chronicle material which is unspecifiable. No sign of dependence on Chron. II is discoverable in the work. See further Séligsohn's discussion on *Sepher Dibhre ha-Yamim* and the unknown Sadaqah chron. ref. to by AF as unreliable.

This chron. too starts from Adam and it continues to the year before the actual composition in 1900. It is in some ways more useful than its immediate predecessors in that its data on each high priest are fuller and better documented, even if they are by nature secondary. Like Chron. II (H<sub>2</sub> version) Chron. VII calls the high priest *Pāqīd*, spelled PQYD (H<sub>2</sub> PWQYD). It is also characterized by its use of the *matres lectionis*, *plene* writing being much more developed here than in earlier Heb. works.

## II. The content of Chronicle II

### (a) In relation to the Biblical Text

To consider every deviation from the BT in H<sub>1</sub>, every add., om. and alteration, would require a large scale work in itself. We can do no more than draw attention to the larger oms. and adds., suggesting reasons for them — where reasons can be found — in the light of our present-day knowledge of the Sam. outlook during various periods in their history. Some of the reasons suggested will strike a chord in the minds of many readers who are familiar with the literature dealing with the differences between the SP and BT. Such reasons certainly apply here and there in connection with our text, but others derive from our increasing knowledge of the Sam. chron. and exegetical works.

I have felt obliged to assume in general that the chronicler deliberately altered (reduced or add. to) the BT, rather than that the ST represents an original var. of the BT. All the signs point to this. Yet, there are many indications *passim* in the ST that it reflects genuine ancient vars. Notice has been taken of this where appropriate. I do not maintain with complete confidence that my judgment of the ST is altogether correct. It is so easy for all of us to presuppose the greater antiquity and authority of the BT — the Holy Bible — but we must recognize that most OT commentators of repute agree that there is polemic in the BT too. Which polemic, that of BT or that of

<sup>22</sup> P. 190 of "une Nouvelle Chronique Samaritaine", *REJ*, Vol. 44, 1902.

ST, has the authority of prior antiquity — if polemic can be said to have authority? Most of us will say, "The BT." But even if the ST is a later work *in extenso*, it may contain genuinely ancient traditions which antedate some polemical BT passages. No conclusion is final on this subject. At this stage in our enquiry we are justified in letting the ST speak for itself and not allowing the traditional supremacy of the BT to obscure our judgment.

*N.B.* Observations in minor oms. & adds. are recorded in the notes to the Text & Translation respectively. The notes immediately following are generally framed to reflect the probable views of the chronicler and editors as they scrutinized the Sam. version of BT, and not to pronounce the outlook of modern OT scholarship.

#### JOSHUA

§ A BT i 6 om., either because *a* is a doublet & unnecessary, or because the ref. to the allotment of territory is too early. i 8–9 again may be regarded as mainly duplicate (to 5,7). The ref. to 'this book of the law' may have been held to be anticipatory, since the Sam. tradition of the first copy of the law ref. it to Abisha on the 13th day after the Entry into Canaan.

§ B i 10, A\*–D\* replace BT i 11, which merely speaks of preparations for the three days journey to cross the Jordan. The ST presents a picture of a well-ordered administration centred on Joshua. Here we have preparations ordered for a military conquest, but no ref. to the projected journey is yet made. This comes only after D\*, suggesting that Joshua was awaiting news about the territory to be invaded, no doubt from the spies (cf. ii 1), before giving detailed orders to the people. The entire ST passage emphasizes the wholesale nature of the conquest, despite the restriction of the bibl. verses 12 ff. to the tribes of Reuben, Gad and half of Manasseh (12). This suits the panoramic picture of an idealized community of Israel under Moses' successor. 15b: there is no obvious reason for the om. here, unless the ref. to territorial distribution was regarded as anticipatory. 17b–18 may have been om. as unnecessary, and partly (18a) anticipatory (of Achan/Ilan).

§ C ii 1 presents an add. between 1a & 1b, this widening the scope of the spies (not enumerated here in ST, but numbered in vi 22 § I). It is possible to regard the BT ref. to Jericho as a late add. or parenthesis, but it is likely that ST has deliberately widened to 'the land of Canaan' before the specification of A\*. A\* might suggest that Jericho was the chief centre of opposition in Canaan and that a victory there would mean the successful launching of a much greater campaign. Geographically this would be valid. B\* replaces BT 14a and simplifies an odd bibl. expression (but see RSV rendering). 19–21a. We may

regard the discussion here as om. because Rahab was not only un-virtuous but non-Israelite. 22–23a<sup>a</sup> om. as unnecessary. 24 is replaced. The BT, with its ref. to ‘all the land’ instead of simply ‘Jericho’, may have seemed at fault. Possibly the BT of 24a<sup>a-b</sup> supports the ST of ii 1. The ST for 24, however, is little more than a ‘correction’ of the BT 23b<sup>a</sup>, for throughout the chron. the high priest is given pride of place, and it would have been improper for the spies to report to Joshua alone. This conforms to the traditional Sam. view of the hierocracy of Israel.

§ D iii A\*ff. After iii 6 comes the Song of the Priests, an obvious late add. in the style of the liturgical Heb. It has no ref. to the events of the story, but it is possible that at some time a family or families of the Sams. commemorated the Entry into Canaan (one of the ‘ful-filled promises’) with such a hymn of praise (the J MSS vars. support this), no doubt after the model of Ex xv & Deut xxxii, two of Samaritanism’s most oft quoted passages.

§ E iii 9–11 is replaced, perhaps because of the statement in 10a. The Sams. could never have stated that the presence of God was provable in terms of conquest or (11) the ark of the covenant. The om. of these verses may suggest that the chronicler here lived at a time when the theology had assumed its distinctively Sam. form. The visible sign of God was the pillar of cloud (& of fire) in the early traditions. In other words, the BT’s concept here of the evidence of God’s presence is replaced by the Sam. concept in (Mosaic) terms of the cloud. As the cloud guided Israel in the days of Moses, so it was in the days of his successor. C\* seems to suggest that the formula of address in BT iii 9 had been deliberately removed when 9–11 were om. and so the necessary formula is introduced at this point. iii 13: the phrase ‘Lord of all the earth’ is om. The Sams., at least from Roman times—witness *Memar Marqah* (*passim*)—would have said ‘Lord of heaven & earth’ or ‘Lord of the worlds’. There is also the add. ‘the covenant of’ in ‘the ark of the Lord’, a phrase many times retouched in the sequel to Joshua. As in the E tradition so often, so in the ST & Sam. theology generally, there is a very real dislike of anything that savoured of the anthropomorphic. iii 14 (apart from the introductory Heb. verb) is entirely om. This may be because it is unnecessary. May the verse be not original in BT? 15: note the om. of the repetition in this verse. 16b: the whole of this passage is replaced by ‘and the waters dried up’. Is the passage original in BT? iv 1–3 om. 2 could have been regarded as a duplicate of iii 12, being only an intro., and 3 as unnecessary in view of 5. 4b<sup>a</sup> similarly is a repetition (so the word ‘Joshua’ in 5a), but the Versions also om. it. 8b om., <sup>a</sup> as repetitious and <sup>b</sup> as unnecessary. 10–13 om. There are two BT details of the tradition here: (1) that the priests, with ark, waited till the people had crossed before themselves



crossing: (2) that the two and a half tribes (12-13), 40,000 warriors, were ready for battle at the time of crossing. ST has none of these. 14b-17 om; perhaps 14b was regarded as, to some extent, a criticism of Moses & Joshua, which did not harmonize with the idealistic concept of these two saviours in the chronicler's mind. 15-17 can at once be seen to be repetitious, unnecessary after 11. 18b, d consist of details in BT which the chronicler may have considered unnecessary, or they represent glosses to the original text. 19b is om. here, but incorporated in 20 (§ G).

§ F The whole of § F is non-bibl. We have the Song of Joshua (|| the Song of the Priests in § D), which is stated to have been preceded by Ex xv 1-19. This Song of Moses, like its predecessor in § D, is of the liturgical type and in the style of the liturgical Heb. Like it, it has no relevance to the narrative of Joshua and must clearly be regarded as a very late add. The repetitious verse L\* is but a concluding verse and may have been inspired by the BT iii 7 which ff. the Song of the Priests. The expressions 'lord of the prophets' & 'upon whom be peace' are very late, but how late it is not possible to say. They appear Islamic in style, but there is no evidence as to whether the Sams. already used such—this in view of the Sam. veneration of Moses from earliest (E) times.

§ G iv 21-24 om. as repetitious, unless the passage is not original to BT, but the ST here may reflect such a passage, otherwise treated as repetitious. v 8-1 om. Verse 1 limits the ref. to 'foes' to the king of Damascus (unless there is some text missing, mentioning the kings of other regions), but keeps the plur. verbs. It may be that the BT in its MT form is suspect because of the central part of the verse with its 1st person ref. 2-8, dealing with the circumcision of the contemporary generation of Israelites, totally om. The reason for this is well-known especially in connection with Gilgal. 9 is altered. The BT is concerned with the uncircumcised state of Israel being corrected & the ST explanation of the name 'Gilgal' is thereby different. Indeed it is as unlikely as the BT's. The verse may come from a different chronicler, since ST v 1 ref. only to the king of Damascus, while ST 9 ref. to all 'peoples'. This is perhaps a good example of the composite nature of the non-bibl. material in the ST. A\*, typical of the arrangement of the chron., presents at the new juncture in the history of Joshua an exact dating; for the year 2794 see the chronology in § A and APP. V. The removal of the cloud, in Sam. eyes, meant that God had fulfilled his promise to lead Israel to the Promised Land (so the cessation of the manna and the eating thereafter of the produce of Canaan indicates the end of one era and the beginning of the new). This is indicative of the Priestly cast of the chron., as discussed in the § of the Intro. dealing with the nature of Chron. II. 10-11 provide the add. inform-

ation that the first Passover was celebrated in the first month and for the prescribed 7 days—all Priestly in concern.

§ H v 15 om. the ref. to the commander of the Lord's host. Samaritanism has no belief in intermediaries other than angels and these are never specified in such a way. Cf. vi 2 below where the normal Sam. expression occurs. vi 1 probably deliberately om. because it is critical of Joshua's abilities. vi 2: see v 15 above. There is no regularity in ST in replacing 'the Lord said' with 'the angel of the Lord said'; only in the non-bibl. material, reflecting the views of a later era, is there such regularity. 4a is replaced. Again there is a playing down of the role of the ark. The BT gives greater prominence here to the ark. The om. of 'rams' horns' is strange (unless the ST lacks the words by err.) in view of the occurrence of 'ram's horn' in 5 below. It is possible that the chronicler realized from the latter (one ram's horn) that the 'seven trumpets of rams' horns' must be wrong, since only one was blown. But in 6–8, 13, 16 below the plur. and the number 7 are retained. 5: typical of such occasions the ST add. a passage clearly connected with Moses (Ex xv 3); so after vi 16 in § I.

§ I 8a<sup>b</sup> om. as repetitious. 9: again a passage dealing with the warriors is om., in the same way as iv 12–13, presumably here because in the Sam. tradition the armed men consisted of over 600,000 Israelites (§ B B\*), not the mere 40,000 of the BT iv 13. Thus the picture presented by the BT in vi 9 is irreconcilable with the Sam. tradition. 10b<sup>b</sup> is om. as repetitious. 13: this verse greatly reduced; it is repetitious & (as we have seen above in connection with 9) irreconcilable with Sam. tradition. 15: 'after the same manner' may have seemed to the chronicler an inaccurate expression in view of the 'seven times' ff. 15b<sup>b</sup> 'only on that day . . .' om. as repetitious. Is it a gloss to the original BT? 18: the central clauses om. in the same way as i 18. 20 reduced by om. the unnecessary a<sup>b</sup>, b<sup>a</sup>. 21: the unnecessary 'young and old' om., since 'all' that was in the city makes the expression superfluous? 23a: 'the young men who were with' om. as unnecessary detail—or not original? 23d: 'and left them . . . camp of Israel' may have been regarded as inexplicable by the chronicler, since it would have been more natural to say 'outside the city'. 24b–25 om. Ref. to the Lord's treasury again om. (cf. 19b). 25 om. because of the ref. to a non-Israelite & immoral woman dwelling in Israel 'to this day'. 26b: original to BT or om. as inexplicable?

§ J vii 1. Unwilling to accept that the Israelites, as such, committed an offence against God, the chronicler places the crime on one man. Interestingly, he gives a location for the offence—a house of SLMY, by which is presumably meant (reading ZLMY) 'a heathen temple'. Thus the crime is all the greater. 7: the final optative sentence om., presumably to soften the doubts of Joshua. 9: the final question of

9 om. because of the theological belief involved. 11: the om. of the second sentence indicates the implicit Sam. denial of any covenant other than the patriarchal & high priestly ones, which includes Judah? The om. of the last three verbal expressions may be due to their being regarded as unnecessary. The add. 'go to the people' replaces 12. 13-14: om. as anticipatory. The material in 14 is covered by 16-18. 16-18: in these we have the further detail in the scene of judgment that the high priest in full ceremonial dress presided; it is the high priest who employs the divination by lot and Joshua acts only when the culprit is discovered. On the procedure of divination which involves the rows of stones see J. Harris' article (in *The Annual of Leeds University Oriental Society*, Vol. 5, 1966). The Sam. picture here presented is an improvement on the BT and may well contain a truly old tradition. See further the Sam. Targum on the 'jewels passages'—Ex xxviii & xxxix. In 18 'comes up black' seems to throw 'light' on the Urim & Thummim, and it ties in with the arrangement of the colours of the stones as described in the Sam. Targum. 19a<sup>b</sup>: the command to glorify the God of Israel and confess to him is altered to a typical (liturgy, *Memar Marqah*) expression. 21 om. because unnecessary? It is unnecessary in BT after 20b<sup>a</sup> and may be a later add. there. The add. between 22a & 22b emphasizes the heathen aspect of the things taken by Ilan (cf. vii 1 & 24 ST). 23: the om. of part of 23a<sup>b</sup> can be explained in terms of Joshua's prerogatives as king & judge (under the high priest). Why should the stolen goods be brought before the people as well as Joshua? 24: part of a<sup>a</sup> om. for the reason just mentioned (23). The om. of part of b<sup>a</sup>: unnecessary in view of the ff. words 'and all that he had'. It is interesting, in view of the ST 'Ilan', that the ref. to the valley of Achor is om. here. 25a is om., perhaps because the chronicler saw no need to bring God into the punishment—despite his retention of 26b. The punishment was the penalty long imposed by tribal law. Repetition (in view of 26b) could be a reason. In connection with the BT 'stoned him' & 'burned them', the ST removes the problem by using the plur. object after both verbs. This could be original. 26c: for this om. see the observation in connection with vii 24.

§ K viii 2 om: partly anticipatory & repetitious (in view of 4). The chronicler seems to have been little interested in booty, only in the successful conquest of territory by the great northern hero Joshua. 6 om; it seems in BT parenthetical and may be a late add. 8 is recast into the accomplished act. The long passage 9-29 om: the likely reason for the om., unless the Sams. did not possess the story of Ai's conquest in the BT form—which is unlikely—is the locating of Ai near Bethel. H2 identifies Ai with Rugib near the Sam. Bethel. In view of the Sam. identification of Bethel with a site on Mount Gerizim, the topo-

graphical set up of this passage could not be accepted. But the chronicler could have om. 'Bethel' or changed the name as H2 did; so it might be that the story was of little interest from his point of view. Yet the full account of the stratagem of the Gibeonites is retained. The add. 8ff. A\*–D\* could have been a later attempt to shift the locus, because of Bethel refs. in the BT. So we are taken north to the Sam. Bethel (= Luzah). But the continuation of D\* is missing. This is a key passage in determining the composition of the chron. If the Sams. had merely concocted their own version of the account held by the Judahites, they would hardly have left themselves open to ridicule by having a passage end with the word **לאמר**! Yet all copies extant of the Jos part of Chron. II lack the continuation. We must assume that the add. material here (A\*–D\*) has a fairly long history. [See further A\* in § L].

§ L The add. verse A\* draws us farther into Sam. territory by moving from Bethel (= Luzah) to Gilgal and Elon Moreh. Yet the previous section (§ K) took us only to Luzah and no mention was made of the Israelites being at Gilgal. We have to suppose that the missing text, introduced by D\*, was long enough to give Joshua's words and tell of the Israelites going to Gilgal.

The add. of A\* must also have been designed as a prop to verse 30, since the BT places Joshua's altar on Mount Ebal. In any case the BT implies that Ai was near Mount Ebal, whereas Ai is to be located beside the Bethel of Benjamin. BT verse 33 also places the Israelites in Sam. territory. In 30 we are not surprised to find the BT 'Ebal' changed to 'Gerizim'. Oms. in 31, 32b, 33–35 all reflect the Sam. rejection of the BT tradition of Joshua reading the Law to *all* Israel in the circumstances here described. Indeed 33 in BT is a remarkable verse, unusually pregnant with refs. back to the books of Moses—the dividing of the people into two groups, each group 'over against' one of the mountains, the commandment to bless the people (rejected here by the chronicler because only the priests of Phinehas' line could bless the people), and the reading of the Law. The smooth transition in BT of 32 to 34 is interrupted by 33, which may well be adjudged polemical [See further § M A\*–G\*]. The add. verses B\*, C\* present a typically Sam. picture of the theocracy (hierocracy), B\* being probably very late. C\* presents the same sort of situation as A\*ff. in § D & A\*ff. in § F, and perhaps the add. to vi 5 in § H and the add. in vi 16 in § I. 32 is revised according to the undoubtedly ancient Sam. tradition that Eleazar's grandson wrote the first copy of the Law as possessed by the Sams. (Ithamar having written the first copy of that held by the Judahites). D\* is an odd add. It looks like an unsuccessful attempt (by a scribe?) to justify verse 32. His choice of quotations is inapposite. E\* may be adjudged a justification of the claim that the altar of Joshua still existed on Mount Gerizim.

§ M The whole section A\*–G\* is clearly an add. designed to give what to the Sams. would be a proper description of the reading of the Law before the people. The burial of the bones of Joseph (xxiv 32) may have been placed here as a sign of final and total possession of the territory in the North associated with the Josephite tribes.

§ N ix 1,3 simplifies BT ix 1–3, with the mention of cities captured by Joshua at this time, according to the Sam. tradition. It is not easy to decide if it was this condensing of the BT verses which led to the Sam. version, which does not restrict the story of ix to the Gibeonites. 4 is almost entirely unrepresented and this may be due, as 1,3, to reduction. There is some obscurity in 6, because only J1–3,5 have the full text of ST herein published. The H1 & J4 texts have 6 incomplete. The subject of the beginning of verse 7 is altered to the more fitting one from a Sam. point of view—Joshua and Eleazar, king and high priest, being supreme. 9–11: the ST here gives part of 9, then a fragment of 8 (or 11) ff. by the continuation from J1–3,5. H1, J4 om. 8–11. The ST may have resulted from confusion over the words ‘we are your servants’ occurring twice in BT (8,11 and ‘your servants’ in 9). 27: the om. of ‘up to this day’ seems to be a deliberate one, probably because the chronicler realized that the statement did not hold true for his (much later) time.

§ O x 1: om. of first half due to it being unnecessary & repetitious. In 6, 7, 9 refs. to Gilgal om., the locus shifted to Mount Gerizim nearby (according to the Sams.); cf. 15. Om. of 11 due to Sam. refusal to accept divine intervention too readily. Probably not a Northern tradition. Like 11, 12b–14 om. because of the divine intervention—and here in a most unlikely way. The add. material in ST 12 (repetitious too!) may be indicative of deliberative om. of BT material.

§ P x 28–39: almost entirely from J1–3,5; see notes on xi 1–23. 42–43 (1<sup>0</sup>): the words within square brackets in 42 from J1–3,5 seem properly to belong here. H1, J4 have these words out of place (see 42 below). The similar 43 is correctly placed. B\* take us five months on to the first proper settlement of Israelites in the Shechem area. 42–43 as in H1, J4, but see further 42 above. It seems that H1, J4 are confused, just where there is add. material between 42 & 43 (1<sup>0</sup>) and after 43 (1<sup>0</sup>). The add. verses C\*–E\* designed to express the religious purity of the new community at & near Mount Gerizim, who began their settled life with Passover. xi occurs only in J1–3,5. Except for the om. of 18 (a criticism of Joshua) & 21 a<sup>9</sup> (a claim not made by the Sams?) the whole chapter is reproduced as in BT. This is the only place in the Book of Joshua where so much bibl. text is reproduced without var. & alteration. Interesting for the history of our text. The chapter may have been om. with xii in one literary tradition.

Like x 28–38 we have a solid block of text, almost *verbatim* with BT and it must be considered that these passages were either inserted

at some time because there was a Sam. literary tradition (in one family?) which included these sections, or they were inserted from a text obtained from Karaite or Rabbinic Jews, a less likely explanation. Another possibility is that the earlier literary tradition did not contain much information on geographical & topographical matters—hence its om. also of chapters xiii ff. The inserted material (x 28–39, xi 1–23, xiii 7–33, xiv 1–5) is likely to have belonged to another northern version which was concerned much more with such data as tribal delineations, towns captured, and so on.

§ Q: this add. § deals with the erection of Joshua's sanctuary on Mount Gerizim & the domestic rule of Joshua. It is possible that two traditions are enshrined here: (a) A\*–D\* speaks of a sanctuary, including the holy of holies; (b) G\* (later add?) speaks of a Temple with the tent of meeting, ark, propitiary, screen & altars. The latter may be no more than a later completion of the former, but the use of the word Temple may suggest a polemical situation, with the purpose of forestalling the erection of Solomon's Temple in the 10th century.

It would seem from the literary evidence of § Q that Joshua had a sanctuary built, and a later chronicler add. G\*, perhaps because by his time the Sam. Temple was believed to have been built by Joshua, or as suggested above for polemical purposes.

§ R xiii 1e–7a om. [1a occurs later], because of the statement of the incompleteness of Joshua's conquest & because Joshua is instructed by God to apportion the land. The Sam. view (cf. D?) was that the conquest was completed under Joshua; hence ST lacks Judg. The remainder of xiii & xiv 1–5 is included in the J1–3,5 MSS as we have seen, and, like x 28–39, xi 1–23, the BT is reproduced *verbatim*. The whole cast of the material included in ST is that God's command to Moses (not Joshua) to apportion the land was carried out. xiv 6–15, the story of Caleb's inheritance of Hebron, is rejected, because his family relationship was with Joshua and the north.

§ S xv 1b–xx 6 om., dealing with Judah's territory and that of the Josephite clans (the most disputed territories in ancient Israel) & statements of the incompleteness of Joshua's conquest & the tabernacle at Shiloh & the territories of Benjamin & Simeon, Issachar & Dan. The Sam. version of the allotment of territory to the tribes (apart from the two and a half tribes—xiii 7b–33) shows a different topographical set up from that recorded in Jos xv BT. This version has been examined and a map of the Sam. territory delineations drawn up by A.D. Crown (see Bibliography). xx 1–6, giving the appointment of cities of refuge, om. (see below). 7–9 is replaced by M\*. Only Bezer (xx 8) of BT is om., probably a scribal err. xxi; mention of the cities given to the Levites om. The Sam. view of Levitical dispersion may be an old tradition.

§ T xxii 1–6, dealing with the Transjordanian territories, is retained with the add. (A\*–B\*) about Nobhah being made king of the two and a half tribes. There is a city called Nobhah in that territory. Nobhah appears again in the Legend of Shobhach (App. I).

§ U: in this § xiii 1 is brought into immediate conjunction with xxiv 1, resuming the continuity of narrative from xi 23. The occasion for xiii 1 in BT was the division of territory following—rejected by the chronicler because Joshua only carried out the command of the Lord to Moses and could not, in his view, have been thus commissioned himself by the Lord. xxiv 2–5 om. here. Sam. judgment of secular history is based on Moses & Joshua. While the Sams. write purely religious history in terms of Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob & Joseph, they place such emphasis on Moses & Joshua that the Patriarchs in the chrons. are hardly mentioned. 6–7 is recast in broader terms. 8–10, 11a<sup>b</sup>–12 om., possibly treated as of secondary importance here. 14b<sup>b</sup> om. because of the criticism of the fathers of Israel. 15: central section altered for the same reason. 17a<sup>b</sup>–18b<sup>a</sup> om. as of secondary importance here. 19–21 probably om. because of theological objections. 23–24 om. possibly because of the direct criticism of alien worship on Israel's part. 26: ref. to the law of God removed, because it was believed that God wrote the law through Moses, and Joshua had no part in it. The add. 'and gave it to the priests, the Levites' serves to reinforce the Sam. claim for the priestly control of all religion. 27b, c om. because of the role of the stone as recipient of God's words. 28 om. because irrelevant to the Sam. account ff?

§ V A\*–C\*: Joshua's successor chosen by lot at the direction of the high priest—typical Sam. view of the hierocracy of Israel.

§ W: the accomplishments of Phinehas—calendar, his son Abisha and the copy of the Law, details of Abisha's Scroll. See M. Gaster, *The Samaritans*, pp. 107–112.

#### JUDGES

ST lacks a title as is the case with the other historical books corresponding to BT. It is interesting that it prefers (not exclusively) the use of מלך to שפט. This practice may have arisen at a time, long after the BT was formulated, when the idealist hierarchy centred on Shechem had been established. Then there was a king under the direction of the high priest. The latter was no 'judge' in the Sam. tradition except in religious matters. The former most certainly was a judge—cf. Jos § J vii 19, § Q F\*, § U C\*, etc. It is always the king who exercises civil & criminal judgment. In much more ancient times, in Ugarit, 'king' and 'judge' were parallel terms, confirming the Sam. tradition that kingship & judgment went hand in hand.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> E.g. Anat v 40, & cf. II Danel 7 for the use of the root ŠPT in judging.

A second point of general interest is the significant om. throughout in ST of the Deuteronomic 'The Israelites did evil in the sight of the Lord . . . the Israelites cried out . . . Lord raised up a deliverer.' This (later add. to BT?) finds no place in the Sam. *schema* for Judges. It may well be that we do the ST an injustice if we assume that *all* oms. from BT are due to polemical considerations. While something of this may be true—as indicated in the notes which follow—it could be that the text in the hands of our chronicler(s) lacked substantial portions of BT. If there is truth in this, we may assume that the Sams. did have oral traditions of their own, reflecting the history of purely local kings/judges centred in Ephraim-Manasseh territory.

The strict Sam. framework for Judges may conceal the true history of the ST. Some will feel that the ST represents no more than mere selection from and abridgement of the BT, later reframed to fit the Sam. ideology of high priest & king governing the community of God's people. But our text poses too many problems for such an explanation to be wholly satisfying. The well-defined and systematic arrangement of Judges in ST is matched by the Deuteronomic framework imposed on a collection of old, regional and unrelated folktales. Idealistic though the ST framework is, it comes more naturally after the reign of *king* Joshua and before the reign of Saul. The BT presentation of a sinful Israel (as if the tribes were united politically and morally) being punished by the Lord until they cried out for and received deliverance is every bit as idealistic as the ST framework of a well-governed community under a high priest and king-judge rebuffing its enemies' attempts to remove it from territory once owned by them.

The Sam. chronology is fixed, as it is throughout the ST, in such a way that there is a regular succession of kings after Joshua. If Israel was united under Joshua and there was no disruption of national unity—religious and cultural if not political—it would seem reasonable to suppose a succession of rulers centred where Joshua was centred—at Shechem. However, there are many perplexing problems in connection with the BT Judges, and the appearance now of the ST version may well increase their number. There is no room here for an examination of such questions. The notes which follow therefore merely draw attention to the larger oms. and adds. If the ST receives the attention that critical investigation demands, the problems raised herein will be discussed by many writers.

§ A i—iii 1–7 is not recorded, obviously because the account of the conquest of the remainder of Canaan clashes with the account of the total conquest of Canaan recorded as having been accomplished in Joshua's lifetime. Nor was serious apostasy on the part of Israel after Joshua's death (BT ii 11 ff.) an historical fact as far as the Sams. were concerned. Serious apostasy in their view began after the last of the



Judges (Samson), when Eli caused a split among the Northern tribes.

Our text begins with the reign of Joshua's immediate successor Nethanel (BT Othniel) in iii 8. For a comparative list, ST & BT, of the Judges see APP. IV C. Verses B\* ff. illustrate the Sam. tradition of the hero Joshua, centred on the Shechem area, moving out from the centre of the hierocracy to attack his enemies. One almost feels that the ST is less prejudiced than the BT here, being content to state the facts without interpretation (cf. BT iii 6-7, 12 etc.). For verse 11 the ST gives a 9 year reign; the BT offers none. The picture of his successor's appointment is that presented throughout Chron. II in most versions.

§ B: the ST om. of iii 16-19 must be judged in the light of the problem created by the BT verses, where 19 seems an add. in the BT story, and 20a is a doublet of 17a containing a different purpose. The ST om. of 19, 20b is thus understandable either because the ST was shorter or because the chronicler excerpted the basic elements of the account as he did elsewhere (see below). The om. of 22-25 may be due to the same reasons, while the om. of 26a is due no doubt to a topographical problem—where exactly is Seirath? In any case 27a<sup>8</sup> fits the Sam. geographical setting for the 'kings' after Joshua. So ST's 26 must be regarded as a rewrite of the BT tradition. The om. of 30b matches the similar om. of the time ref. in 11a. The Sams. no doubt had long possessed their own chronology of the period.

§ C A\*-B\*: again the traditional Sam. setting for the succession. BT Shamgar becomes Gomer, which is hardly due to dialectal differences. C\* is a framework verse in line with the formula of introducing the new hero. The BT lacks the 'moral' reason for the new situation (cf. BT iii 12, iv 1, etc.). Indeed BT's one-verse story is the only one of its kind in BT. Either ST represents a rewrite in terms of a tradition or reflects an earlier or other form. D\*: the normal Sam. expression 'was gathered to his people' (cf. as used for high priests) may be a purely Priestly formula.

§ D. It is clear from BT here that after the death of the Judge there was a period when Israel had no Israelite overlord. The Sam. tradition, with its tight chronology, does not allow this. The var. from BT iv 2a may signify reformulation by the chronicler. The evil (iv 1) and anguish (iv 3a) of Israel are suppressed, unless the BT as much as the ST in its own way represents an arrangement of older material. The om. of 4-9 is explained by the Sam. rejection of Judahite prophets. ST 10 probably om. the geographical signification as being too far removed from the Shechem centre. In 10 ff. all ref. to Deborah is om. as one would expect. The ST ref. to Kishon (10) seems to pick up BT 7a. BT 11 om. due to polemic or regarded as irrelevant to the story. 14b-24,

the only part of the Book of Judges in ST which is *verbatim* with BT, may well have been an ancient folktale, since it reflects no signs of later religious interpretation or bias.

§ E BT v om. because the Sams. had no prophets after Moses. The om. of vi 1-3 is again the om. of a formulized BT passage. The fragments of vi ff. quoted in ST are 34, 12, (14), 4, ff. by vi 7, viii 13. The lengthy oms. here may mean that the Gideon tradition was not well known in Ephraim & Manasseh, though Gideon is stated here to be from the latter. The refs. to the east may suggest that Gideon came from the half of Manasseh east of the Jordan, in which case there would be no local (Shechem) established tradition. It is possible, however, that this lengthy om. is due to theological factors which are patent. The later Sam. tradition found here places Gideon, like other judges, in the heart of Sam. territory (ST viii 13). See the n. below on Gideon & Jerubbaal. Evidence that the Gideon-Jerubbaal story was not traditional in Samaria may be observed in the oms. of vii-viii, some of the material being unacceptable for theological reasons, but much more could have been recorded otherwise.

The Abimelech story is practically ignored in ST, and Abimelech is called *Gideon's* son. He is placed in the Shechem area (R\*) as in BT ix 1 and said to have reigned 13 years (BT does not give the length of reign). The Gideon story of BT probably possesses two strands representing two traditions, one of Gideon & one of Jerubbaal, ST having no ref. to the latter and hence the om. of ix. Furthermore, much of ix offended Sam. theological & idealist susceptibilities (*e.g.* 4, 7ff., 23, etc.). Verse 6 at least is reflected and in new guise in Q\*.

§§ F-G. Jair is elected like his predecessors; he is named *Jair son of Gilead* instead of *Jair of Gilead*. He is said (ST 3) to have been a Manassite prince (Gilead being in Manasseh territory). The BT is probably original and the Sam. chronicler has assumed Gilead to be patronymic rather than geographic. Verse 5 appears, part of it duplicated, in ST. The first ref. sets his death in the traditional formula. The BT final n. in 4 is om., no doubt because of ST 3.

§ H BT x 6-18 is om., as such passages dealing with Israel's sin & anguish always are. Jephthah is 'removed' from BT Gilead to Judah and his sojourn in Tob (N. of Gilead) is om. So he is not stated to have been buried in Gilead (BT xii 7). The abrupt intro. of xi 5 in ST suggests deliberate om., no doubt because of the BT ref. to Jephthah's ancestry (BT xi 1-2). 6-11 is the only large om. before the om. of 34ff. and was probably due to the way Jephthah is recorded as having been elected over Israel. 29-31 om. because of the relationship between Jephthah and the Lord. xi 34 to end of BT text of Judges is om., except xii 6, xiii 1, and the ST account of the remaining judges is different.