

SANBALLAT AND THE SAMARITAN TEMPLE ¹

By HAROLD H. ROWLEY, M.A., D.D., THEOL.D., F.B.A.

PROFESSOR OF HEBREW LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE IN THE
UNIVERSITY OF MANCHESTER

IN the book of Nehemiah we find a number of references to Sanballat the Horonite,² who was the leader of the Samaritan opposition to the rebuilding of the walls of Jerusalem, and it would appear that if Nehemiah had not been as wary as Sanballat was wily, the task would not have been completed. The meaning of the term Horonite is uncertain, and a number of scholars³ have connected it with Horonaim, in Moab.⁴ Others⁵

¹ A lecture delivered in the John Rylands Library on the 9th of February, 1955. The substance of this lecture was given in French as a paper at the Journées Bibliques held in Louvain in September 1954. The following abbreviations are used in this article: *A.J.S.L.* = *American Journal of Semitic Languages*; *A.N.E.T.* = *Ancient Near Eastern Texts*; *B.J.R.L.* = *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*; *C.A.H.* = *Cambridge Ancient History*; *C.Q.R.* = *Church Quarterly Review*; *D.B.* = *Dictionary of the Bible, or Dictionnaire de la Bible*; *E.B.* = *Encyclopaedia Biblica*; *H.A.T.* = *Handbuch zum Alten Testament*; *H.K.* = *Handkommentar zum Alten Testament*; *H.S.A.T.* = *Die Heilige Schrift des Alten Testaments*; *H.U.C.A.* = *Hebrew Union College Annual*; *J.B.L.* = *Journal of Biblical Literature*; *J.E.* = *Jewish Encyclopedia*; *J.P.O.S.* = *Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society*; *K.A.T.* = *Kommentar zum Alten Testament*; *K.E.H.* = *Kurzgefasste exegetische Handbuch*; *K.H.C.* = *Kurzer Handkommentar*; *P.G.* = *Patrologia Graeca*; *P.R.E.* = *Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche*; *P.W.* = *Pauly-Wissowa-Kroll-Witte, Real Encyclopädie des classischen Altertums-Wissenschaft*; *R.E.J.* = *Revue des Études Juives*; *S.B.U.* = *Svenskt Bibliskt Uppslagsverk*; *S.D.B.* = *Supplément au Dictionnaire de la Bible* (ed. by L. Pirot); *Th.L.Z.* = *Theologische Literaturzeitung*; *U.J.E.* = *Universal Jewish Encyclopedia*; *Z.A.W.* = *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*.

² Cf. Neh. ii. 10, 19; iv. 1; 7 (Heb. iii. 33; iv. 1); vi. 1, 2, 5, 12, 14; xiii. 28.

³ So H. Winckler, *Altorientalische Forschungen*, II. Reihe, II (1898), 228 ff.; F. Vigouroux, *D.B.* v (1912), 1443; R. Kittel, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, III, 2. Hälfte (1929), 627; W. O. E. Oesterley, *History of Israel*, II (1934), 154.

⁴ Cf. Isa. xv. 5; Jer. xlviii. 3. In Neh. xiii. 1, note is made of the fact that no Ammonite or Moabite should enter the congregation of God, and this would have special relevance if Tobiah were an Ammonite and Sanballat a Moabite.

⁵ So H. E. Ryle, *Ezra and Nehemiah* (Camb. B.) (1893), p. 164; H. A. White, in Hastings's *D.B.* II (1899), 416b; T. K. Cheyne, in *E.B.* IV (1907),

have connected it with the name Beth-horon,¹ and this seems more probable.² Torrey³ thinks the term was one of contempt, and that it indicates that Sanballat had taken up his residence at one of the two Beth-horons, close to Jerusalem, the better to seize his opportunities of interfering with Nehemiah's work.⁴ That he was a worshipper of Yahweh is probable, since his sons bore the names Delaiah and Shelemiah,⁵ both of which are compounded with the name Yahweh,⁶ and his daughter married into the Jerusalem high priestly family.⁷ Torrey, as will be seen below, does not identify Nehemiah's contemporary with the father of Delaiah and Shelemiah, but with the son of one of them,

4281 (Cheyne's "New theory" in the appendix to this article may be ignored); J. A. Montgomery, *The Samaritans* (1907), p. 58; H. P. Smith, *Old Testament History* (2nd imp. 1911), p. 384; Davis-Gehman, *Westminster Dictionary of the Bible* (1944), p. 532; J. Stafford Wright, in *The New Bible Commentary* (1953), p. 373.

¹ Cf. 1 Chron. vii. 24. There were two Beth-horons, situated on the easiest approach to Jerusalem from the west. Cf. A. T. Chapman, in Hastings's *D.B.* i (1898), 280a.

² A. Klostermann, in *P.R.E.*, 3rd edn., xiii (1903), 702, connected the name with Harran, in Mesopotamia, which was a great centre of the worship of Sin, whose name forms an element of Sinuballit, or Sanballat. So also S. Feigin, *A.J.S.L.* xliii (1926), 58 n.

³ Cf. *Ezra Studies* (1910), pp. 634 f.; *J.B.L.* xlvii (1928), 384 f.

⁴ Cf. *J.B.L.*, loc. cit. p. 387; "He had taken up his residence at Beth-horon, a little northwest of Jerusalem, with the express purpose of taking a hand in Jewish affairs. A glance at the map of Palestine, and especially a raised map or air-map, will show that this was a base of operations admirably suited to his purposes." Cf. G. A. Smith, *Historical Geography of the Holy Land*, 22nd edn., p. 291, and F.-M. Abel, *Géographie de la Palestine*, ii (1938), 220 f., on the strategic position of the place.

⁵ E. Sachau, *Aramäische Papyrus und Ostraka* (1911), p. 5 n., conjectures that Sanballat's real name was Shelemaiah, and in this he is followed by Oesterley, *History of Israel*, ii. 52 n. This rests on the assumption that the name borne by his second son was identical with his own, while his eldest son would bear the name of Sanballat's father. This is surely hazardous, since there was no regular practice such as this. The name Sanballat is then held to be a foreign name assumed by Shelemaiah when he took the office of governor.

⁶ W. F. Albright, in *The Jews* (ed. by L. Finkelstein) (1949), p. 52, says it may be considered as certain that the Yahwism of Sanballat and Tobiah was of a syncretistic structure, with archaic features, presumably something like the religion of the Jewish colonists at Elephantine. The association of Tobiah and of Sanballat's daughter with the Jerusalem Temple (see below) would not suggest that there was any clear difference between their Yahwism and that of Jerusalem.

⁷ Cf. Neh. xiii. 28.

but this would establish even more closely his association with the worship of Yahweh. The marriage of Sanballat's daughter to the son of Joiada took place while Nehemiah was absent from Jerusalem, and when he returned it was with some indignation that he learned what had happened. Associated with Sanballat in his opposition to Nehemiah had been Tobiah, who is called an Ammonite,¹ but whose name is again compounded with the name Yahweh, and one Geshem,² or Gashmu,³ an Arabian.⁴ When Nehemiah returned to Jerusalem he found Tobiah installed in a room in the Jerusalem Temple.⁵ This would again suggest that Tobiah professed the Jewish religion. With characteristic vigour Nehemiah expelled Tobiah and the priestly son-in-law of Sanballat from the Temple, and took steps to get rid of all alien influence from the Jerusalem community.⁶

In Josephus's *Antiquities*⁷ we read about a Sanballat, who lived in the time of Darius III and Alexander the Great. Josephus relates that Bagoses, or Bagoas, promised the high priesthood to Jesus, the brother of John, who was the rightful High Priest, but that John slew his brother in the Temple precincts.⁸ Bagoas and John, or Johanan, are securely known to us from the Elephantine Papyri. In 408 B.C. the Jews of Elephantine wrote a letter to Bagoas, who was then the Governor of Judaea, in the course of which they refer to an earlier letter sent to him and to Johanan, the High Priest.⁹ Johanan was the

¹ Cf. Neh. ii. 10, 19; iv. 3 (Heb. iii. 35), +.

² Cf. Neh. ii. 19; vi. 1 f.

³ Cf. Neh. vi. 6.

⁴ H. P. Smith, *op. cit.* p. 384, says that how Geshem got his name of Arabian cannot now be made out. W. C. Graham, *A.J.S.L.* xlii (1925-26), 276 ff., holds that he was an Arabian, interested in the keeping open of trade routes vital to his people, and that between the rebuilding of the Temple and the arrival of Nehemiah the Edomites had been overthrown by a confederacy of Arab tribes.

⁵ Cf. Neh. xiii. 7. According to Neh. xiii. 4 Tobiah was connected by marriage with Eliashib. The Hebrew expression is the same as that used in Ru. ii. 20 to indicate that Boaz was related by marriage to Naomi and Ruth.

⁶ Cf. Neh. xiii. 8, 28, 30.

⁷ Cf. *Antiq.*, xi. vii. 2 (xi. 302 f.); viii. 2 ff. (306 ff.).

⁸ *Ibid.* xi. vii. 1 (xi. 298 f.).

⁹ Cf. A. Cowley, *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C.* (1923), pp. 111 ff. (Papyrus 30). A translation of this papyrus by H. L. Ginsberg may be found in *A.N.E.T.* (ed. by J. B. Pritchard) (1950), p. 492.

son of Joiada,¹ and therefore the brother of the priest who is said in the book of Nehemiah to have married Sanballat's daughter.² Johanan's son and successor was Jaddua,³ who is the last High Priest known to us under the Persian empire, and who is said by Josephus to have been in office at the time of Alexander's conquest.⁴

Here, however, Josephus recounts a story which has curious points of similarity to what is found in the book of Nehemiah. He reports⁵ that Jaddua's brother, Manasseh, married Nicaso, the daughter of Sanballat, the Persian Governor of Samaria, whom Darius III had appointed. Sanballat, he tells us, was a Cuthite of the same stock as the immigrants who had been brought to Samaria after its conquest by the Assyrians in 721 B.C., though he was not one of the Samaritan community. On account of his marriage with Sanballat's daughter Manasseh is said to have been driven out of Jerusalem by Jaddua and the elders, and to have taken refuge with his father-in-law, who promised to build him a Temple on Mount Gerizim, like the Temple of Jerusalem.⁶

Before this could be done Alexander appeared upon the Palestinian horizon, following the battle of Issus. Sanballat promptly renounced his loyalty to Darius, and transferred his allegiance to Alexander, leading a large contingent of soldiers to take part in the siege of Tyre.⁷ Taking advantage of the occasion he secured authority from Alexander to erect the Temple on Mount Gerizim, which was forthwith built with such speed that within a few months it was completed and Manasseh installed as priest. The speed of the whole business is indicated by the fact that Sanballat is said to have died at the end of the seven months'

¹ Cf. Neh. xii. 11, 22. In xii. 11 the name of Jonathan is almost certainly a scribal error for Johanan. Cf. my *Servant of the Lord* (1952), p. 145 n.

² R. Marcus, in *Josephus* (Loeb edn.), vi (1937), 461 n., observes that in Hebrew usage son may stand for grandson, and hence Sanballat's daughter may have married the grandson of Joiada. Reasons against this will be given below.

³ Cf. Neh. xii. 11, 22.

⁴ Cf. *Antiq.*, xi. viii. 4 (xi. 326).

⁵ *Ibid.* xi. vii. 2 (xi. 302 f.).

⁶ *Ibid.* xi. viii. 2 (xi. 306 ff.).

⁷ F.-M. Abel, *Histoire de la Palestine*, i (1952), 11, thinks it is possible that there is historical substance in the statement that there were Samaritan contingents in Alexander's army.

siege of Tyre and the two months' siege of Gaza.¹ When Alexander had taken Gaza he hastened to Jerusalem, on leaving which he was met by representatives of the Samaritans, who begged him to visit Shechem and to do honour to their Temple.²

The authentic character of Nehemiah's Memoirs has been generally recognized by leading scholars.³ The circumstantial character of Josephus's narrative, giving it an air of reliability, is manifest in the above summary. Nehemiah does not give us the name of the priest of his story, whereas in Josephus's story we are given the name of the priest and also his wife's. In Nehemiah's story the priest is the brother of Johanan, whereas in Josephus's he is his son. In Nehemiah's story there is no mention of the Samaritan Temple, whereas that is essential to Josephus's, and here the date of the erection of the Temple is very precisely fixed.⁴

Most modern writers regard Josephus's account as unhistorical.⁵ Some hold that he has transferred an incident from the

¹ Cf. *Antiq.*, xi. viii. 3 f. (xi. 313 ff.).

² *Ibid.* xi. viii. 6 (xi. 340). For the Samaritan traditions about Alexander cf. *Chronicon Samaritanum*, chap. xlvi (ed. T. W. J. Juynboll (1848), 184 ff.).

³ Cf. R. H. Pfeiffer, *Introduction to the Old Testament*, 1941, 834: "The genuineness of the Memoirs of Nehemiah has never been questioned, but their extent is disputed."

⁴ In *Antiq.*, xiii. ix. 1 (xiii. 256) Josephus briefly repeats his story, and adds that the destruction of the Samaritan Temple by Hyrcanus in 128 B.C. was two hundred years after its erection.

⁵ Cf. R. Rüetschi, in Herzog, *P.R.E.* xiii (1860), 412 f.: "Was Josephus von einem Sanballat erzählt . . . ist ein sehr ungeschichtliche Erzählung"; H. Willrich, *Juden und Griechen vor der makabäischen Erhebung* (1895), p. 6: "Dass uns ein apokryphes Buch im Auszuge vorliegt, ist unzweifelhaft"; A. H. Sayce, in Hastings's *D.B.* iv (1902), 391b: "The whole story seems to be derived from some apocryphal Jewish account of the origin of the Samaritan temple"; F. Vigouroux, *D.B.* v (1912), 1443: "Le récit de Josèphe est plein d'anachronismes et ne saurait être accepté"; G. Hölscher, in Kautzsch-Bertholet, *H.S.A.T.*, 4th edn., ii (1923), 561: "Die Ausbildung der jüdisch-alexandrinischen Schullegende, von der Josephus abhängig ist, erfolgte nur wenige Menschenalter vor Josephus. . . . Von Tradition über mehrere Jahrhunderte frühere Ereignisse kann damals nicht die Rede sein, wie gerade die ganz konfuse, aus blosser willkürlicher Exegese des Nehemiatextes herausgesponnene Alexander-Jaddualegende zeigt"; G. F. Moore, *Judaism*, i (1927), 24: "The Alexander part of the story in Josephus is not embellished legend but pure fiction of a species very familiar in the Hellenistic literature of the Jews. . . . A historian may properly decline to admit such testimony as to either fact

time of Nehemiah to the following century; of these some transfer the whole, in so far as there is any reliable kernel of fact in it, to the time of Nehemiah, while others accept Josephus's date for the building of the Temple, but transfer all else to the preceding century.¹ Many years ago C. C. Torrey adopted a different view, and transferred Nehemiah to the fourth century, to the reign of Artaxerxes II.² Later he argued that there were two Sanballats,³ of whom the first preceded Nehemiah, while the second was his contemporary in the fourth century. The latter outlived Nehemiah and survived until the time of Alexander. The view that there were two Sanballats was not new with Torrey. It had been adopted by a number of older scholars,⁴

or date"; E. Sellin, *Geschichte des israelitisch-jüdischen Volkes*, ii (1932), 169: "Es ist klar, dass es sich hier überwiegend um eine Legende handelt, die aus Neh. 13₂₈ heraus gewachsen ist"; Pfeiffer, *op. cit.* p. 809: Josephus . . . gives a purely fictitious account of the founding of the Samaritan church"; M. Noth, *Geschichte Israels* (1950), p. 307: "Diese ganze Erzählung ist voller legendärer Einzelzüge und lässt allerlei Gestalten wie den samarischen Statthalter Sanballat auftreten, die in diesen geschichtlichen Zusammenhang nicht gehören." A. Büchler, *R.E.J.* xxxvi (1898), 1 ff., analyses Josephus's account into three separate strands, of which the first was of Samaritan origin and the third of Jewish anti-Samaritan origin, while the second was of Jewish origin and of a propagandist character. M. H. Segal, in *Assaf Anniversary Volume* (1953), pp. 409 f., agrees with Büchler that the first of these strands was Samaritan propaganda, and suggests that only a Samaritan could have remembered that Sanballat was governor of Samaria, or preserved the name of his daughter, and this view is favoured by the omission of any reference to Nehemiah.

¹ These varieties of view will be separately examined below, where references will be found.

² Cf. *Composition and Historical Value of Ezra-Nehemiah* (1896), pp. 51 ff., and *Ezra Studies* (1910), pp. 238 ff. For more than half a century Torrey has been one of the most stimulating figures amongst Old Testament scholars, and though his views have often found little following, he has had much to teach both followers and critics. In December 1953 he celebrated his ninetieth birthday, amid a shower of congratulations from all over the world, and, though the present paper is critical of some of Torrey's views, the writer yields to no one in his admiration for the Nestor of our studies.

³ Cf. *The Second Isaiah* (1928), pp. 457 f., and *J.B.L.* xlvii (1928), 380 ff. Kittel, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, iii. 612, rejects Torrey's view, and later (p. 680) says it is unthinkable that Sanballat and his son-in-law were contemporaries of Alexander.

⁴ So, e.g. I. Vossius, *De Septuaginta interpretibus*, etc. (1661), p. 134; H. Petermann, in Herzog, *P.R.E.* xiii (1860), 366; I. Spak, *Der Bericht des Josephus über Alexander den Grossen* (1911), p. 14; M. Gaster, *The Samaritans* (1925),

but had fallen out of fashion. Quite recently, in a study on Ezekiel,¹ L. E. Browne has revived in a new form the view that that prophet lived in the fourth century, at the time of the overthrow of the Persian empire, and has claimed to find references to the building of the Samaritan Temple in the prophecies of the book of Ezekiel. Without re-examining the reliability of Josephus's account, he accepts it as giving an accurate indication of the date of the erection of the Samaritan Temple.²

Some re-examination of this question is therefore called for, though it may be said at the outset that there is a complex tangle of issues, on which certainty may not always be possible. The desire for a clear-cut and sure solution of Biblical problems can rarely be satisfied, for we are often left at vital points without any evidence, and can do no more than piece together the bits of evidence we have, to form at best a probable picture.

There is no antecedent improbability in the suggestion that there were two Sanballats.³ Torrey rightly points out that there are many cases of a grandson bearing the name of his grandfather, and that a second Sanballat, two generations after the first, would be in no way unusual.⁴ It would be very surprising, however, for the daughter of the second Sanballat, a great-niece of the daughter of the first Sanballat, to repeat so exactly and with such similar consequences the experience of her great-aunt. If both stories are accepted as historical, then the husband in the second case was the nephew of the husband in the first, and both husbands were chased out of Jerusalem as the result of their marriage. For so exact a repetition of history at an interval of a century, at a distance of two generations on the wife's side and a single generation on the husband's, we should need stronger evidence

p. 30 n.; W. F. Lofthouse, *Israel after the Exile* (Clarendon Bible) (1928), pp. 33, 235 f. Also W. F. Albright, *J.B.L.* xl (1921), 122, accepted two Sanballats, but transferred Josephus's story to the first.

¹ Cf. *Ezekiel and Alexander* (1952).

² Cf. *ibid.* p. 3, where he says 332 B.C. is the exact year when the Samaritan temple was built on Mt. Gerizim. Cf. also pp. 22, 23 f.

³ Cf. S. A. Cook, in *C.A.H.* vi (1927), 172.

⁴ Cf. *The Second Isaiah*, pp. 457 f.

than Josephus's account can supply.¹ For his story is full of improbabilities.

Torrey does not argue for any duplication of this incident,² however, as other upholders of the view that there were two Sanballats had done. Since he transfers Nehemiah to the reign of Artaxerxes II, he eliminates the fifth century incident altogether. We may therefore first examine this view, which transfers the whole account in the book of Nehemiah to the following century, in so far as it contains any reliable kernel.

Torrey finds two Sanballats, but not two marriages into the high priestly family. By the identification of the incident recorded in Nehemiah with that recorded in Josephus he is able to attach more historical worth to Josephus's story than most scholars do. He does not discuss some chronological difficulties, however. He observes that since Sanballat was an old man in Josephus's story, dealing with the time of Alexander,³ he could well have been a young man, not yet in the office of governor, at the time of Nehemiah's mission in the twentieth year of Artaxerxes II, fifty years earlier.⁴ But according to the book of Nehemiah the marriage of Sanballat's daughter to the son of the high priest had taken place before Nehemiah's second visit to Jerusalem in or after the thirty-second year of Artaxerxes.⁵ If

¹ Cf. Montgomery, *op. cit.* pp. 67 f.: "There could hardly have been two Sanballats in succeeding centuries, each of whom married his daughter to a member of the high priestly family, an offence in each case visited with excommunication"; A. E. Cowley, *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C.* (1923), p. 110: "The view that there were two Sanballats, each governor of Samaria and each with a daughter who married a brother of the High Priest of Jerusalem, is a solution too desperate to be entertained." Such a suggestion was rejected as unthinkable by H. Prideaux, *The Old and New Testament Connected* (1845 edn.), i. 288 f. Cf. also the references given below for the view that Josephus has transferred the incident recorded in the book of Nehemiah to the following century. These scholars are all persuaded that the basis of Josephus's story is the Biblical story, and that there were not two Sanballats.

² Spak, on the other hand, does argue for the historicity of both the incident recorded in Neh. xiii. 27 f., and that recorded in Josephus for a century later (*loc. cit.*). ³ Cf. *J.B.L.* *loc. cit.* p. 389. ⁴ *Ibid.* p. 386.

⁵ It is commonly said, on the basis of Neh. xiii. 6, that Nehemiah returned to Jerusalem in the thirty-second year of Artaxerxes, but as L. W. Batten, *Ezra and Nehemiah* (I.C.C.) (1913), p. 45, points out, this is not strictly correct. What the verse says is that Nehemiah returned to court in that year, and "after some days" asked permission to return to Jerusalem. It is improbable that after so

the stories of Josephus and of the Bible are combined, then Sanballat must be supposed to have promised Manasseh a Temple on Mount Gerizim nearly forty years before Alexander appeared on his horizon, when he first began to think of the implementing of his promise. But Josephus says that Sanballat was appointed governor by Darius III, and that the marriage took place after his appointment.¹ This date of his appointment is rejected by Torrey as improbable, on the ground that Darius reigned for but three years and it is unlikely that Sanballat, who died at an advanced age in 332 B.C., should have been so recently appointed.² Torrey therefore supposes that Sanballat was appointed Governor by Artaxerxes III. The marriage of Sanballat's daughter and the subsequent expulsion of Manasseh he places in the time of Darius III,³ however. This involves him in the necessity of denying that Neh. xiii. 28 f. had anything to do with Nehemiah,⁴ and involves fresh chronological difficulties, which Marcus points out.⁵ For it is highly improbable that an old man such as Torrey depicts Sanballat as being at that time would have had a marriageable daughter, or that the brother of the aged Jaddua would have been an eligible husband.⁶

long an absence from court his return would be for but a very brief time, and, as Batten points out, the things that had happened in his absence would seem to presuppose a long time. We have no means of knowing how long it was, save that the second visit to Jerusalem fell in the same king's reign. R. H. Pfeiffer, *Introduction*, p. 835, deals with the difficulty in a different way, by supposing that Nehemiah's first period in Jerusalem lasted for but a year, or, at most, two.

¹ Cf. *Antiq.*, xi. vii. 2 (xi. 302 f.).

² Cf. *J.B.L.*, loc. cit. p. 389.

³ Cf. *The Second Isaiah*, p. 459.

⁴ *Ibid.* and earlier in *The Composition and Historical Value of Ezra-Nehemiah* (1896), pp. 48 f. R. H. Pfeiffer, *op. cit.* p. 837, rejects Torrey's dismissal of the evidence here. It may be added that C. Steuernagel (*Einleitung in das A.T.* (1912), p. 426), L. W. Batten (*Ezra and Nehemiah*, p. 15), and O. Eissfeldt (*Einleitung in das A.T.* (1934), p. 589) all accept these verses as genuine. So, too, S. Mowinckel, *Statholderen Nehemia* (1916), pp. 88 f.

⁵ Cf. *Josephus* (Loeb edn.), vi. 508 f.

⁶ It may be noted that if Sanballat's daughter married the grandson of Joiada, as Marcus suggests (*Josephus*, vi. 461 n.), even greater chronological difficulties would arise. For Sanballat and Eliashib were contemporaries in office, the one as Governor of Samaria and the other as High Priest. For the daughter of the one to marry the great grandson of the other would be highly surprising, even though it be allowed that Eliashib was an older man than Sanballat. For it would be unlikely that the bride would be greatly older than her husband.

Much more serious, however, is the difficulty of assigning Nehemiah to the period of Artaxerxes II, in the fourth century. This difficulty has been generally recognized, and accounts for the lack of following Torrey has obtained for his view. If there were two Sanballats, it may be said to be quite impossible to make Nehemiah the contemporary of the second. For the Elephantine Papyri provide us with unassailable evidence that in 408 B.C. Johanan was the High Priest in Jerusalem and Sanballat the Governor of Samaria.¹ Torrey says this is the sole basis for the view that Nehemiah belongs to the fifth century,² but it will be seen below that this is not the case. Moreover, since the view that Nehemiah belonged to the fifth century long antedated the finding of the Elephantine Papyri it could scarcely be the case. Since the Jews in Elephantine say that they had written to the sons of Sanballat, it would seem to be probable that Sanballat himself was an old man, who had left the administration of affairs in the hands of his sons.³ From the same Papyrus we have evidence that Bagoas was at that time the Persian Governor in Jerusalem. If there were two Sanballats, therefore, the time of the *floruit* of the first is securely fixed in the fifth century B.C. In the book of Nehemiah Sanballat is not called Governor, whereas in the Papyri he is stated to be the Governor of Samaria. Torrey argues on this basis that Nehemiah's Sanballat was not yet Governor, at the time of the rebuilding of the walls of Jerusalem.⁴ But there is nothing inconsistent with his being Governor in the record in Nehemiah, and it can be more easily understood how he could raise troops to molest Nehemiah, if he

¹ Cf. *supra*.

² Cf. *J.B.L.*, loc. cit. p. 380.

³ Cf. L. W. Batten, *Ezra and Nehemiah*, p. 26: "It suffices to assume that Sanballat was an old man, and that his sons had succeeded him, or were the real administrators of the governorship." So Oesterley, *History of Israel*, ii. 118. Several writers have assumed that Sanballat was himself already dead in 408 B.C. So R. Smend, *Th.L.Z.* xxxii (1907), 706; I. Spak, op. cit. p. 14; A. Vincent, *La Religion des Judéo-Araméens*, 252; Höpfl-Miller-Metzinger, *Introductio specialis in V.T.* (1946), p. 187. E. Sachau points out that the language used implies that Sanballat was still alive and governor in name. Cf. *Aramäische Papyrus und Ostraka* (1911), p. 5. Similarly, A. E. Cowley, op. cit. p. 110. N. Messel, *Ezechielfragen* (1945), pp. 23 f., holds that Delaiah and Shelemiah were living in Jerusalem, and were the friends of Bagoas.

⁴ Cf. *J.B.L.*, loc. cit. p. 386.

were Governor. Moreover, it may be noted that Torrey had earlier, on the basis of the same facts, maintained that Nehemiah's Sanballat was the Governor of Samaria.¹

Quite apart from the evidence of the Elephantine Papyri, however, and fatal to Torrey's hypothesis of the date of Nehemiah, is the fact that Nehemiah was the contemporary of the High Priest Eliashib, the grandfather of Johanan.² Since Johanan was High Priest in 408 B.C. his grandfather's high priesthood cannot be placed thirty years later, but must have fallen before.³ Johanan is the John of Josephus's account, and the only Eliashib of whom we have any record, who could possibly be identified with Nehemiah's contemporary, is the one just mentioned. It would be quite unjustified to posit another Eliashib in the reign of Artaxerxes II, since Johanan was the father of Jaddua, who

¹ Cf. *Ezra Studies*, pp. 334 f., where Torrey had argued that though Nehemiah's Sanballat is not called Governor, we may regard it as fairly certain that he was in fact Governor of Samaria. This, indeed, was recognized long before the Elephantine Papyri came to light. As long ago as the beginning of the eighteenth century Humphrey Prideaux had referred to him as "Governor of Samaria". Cf. *The Old and New Testament Connected* (1945 edn.), i. 285 (the Preface of this work is dated 1715).

² Cf. Neh. iii. 1, 20 f.; xiii. 4, 7.

³ Morgenstern, *H.U.C.A.* x (1945), 130 f. n., maintains that Johanan became High Priest in 411 B.C. When his father Joiada succeeded to the high priesthood is difficult to determine. In *The Servant of the Lord*, p. 148, I accepted the probability that the incident of Neh. xiii. 28 fell in the high priesthood of Joiada, and not of Eliashib, and that the English punctuation is misleading. Prideaux, op. cit. i. 395 f., goes beyond me and declares that this is the only possible interpretation of the text. Cf. H. Wiener, *J.P.O.S.* viii (1927), 155. J. Morgenstern, *H.U.C.A.* x (1935), 130 n., takes the opposite view and says Eliashib was certainly still High Priest in 432 B.C. It may be added that Prideaux cited the evidence of the *Chronicon Pascale* that Joiada did not become High Priest until the eleventh year of Darius II (cf. ed. L. Dindorf, in *Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae*, Pars ix. vol. i (1832), 310, or H. Gelzer, *Sextus Julius Africanus und die byzantinische Chronographie*, ii (1898), 175) and hence Prideaux transfers this incident in Neh. xiii. 28 to the fifteenth year of Darius. In this he is certainly wrong. E. Schürer, *History of the Jewish People*, E. Tr. I. i. 189 n., says that every attempt to determine chronology accurately with this aid is necessarily doomed to failure. Moreover, since we now know beyond a peradventure from the Elephantine Papyri that Johanan was High Priest in 410 B.C., it is quite impossible that his father could still have been High Priest in the fifteenth year of Darius II, which fell after that date. Cf. J. N. Schofield, *The Religious Background of the Bible* (1944), p. 167, for the suggestion that the incident recorded in Neh. xiii. 28 f. led to the supersession of the then High Priest in favour of Johanan.

was High Priest in the time of Alexander, and Torrey does not propose to posit a second Eliashib.¹ If Nehemiah was contemporary with a Sanballat and also with Eliashib, therefore, he must be placed towards the middle of the fifth century B.C.

We may next observe that in his account of Nehemiah Josephus does not mention Sanballat, and it would seem that he deliberately removed him from that account in order to make him contemporary with Alexander. He does not seem to have known two Sanballats, or he would have been under no necessity to do this. His Sanballat is not represented as a Samaritan, as the grandson of a former Governor and the son of Delaiah or Shelemiah. He is represented as a Cuthite, of the same stock as the Samaritans, but sent to Samaria by Darius III.² Josephus's Sanballat does not appear to be a second person, therefore, but to have been taken from the Nehemiah Memoirs, but removed far from Nehemiah in date.

Moreover, the circumstantiality of the mention of the name of Manasseh loses its impressiveness in view of the fact that no Manasseh appears in the Samaritan list of their High Priests.³ The author who borrowed the name of Sanballat from Nehemiah's Memoirs may just as easily have borrowed the name of Manasseh from some other context, and transferred it to suit his convenience and to give a specious circumstantiality to his narrative.⁴ It may further be noted that in the surrounding

¹ Cf. *J.B.L.*, loc. cit. p. 383: "We have no reason whatever to doubt that each of these two high-priests held the office for a long term, and there is no need to suppose, as some have done, that there was an intervening incumbent." Earlier Torrey had rejected as unreliable the Chronicler's list of High Priests. Cf. *Ezra Studies*, pp. 219 f.

² Cf. *Antiq.*, xi. vii. 2 (xi. 302). Josephus expressly says "Darius the last king", though these words are omitted in the Latin version (cf. note in Loeb edn., ad loc.).

³ Cf. M. Gaster, *op. cit.* pp. 32 f.

⁴ G. Hölscher, in *H.S.A.T.*, loc. cit., thinks the supplying of names in itself suspicious, and finds this to be a mark of a late legend, but Torrey objects to this and thinks these names could never have been forgotten in Jerusalem (*J.B.L.*, loc. cit. p. 382). It might surely have been supposed that the name of the founder of the Samaritan Temple would not have been forgotten by the Samaritans, or the circumstances of the founding of their Temple, if it was built in express rivalry of the Jerusalem Temple. And, if the name remained so famous as Torrey supposes, we might have expected it to be recorded in the book of Nehemiah, where Torrey finds the marriage and expulsion of the same Manasseh to be

narratives Josephus is universally recognized to present garbled and unreliable history. He places Nehemiah in the reign of Xerxes,¹ instead of Artaxerxes, despite the fact that Xerxes reigned for but twenty years,² while Nehemiah returned to the court in the thirty-second year of the reign of his patron.³ It is curious to find how little accurate history of the Persian period survived in Jewish tradition, and for chronological purposes in this period Jewish sources are of slight value.⁴ It may be added

anonymously recorded. It is well-known that in Judges xviii. 30 the priest of the sanctuary at Dan is said to have been the grandson of Manasseh, but the text is suspended and the Rabbinic view that this was a deliberate change of the name Moses is generally accepted. G. F. Moore, *Judges* (I.C.C.), 2nd edn. (1898), p. 402 n., observes that it is at least a coincidence that in Josephus the first Samaritan High Priest is named Manasseh. That this provides no independent support for Josephus, however, is obvious. For we have no means of knowing how ancient the change is, and it may even depend on Josephus. Moreover, Jewish writers connected the name of this Manasseh with the wicked son of Hezekiah, and not with a Samaritan High Priest. No evidential value can therefore be accorded to it here.

¹ Cf. *Antiq.*, xi. v. 6 (xi. 159).

² In *Antiq.*, xi. v. 7 (xi. 168), Josephus locates Nehemiah's first visit to Jerusalem in the twenty-fifth year of the reign of Xerxes. In xi. v. 8 (xi. 179) he says the building of the wall was completed in the ninth month of the twenty-eighth year, and that the work had taken two years and four months, whereas the Bible text says that the work took but fifty-two days to complete. Cf. Neh. vi. 15.

³ Cf. Neh. xiii. 6.

⁴ J. A. Montgomery, op. cit. p. 68, calls Josephus irresponsible in Persian chronology, and S. A. Cook, in *C.A.H.*, loc. cit. p. 171, speaks of his ignorance of the chronology of the Achaemenid period. Similarly H. Crosby, *The Book of Nehemiah*, in Lange-Schaff, *Commentary on the Holy Scriptures*, O.T. vii (1877), 3, says: "The chronology of Josephus is so wretchedly corrupt in the matter of Nehemiah, Ezra, Sanballat, etc., that it is waste time to give him attention." In *The Zadokite Fragments and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (1952), pp. 62 f., I cited some other examples of unreliable chronology of this period in Jewish works, e.g. Daniel's seventy weeks, the 390 years of the Zadokite Work, and the chronology of the *Seder 'Ôlâm Rabba*, which reduces the Persian period to a mere 34 years. J. L. Teicher accuses me of wanting to eat my cake and to have it because after arguing that the 390 years of the *Zadokite Work* is a schematic figure and quite unreliable, I go on to argue that it is, in fact, approximately correct (*J.J.S.*, iv, No. 2 (1953), 51). In fact I neither want to have my cake nor to eat it, but simply throw it away. In my argument for the date of the founding of the sect of the Scrolls and of the composition of the *Zadokite Work* I nowhere base myself on this figure, but make it plain that if in my view it is an approximation to the truth, that is entirely due to accident and not to the author's accurate chronology. It may be added that later Jewish tradition made Alexander the Great contemporary with the High Priest Simon the Just. Cf. Strack-Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum N.T. aus Talmud und Midrasch*, i (1922), 555, where the passage is cited.

that immediately following the account of the building of the Samaritan Temple, Josephus relates how Alexander on his visit to Jerusalem was shown a copy of the book of Daniel, with its prophetic references to himself.¹ Few can be found today to defend the historicity of this account, and most scholars of all schools are firmly convinced that the book of Daniel was not yet written at that time. A historian who is so little trustworthy here can scarcely be used as a reliable authority for the existence of a second Sanballat, or for the repetition of history that would be involved if Joiada's son and grandson both married daughters of Sanballats, and both involved their husbands in the loss of their priestly office.

It might still be regarded as possible, however, that while Josephus or his source has wrongly transferred Sanballat from the fifth century to the fourth, he has correctly indicated the date of the building of the Temple. This then brings us to the second of the views already mentioned, that Josephus's date for the building of the Temple is correct, even though his account of Sanballat's connection with it is completely garbled.

Hölscher once suggested² that Josephus is here following Alexander Polyhistor, who provides a usually reliable source. This is no more than conjecture, and it will be seen below that, whatever his source might have been, there is no reason to trust his account. A number of scholars have been prepared to trust it, however, so far as the date of the erection of the Samaritan Temple is concerned.³ Even a garbled account may contain

¹ Cf. *Antiq.*, xi. viii. 5 (xi. 337).

² Cf. *Die Quellen des Josephus für die Zeit vom Exil bis zum jüdischen Kriege* (1904), pp. 43 ff. Hölscher was followed by E. Norden, *Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum*, xxxi (1913), 661. Cf. Hölscher more recently, in *P.W.* ix. 2 (1916), 1968. Hölscher himself now rejects Josephus's account as a late and worthless legend. Cf. *H.S.A.T.*, loc. cit., and *Geschichte der israelitischen und jüdischen Religion* (1922), p. 172. He holds that the section of Josephus with which we are concerned is an unhistorical legend of Jewish-Alexandrian origin. Cf. *P.W.*, loc. cit.

³ So A. E. Cowley, in *J.E.* x (1905), 671a; E. Kautzsch, in Herzog-Hauck, *P.R.E.*, 3rd edn. vii (1906), 431 (English trans. in *The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopaedia*, x (1911), 188a); A. E. Cowley, in *E.B.* iv. (1907), 4260; I. Spak, *Der Bericht des Josephus über Alexander den Grossen* (1911), p. 12; C. Steuernagel,

some substratum of history, and the view that we have here one sound fact of history cannot be summarily brushed aside. On the other hand, it cannot be uncritically assumed.

In the book of Nehemiah there is no mention of the building of the Samaritan Temple as the sequel to Nehemiah's action. While the argument from silence must always be used with great reserve, it may be allowed that this is presumptive evidence against the building having taken place at that time, as the result of the expulsion of Sanballat's son-in-law by Nehemiah. It may therefore have taken place at some subsequent date, and perhaps as long after as the date given by Josephus. Browne cannot therefore be unceremoniously dismissed for his acceptance of Josephus's date, though it is to be regretted that he uncritically and without examination accepted a date from a source which has for long been regarded with suspicion, and made it a major argument in a novel hypothesis on the date and interpretation of the book of Ezekiel. For while it may be freely allowed to be possible that Josephus's account may contain some sound reminiscences of history, and that he may have telescoped the story of the intermarriage between the houses of Sanballat and the Jerusalem high priesthood and the story of the building of the Temple on Mount Gerizim, the mere possibility of this is not sufficient to establish its probability.

Einleitung (1912), p. 42; J. Touzard, *R.B.*, n.s. xii (1915), 109 f. n.; L. E. Browne, *Early Judaism* (1929 edn.), p. 207; R. Kittel, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, iii. 680; E. Sellin, *Geschichte des israel.-jüdischen Volkes*, ii (1932), 170; G. Ricciotti, *Histoire d'Israël* (French trans. by R. Auvray), new edn., ii (1948), 199; R. H. Pfeiffer, *Introduction* (1941), p. 809; T. H. Gaster, in *U.J.E.* ix (1943), 336a; I. G. Matthews, *The Religious Pilgrimage of Israel* (1947), p. 239 n.; A. Médebielle, *Esdras-Néhémie* (in Clamer's *Sainte Bible*) (1949), p. 383. Cf. Oesterley, *History of Israel*, ii. 157, who assigns it to the middle of the fourth century. P. Antoine, *S.D.B.* iii. 546, notes that Eusebius (cf. Migne, *P.G.* xix (1857), col. 488) says that this Temple was built under Alexander, but observes that Eusebius here depends on Josephus and has no independent value. M. H. Segal, in *Assaf Anniversary Volume* (1953), pp. 410 ff., maintains that the Temple was built at the time Josephus states, but not in that manner. He holds that the Samaritans seized the opportunity afforded by the decline of the Persian power to erect the Temple, but not with Alexander's permission, and thinks it might have been built by descendants of Sanballat, and the priests might have been descendants of Manasseh. For this interesting suggestion we have nothing but unsupported conjecture.

For there are some inner improbabilities in the account of Josephus which have not yet been noted. If Sanballat did not revolt from Darius and transfer his allegiance to Alexander until after the siege of Tyre had begun, and authority to build the Samaritan Temple was not obtained until after this transfer, it is highly improbable that the Temple could have been built by the end of the siege of Gaza, nine months after the beginning of the siege of Tyre.¹ For, according to Josephus's own story, Sanballat was apparently himself absent from Samaria during this period, together with a large number of its citizens who were with him in the army of Alexander.² That a structure comparable with the Temple of Jerusalem could have been built so rapidly under such conditions is in the highest degree improbable. Nor is the case better if Sanballat is removed altogether from the story, while the erection of the Temple is left at this time. For if Sanballat goes, all the circumstantiality goes out of the story, and the improbability of Alexander's permission having been obtained and the Temple having been built during the sieges of Tyre and Gaza remains unaffected, whether Sanballat or another is thought to have been the prime mover. And if the building of the Temple is divorced from any relation with Alexander, as well as with Sanballat, it can only be said that Josephus does not offer any evidence whatever of such a building.³

There is, indeed, some evidence that Samaria did not stand high in the esteem of Alexander soon after the completion of the

¹ This had already been pointed out nearly a quarter of a millennium ago by H. Prideaux, *op. cit.* i. 291.

² Cf. *Antiq.*, xi. viii. 4 (xi. 321). It is here stated that Sanballat came with eight thousand of his people to the help of Alexander, and it would seem to be a natural inference that Sanballat remained with them as their leader, and not that he abandoned them and returned to build the Temple on Mt. Gerizim. Curiously enough, Josephus says below that the Shechemites brought the soldiers whom Sanballat had sent to Alexander when they came to meet the conqueror after his visit to Jerusalem, and Alexander took these troops with him to Egypt (xi. viii. 6 (xi. 342, 345)). This would seem to imply that they had not remained with Alexander. It is probable that this is an independent legend, which takes no account of the earlier story; for Alexander is here represented as not knowing who the Samaritans were (xi. viii. 6 (xi. 343)).

³ Cf. T. André, in *La Bible du Centenaire*, iii (1947), 414: "Il est prudent de ne pas faire état du récit légendaire et tendancieux de Josèphe." Cf. W. Rudolph, *Esra und Nehemia* (H.A.T.) (1949), p. 210.

siege of Gaza. For Eusebius records that when Alexander had gone to Egypt, the Samaritans set fire to the house of Andromachus, whom Alexander had left as Governor of Syria, and burnt him to death, so that when the conqueror returned from Egypt he executed great numbers of the Samaritans and exiled others.¹ Moreover, Josephus's own account of Alexander's interview with the Samaritan representatives after his journey to Jerusalem suggests a marked reserve and suspicion, which contrasts with the cordial relations which mark the account of the building of the Temple,² and which show that if Josephus's account of the erection of the Samaritan Temple during the operations at Tyre and Gaza cannot be accepted, he cannot be appealed to for support for the likelihood of its erection soon after. Elsewhere Josephus cites from Hecataeus a statement that Alexander gave the district of Samaria to the Jews, but there can be little doubt that this is an exaggeration.³

Nowhere in the Old Testament are we given any account of the building of the Temple on Mount Gerizim, and we are left wholly to conjecture as to when that event might have taken place, with very scanty evidence to support our conjecture.⁴

¹ Cf. Migne, *P.G.* xix (1857), 489 (cf. Syncellus, ed. W. Dindorf (1829), 496, in *Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae*, xx), or Eusebius, v (1911), 197 (ed. J. Karst, in *Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte*). This incident is also recorded in Quintus Curtius, *Hist. Alex.*, iv. viii. 9 f. On this cf. R. Marcus, in *Josephus* (Loeb edn.), vi. 522 ff.

² Cf. *Antiq.*, xi. viii. 6 (xi. 340 ff.).

³ Cf. *Contra Ap.* ii. 4 (ii. 43). H. St. J. Thackeray comments: "This statement (? of pseudo-Hecataeus) is certainly exaggerated, and perhaps an anachronism." Cf. Loeb edition, ad loc. R. Marcus, in *Josephus* (Loeb edn.), vi. 527, says: "We do not know whether this statement actually comes from Hecataeus . . . and is therefore presumably authentic or whether it is taken from a Hellenistic Jewish writer, the so-called Pseudo-Hecataeus, who invented the story for apologetic purposes." Marcus favours a suggestion of Büchler's, that the passage in Josephus ascribes to Alexander a privilege actually conferred by Julius Caesar. Cf. *R.E.J.* xxxvi (1898), 18 ff. Willrich, op. cit. pp. 9 ff., had earlier suggested that the story of Alexander's visit to Jerusalem was a reflection into the past of the reception accorded to Marcus Agrippa, but Büchler, loc. cit. pp. 16 ff., criticizes this view.

⁴ Cf. H. Ewald, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, 3rd edn., iv (1864), 283: "Wann der Tempel auf Garizim wirklich gebauet und ob sein bau schon von jenem Manasse aus Jerusalem unter der mächtigen hülfe Sanballat's angefangen sei, wissen wir jetzt nicht genau genug."

Many scholars have found references to that Temple in some passages of Trito-Isaiah,¹ but these are neither clear and indisputable, nor is their date so certain that they can be used as a *terminus ante quem* for the erection of the Temple.

We may turn now to the third view already noted, which ascribes the erection of this Temple to the fifth century B.C., and maintains that Josephus was a century out in his chronology, but that otherwise his story can be accepted, at least in part.² Those who take this view would purge the story of any reference to Alexander and the siege of Tyre, or to Sanballat's transfer of allegiance, but suppose that the building of the Temple followed soon after Nehemiah's expulsion of Sanballat's son-in-law from Jerusalem. Apart from the lack of mention of any such consequence of Nehemiah's action in the Bible, there are many

¹ E. Kautzsch, in *P.R.E.*, loc. cit., cites Isa. lvii. 3 ff.; lxv. 3 ff.; lxvi. 1 ff., 16 ff., following B. Duhm, *Jesaia* (H.K.) (1892), in locis. Cf. also T. K. Cheyne, *Jewish Religious Life after the Exile* (1898), pp. 22 ff. K. Marti, *Jesaja* (K.H.C.) (1900), thought rather of the pro-Samaritan section of the Jewish population, and has been followed by O. C. Whitehouse, *Isaiah xl-lxvi* (Cent. B.), and G. H. Box, *The Book of Isaiah* (1908) (2nd edn., 1916). J. Skinner, *Isaiah, chapters xl-lxvi* (Camb. B.) (1917), follows Duhm with some reserve. Other editors find no reference to the Samaritans in these passages. So G. W. Wade, *The Book of the Prophet Isaiah* (West. C.) (1911); P. Volz, *Jesaia II* (K.A.T.) (1932); E. J. Kissane, *The Book of Isaiah*, vol. ii (1943); L. Dennefeld, *Les grands Prophètes* (in Clamer's *La Sainte Bible*) (1947). Cf. also R. Kittel, *Geschichte*, iii, 2. Hälfte, 681 f., and L. E. Browne's treatment of Isa. lxv f. in *Early Judaism*, pp. 91 ff. In the second century B.C. the Samaritan Temple would seem to be referred to in Ecclus. i. 25 f., and there is a clear reference to it in 2 Macc. vi. 1 f., where it is put side by side with the Jerusalem Temple but in contrast with it.

² So J. Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*, English trans. (1885), p. 498, and *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte* (5th edn. 1904), p. 194; Bertheau-Ryssel, *Die Bücher Esra, Nehemia und Ester* (K.E.H.) (1887), pp. 356 f.; B. Stade, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, ii (1888), 189 ff., and *Biblische Theologie des A.T.s* i (1905), 355; H. E. Ryle, *Ezra and Nehemiah*, p. 319; T. K. Cheyne, op. cit. p. 31; C. W. Wilson, in Hastings's *D.B.* iv (1902), 376b; L. Heidet, in Vigouroux's *D.B.* iv (1912), 1418; S. A. Cook, in *C.A.H.* vi (1927), 171; R. H. Kennett, *The Church of Israel* (1933), p. 64 n.; P. Antoine, in *S.D.B.* iii (1938), 545 f.; E. Kalt, *Biblisches Reallexikon*, 2nd edn., ii (1939), 576; v.D., in *Bijbelse Woordenboek* (ed. by A. van den Born) (1941), p. 1397; Höpff-Miller-Metzinger, *Introductio specialis in V.T.* (1946), p. 27; Davis-Gehman, op. cit. p. 532; Bo Reicke, in *S.B.U.* ii (1952), 1034; cf. also S. Mowinckel's examination of Josephus's account in *Statholderen Nehemia* (1916), pp. 208 ff.

reasons for doubting if the religious breach between Jews and Samaritans reached such a point in that age.¹

The opposition in Nehemiah's time was political, rather than religious. Sanballat, the Governor of Samaria, did not wish to see the walls of Jerusalem rebuilt and the city restored to a position of strength and importance. Earlier in the reign of Artaxerxes there had been an abortive attempt to rebuild the walls,² which had been brought to a premature end on the ground of the political danger that might come in the train of such a rebuilding. Sanballat was merely continuing the jealous watch on Jerusalem, and though it was impossible to stop it this time by the same means as before, partly because Nehemiah was armed with authority from the Crown, and partly because he was acting so swiftly that the machinery of an appeal to the royal chancellery would take far too long to be effective, he sought to exploit every avenue open to him to prevent the completion of Nehemiah's work.³ That he had no hostility to the religion of the Jews or to the Temple at Jerusalem is shown by the fact that his daughter married into the family of the High Priest.

When Nehemiah returned to the city and found the son-in-law of his old political enemy amongst the priests, and Tobiah installed in a room in the Temple, he had no mind to see the influence of his foes working against him within the community. He had had sufficient experience of the wiles of Sanballat to make him suspicious and intolerant. Hence he drove the priest out, and with him all the Samaritan elements who had come into Jerusalem.⁴ There was no reason why this should immediately

¹ J. W. Rothstein, *Juden und Samaritaner* (1908), p. 80, says categorically that the final breach between Jews and Samaritans resulted from the work of Nehemiah. Similarly, A. Vincent, *op. cit.* p. 251; R. H. Kennett, *The Church of Israel* pp. 64 f. On the other hand, Hölscher, *Geschichte*, p. 172, equally categorically rejects the theory of a schism in that age, while M. Gaster, *op. cit.* p. 28, ascribes the breach to Ezra. For this last view there is some justification in Samaritan tradition, as will be noted below.

² Cf. Ezra iv. 7-23.

³ Cf. what I have said in dealing with the work of Nehemiah, in *B.J.R.L.* xxxvii (1954-5), 559 f.

⁴ N. H. Snaith, *Studies in the Psalter* (1934), pp. 11 ff., suggests that the priest whom Nehemiah drove out was the older brother of Johanan, and was none

lead to a religious breach between the Jews and the Samaritans. If the political tension between Sanballat and Nehemiah had not led to such a breach prior to the marriage of Sanballat's daughter with the son of Joiada, there was no reason why Nehemiah's politically inspired response should cause a religious breach now. For Sanballat was the Persian Governor, and though he had allies in Tobiah and Gashmu, we should not identify the Samaritan people as a whole with him. At an earlier time the Persian authorities in the province had raised questions about the building of the Jerusalem Temple,¹ but that had certainly not precipitated any sharp religious breach between Jews and Samaritans. We should beware of assuming that the deep personal antagonism between Nehemiah and Sanballat, though it must have affected the communities of which they were the leaders, turned itself at once into an irrevocable breach between the two communities.²

It may be allowed that the ambition of the displaced priest might seek to find its outlet in the erection of another Temple, where he could continue to officiate, but there are some reasons for doubting whether the Samaritan Temple was really built for him. For while the Jews traced the Jerusalem priesthood from Zadok, the Samaritans did not,³ and therefore they have no tradition of a High Priest with such an ancestry as Joiada's son would yield. It is well known that Zadok suddenly appeared on the scene after David's conquest of Jerusalem, and that he is

other than the Jesus, or Jeshua, whom Johanan is said by Josephus to have afterwards slain. In this case he had already returned to Jerusalem and had been slain before the arrival of Ezra. The priests who were displaced with him by Nehemiah are identified by Snaith with the Korahites, and the suggestion is made that in the time of Ezra a concordat was reached whereby they were allowed to return to the Temple, but with reduced status.

¹ Cf. Ezra v. 3 ff. In view of what is recorded in Ezra iv. 1 ff., it is not improbable that the action of the authorities was due to Samaritan instigation.

² Cf. L. E. Browne, *Early Judaism*, p. 149: "The opposition of Sanballat and Tobiah to Nehemiah was not an attack of heathen against the servants of Yahweh, much less was it due to unfriendly feelings towards the Jewish people. It was purely political rivalry, arising probably because Nehemiah's arrival curtailed the authority of Sanballat, and threatened the supremacy of Samaria, over Jerusalem."

³ Cf. E. Robertson, *The Old Testament Problem* (1950), pp. 174 f.

given two different genealogies in the Bible.¹ In 2 Sam. viii. 17 he is said to be the son of Ahitub, and the reader could only suppose that he was of the family of Eli.² It is almost certain that there is textual corruption in the verse and that originally Zadok was given no genealogy at all here.³ In a later age, however, he was provided with a full genealogy back to Aaron in the line of Eleazar,⁴ and not in the line of Ithamar, to which Eli belonged.⁵ The Samaritans traced their line of High Priests back to Eleazar, but their line broke off much higher up than Zadok. Both the Samaritan list and the list in Chronicles agree substantially from Aaron down to Uzzi, the seventh name in the

¹ That Zadok was not really an Israelite priest at all originally, but the pre-Davidic Jebusite priest, is a view which has been held by several modern scholars, and to which I have more than once announced my adhesion. Cf. *J.B.L.* lxiii (1939), 113 ff., and *Festschrift Alfred Bertholet* (1950), p. 464. Cf. also S. Mowinckel, *Ezra den Skriftlærde* (1916), p. 109 n.; H. R. Hall, in *The People and the Book* (ed. by A. S. Peake) (1925), p. 11; A. Bentzen, *Studier over det Zadokidiske præsterkabs historie* (1931), pp. 8 ff., and *Z.A.W.*, ii (N.F. x) (1933), 173 ff.; K. Möhlenbrink, *Z.A.W.* lii (N.F. xi) (1934), 204; G. Widengren, *Psalm 110 och det sakrale kungadömet i Israel* (1941), p. 21; H. Ringgren, in *S.B.U.* ii. 1004. J. Pedersen, *Israel III-IV*, English trans. (1940), p. 153, and I. Hylander, *Der literarische Samuel-Saul-Komplex* (1932), p. 291, do not quite commit themselves to this view. ² Cf. 1 Sam. xiv. 3.

³ The text reads: "And Zadok the son of Ahitub, and Ahimelech the son of Abiathar, were priests." This cannot possibly be right. For we know that Abiathar, who was David's priest during the period when he was an outlaw, was still priest at the beginning of Solomon's reign. Cf. 1 Kings ii. 27. Moreover, 2 Sam. xx. 25 states that Zadok and Abiathar were the priests. So long ago as the seventeenth century it was perceived that we should read "Abiathar the son of Ahimelech" (so Tirinus, *Biblia maxima versionum cum annotationibus*, iv (1660), 460), and this is indeed the reading of the Syriac version. F. J. V. D. Maurer, *Commentarius grammaticus criticus in V.T.* i (1835), 184, proposed the reading "Zadok, and Abiathar the son of Ahimelech the son of Ahitub" (cf. 1 Sam. xxii. 20), and so F. Hitzig, in Thenius, *Die Bücher Samuels* (1842), p. 166, while J. Wellhausen, *Der Text der Bücher Samuelis* (1871), p. 177, proposed the order "Abiathar the son of Ahimelech the son of Ahitub, and Zadok". This leaves Zadok without genealogy in the older sources, and is almost certainly correct. K. H. Graf, *De templo Silonensi* (1855), p. 13, held that Zadok belonged to the house of Eli, and that he and Ahimelech were sons of the same father. But this makes 1 Sam. ii. 27 ff. meaningless, yet the supersession of Abiathar by Zadok is said in 1 Kings ii. 27 to fulfil that word. Of any other Ahitub who would be appropriate the books of Samuel leave us without trace.

⁴ Cf. 1 Chron. vi. 4 ff., 50 ff. (Heb. v. 30 ff., vi. 35 ff.).

⁵ *Ibid.* xxiv. 3.

Samaritan list and the sixth in the Jewish, but thereafter the two lines divide.¹ There is thus no reason whatever to suppose that the ejected Jerusalem priest became the Samaritan High Priest. For it must be emphasized that there is no hint of this in the Bible, and the only support is Josephus's demonstrably garbled account.²

We have, therefore, no means of knowing when the Samaritan Temple was built.³ It is conceivable that it was erected at some time in the fourth century, perhaps long before the time of Alexander.⁴ But it is equally conceivable that it was not.⁵ We have nothing but unsupported conjecture to build on, and it is unprofitable to indulge in such conjecture. What is of much more importance is the fact that the erection of the Samaritan Temple and the Samaritan schism are two quite separate questions, and the one may not have synchronized with the other.⁶

¹ Cf. E. Robertson, *op. cit.* p. 175. Cf. also Juynboll, *Chronicon Samaritanum*, p. 298.

² I. Spak, *op. cit.* p. 3, rightly observes that but for the story in Josephus we should have no reason whatever to think of the Samaritan schism in connection with the incident recorded in Neh. xiii. 28.

³ Cf. G. Hölscher, in *H.S.A.T.*, *loc. cit.*: "Das erste sichere Datum ist die Existenz des Garizim-tempels im Jahre 128 . . . ; die Zeit seiner Erbauung ist . . . unbekannt."

⁴ C. F. Kent, *History of the Jewish People* (1927 edn.), p. 221, dates the building of the Temple not far from 400 B.C., while P. Antoine, *S.D.B.* iii. 547, suggests the possibility that it was begun under Darius II but finished under Alexander. On the other hand, E. Sellin, *Geschichte des israel.-jüdischen Volkes*, ii. 170, says it is wholly improbable that it was built in the Persian period.

⁵ Samaritan tradition says the Temple on Mt. Gerizim was restored by Sanballat in the time of Zerubbabel. Cf. P. Antoine, in *S.D.B.* iii. 546; also Juynboll, *op. cit.* p. 314. This date is accepted by H. Winckler, *Altorientalische Forschungen*, *loc. cit.* p. 228. It is curious to find Samaritan tradition agreeing with Josephus in connecting Sanballat with this work of building, but disagreeing by nearly two centuries as to the date when he lived. Cf. *Chronicon Samaritanum*, chap. xlv (ed. Juynboll, pp. 181 ff.). The Bible and the Elephantine Papyri enable us to date Sanballat securely half way between these dates, but here he is not connected with the erection of this Temple.

⁶ Torrey connects the two events definitely and categorically, and says the schism took place in 332 B.C. Cf. *J.B.L.*, *loc. cit.* p. 384. On the other hand, cf. G. F. Moore, *Judaism*, i (1927), 24: "It is this claim"—i.e. the claim that Gerizim, and not Zion, was the place which God had chosen for His habitation—"not the mere building of the Shechemite temple, that constitutes the Samaritan schism".

The Elephantine Papyri show us that at the end of the fifth century no complete breach between Jerusalem and Samaria was known to the colonists up the Nile.¹ When their temple was

¹ Cf. Cowley, *Aramaic Papyri*, p. 110: "The fact that the Jews of Elephantine applied also to Delaiah and Shelemaiah at Samaria and mention this to the authorities at Jerusalem, shows that (at any rate as far as they knew) no religious schism had as yet taken place." So also Torrey, *The Second Isaiah*, p. 458. R. Marcus, in *Josephus* (Loeb edn.), vi. 507, draws the opposite conclusion that the breach had occurred. He thinks the Jews of Elephantine may or may not have heard about the schism when they wrote to Johanan, but it is probable that they had heard about it by 408 B.C. when they wrote the letter which has survived. Others had earlier suggested that it was the lack of response from Johanan which led to this fresh appeal in different quarters. So L. Hennequin, in *S.D.B.* ii (1934), 1010, and A. Vincent, *La Religion des Judéo-Araméens d'Éléphantine* (1937), p. 252. Naturally, it was the lack of response to the first appeal which led to the second, but it is doubtful if we should read into this the disapproval of Johanan and the appeal to the opposing interests in Palestine. The first appeal was made to Bagoas and Johanan; the second to Bagoas and the sons of Sanballat. Josephus tells the story of the friction between Bagoas and Johanan, which led to the murder of his brother by Johanan (see above), and the consequent penalties which Bagoas imposed, but that was in the reign of Artaxerxes II and later than this Papyrus, and we are not justified in antedating the tension. The first appeal was made to the civil and religious authorities in Jerusalem; the second was made to the civil authorities in Jerusalem and Samaria. What was wanted was the permission of the Persian authorities to rebuild the Elephantine temple, and if the influence of both Jerusalem and Samaria could be secured this would be an advantage. In the first place appeal was made to the civil and religious authorities in Jerusalem, since on a religious matter the civil authorities could not be expected to move without the support of the religious authorities. It is gratuitous to suppose that Johanan opposed the request, and that now Bagoas took action in opposition to Johanan's wishes. Moreover, if the schism had taken place and the Gerizim temple had been erected, we should have expected the second appeal to have been sent not only to Delaiah and Shelemaiah, but to the Samaritan priest, who might have been expected to be more ready to support their request. If the signatories to the letter really knew that Bagoas and the Samaritan leaders were hostile to Johanan, it was hardly tactful to mention that their first appeal had been to Johanan. Further, the fact that when the reply was sent it went in the name of the civil authorities of Jerusalem and Samaria (cf. Cowley, AP. 32) would suggest that these authorities were in cordial relations with one another on matters of religious policy, and would not suggest—though it would not rule out—that the communities they governed were deeply at variance on these matters. It may further be noted that when trouble developed between Bagoas and Johanan, Johanan's brother was in close relations with Bagoas. Even if Johanan were opposed to the Elephantine appeal, therefore, it may have been that there was another party in Jerusalem which took a different view. We should beware therefore of assuming that any final breach between Jerusalem and Samaria had

destroyed and they wanted authority to rebuild it, they invoked the help of the Jerusalem High Priest and, later, of the Samaritan authorities, Delaiah and Shelemiah, who were the brothers-in-law of the expelled priest.¹ They do not seem even to have been aware of any family feud that had followed Nehemiah's action, much less any breach between the whole communities.

The existence of a Temple outside Jerusalem was no obstacle to association. The Elephantine Jews could even appeal to the High Priest for help in securing permission to rebuild the Temple in their midst. The mere existence of a Temple on Mount Gerizim, therefore, need not itself have involved an irreparable breach.² It is true that the book of Deuteronomy allowed but one legitimate sanctuary,³ and it is almost certain that Josiah's reform had enforced this law; but it is certain that it was only a temporary enforcement. The displaced sanctuaries and the overthrown practices had begun again to appear before the destruction of Jerusalem,⁴ and we have no precise information as

taken place. At most one party in Jerusalem can be assumed to have been hostile, and there is no real evidence even of that. J. Morgenstern, *H.U.C.A.* x (1935), 126 f., points out that, of the family of Eliashib, Johanan appears to be the only member who was not against the policy of Nehemiah and Ezra, while W. F. Lofthouse, *Israel after the Exile*, p. 47, observes: "Nehemiah gives one the impression that he could have managed Sanballat and Tobiah with ease if it had not been for Eliashib and his family."

¹ Cf. line 18 of the letter: "We sent a letter to your lordship (i.e. Bagoas) and to Johanan the high priest and his colleagues the priests who are in Jerusalem, and to Ostanes the brother of 'Anani, and the nobles of the Jews"; and line 24: "Also the whole matter we have set forth in a letter in our name to Delaiah and Shelemiah the sons of Sanballat governor of Samaria" (translation of Cowley).

² Cf. G. F. Moore, *Judaism*, i. 24: "It is probable that Shechem . . . had all along been a place of worship, with a priesthood of its own and a cultus not unlike that in Jerusalem, though, of course, lacking the *sacra publica*. . . . As such there was no reason why the Jews should concern themselves particularly about it. All this took an entirely different complexion when the claim was set up that Gerizim, and not Zion, was the place which God had chosen for his habitation. . . . It is this claim, not the mere building of the Shechemite temple, that constitutes the Samaritan schism." ³ Cf. Deut. xii. 5 ff.

⁴ Cf. Jer. xiii. 27; xviii. 13 ff.; Ezek. vii. Cf. what I have said in *Studies in Old Testament Prophecy* (Theodore Robinson Festschrift) (1950), p. 168: "If Josiah's reform was the religious side of a bid for freedom which ended in the death of the king and Egyptian rule, until the latter gave place to Babylonian, it could hardly hope to maintain itself. It would be discredited by failure, precisely as the women say to Jeremiah in xliv. 18. Whether Egypt or Babylon

to when they were finally suppressed.¹ At the end of the fifth century B.C. the Jewish authorities could be presumed to look with complacency on the existence of a temple at Elephantine, which could serve a community there which was cut off from the Jerusalem Temple, and it might have looked with equal complacency on a Temple on Mount Gerizim, either then or later, since the political tension which had appeared between Jerusalem and Samaria more than once in the post-exilic days had made the Samaritans but coldly welcomed visitors in Jerusalem. The fact that we nowhere have any account of the precise moment when the Jews ceased to have dealings with the Samaritans itself suggests that there was no precise moment, and that the feud was one which slowly developed.² When it became irrevocable may not be known; but we have some indications of a time before which it had so become.

Hölscher has suggested that the breach did not take place until the second century B.C.,³ while Albright goes further and ascribes it to the first century B.C.⁴ These dates seem improbably late. For it is hard to see why the Samaritans did not accept more than the Pentateuch if that were so. Their non-acceptance of the historical books, known as the Former Prophets, could be understood, since there is a bias against the northern kingdom in

imposed a religious policy on Judah as Assyria had done or not would matter little. All heart would have gone out of the reform movement, and there would be a steady drift back to the old ways which none would stay."

¹ H. Birkeland, *Acta Orientalia*, xii (1934), 89 f., suggests that the Elephantine Jews had heard of the centralization of the cultus after they had sent their first letter. They therefore sent the second letter to Bagoas because he was against the High Priest, and to the sons of Sanballat because the Samaritan community did not share Jerusalem ideas on centralization.

² Montgomery, *op. cit.* pp. 71 f., maintains that relations between the priests of Jerusalem and Samaria continued for long. "It is not necessary", he says, "to hold that the schism from the beginning excluded social and religious intercourse. . . . The close relationship in theology and practice of the Samaritans with the later Sadducees, who were the party of the hierarchy, can best be explained by the supposition of the maintenance of intercourse between the priests of Jerusalem and of Shechem."

³ Cf. *Geschichte*, p. 170. In *P.W.* ix. 2 (1916), 1968 n., Hölscher says the Samaritan schism first took place in the Maccabaeen period.

⁴ Cf. *From the Stone Age to Christianity*, 2nd edn. (1946), p. 336, and *B.A.S.O.R.*, No. 81 (Feb. 1941), p. 6.

the editing of those books. The non-acceptance of the prophetic books, of Job and of the Psalter, to name no others, could not so easily be understood if the breach were so late. For Ben Sira offers us evidence of the place these books had obtained by the beginning of the second century,¹ while if the Psalter had been used in the worship of the Temple, there is no reason why it should not have been used equally in the worship of the Samaritan Temple prior to the breach, or why it should have been rejected after the breach.

It seems much more likely that the breach had become so deep that a reconciliation was impossible before these books had secured anything like so firm a place as they had by the time of Ben Sira. So far as the Psalter is concerned, while many of the individual psalms are undoubtedly old and pre-exilic, the present collection to form the Psalter is probably post-exilic, and dates from long after the exile. The Latter Prophets, again, while containing much ancient material which derives from the prophets to whom it is ascribed, may with probability be supposed to have been first collected in their present form in the fifth or fourth century B.C.² If the breach between Jews and Samaritans had become final in the fourth century, or even had reached an advanced stage then, we could understand how it was that these books failed to win acceptance by the Samaritans.

We have, indeed, a clear indication that the breach had become complete well before the second century. When the Chronicler compiled his history he deliberately left out the history of the northern kingdom. The Deuteronomic editor of the books of Kings had expressed his condemnation of the northern kingdom because of its maintenance of the shrines of Dan and Bethel, and because its people did not repair to the Temple at Jerusalem, but the Chronicler went far beyond this. He omitted the history of the northern kingdom altogether. He no longer recognized it as Israelite at all. To him it was an alien community, that had no more part in the history of the people of God than other foreign countries. The date of the Chronicler is not known with certainty, but there are few who

¹ Cf. *Ecclus.*, xlvii ff.

² Cf. my *Growth of the Old Testament* (1950), p. 87.

place him later than the middle of the third century B.C., and many put him substantially earlier.¹ All we can say with reasonable certainty, therefore, is that at some time before the middle of the third century B.C., and perhaps before the beginning of that century, the breach with the Samaritans had become complete. If the Samaritan Temple was erected in the fourth century B.C., that may have aggravated relations to some extent, though we have no evidence that the actual erection played any notable part in the development of the schism.

It is interesting to note that Samaritan tradition does not link the breach with Nehemiah, but does treat Ezra with the utmost bitterness.² This would suggest that Ezra played a larger part in bringing it about than did Nehemiah. This is to be understood. For while the particularism of Nehemiah was largely of political inspiration, Ezra's was religiously based. Into the vexed

¹ A. Lods, *Histoire de la littérature hébraïque et juive* (1950), p. 637, assigns the Chronicler's work to *circa* 190 B.C., while Hölscher, *H.S.A.T.* i. 500, assigns it to the second century B.C. R. H. Pfeiffer, *Introduction to the O.T.*, p. 812, assigns it to about 250 B.C., while M. Noth, *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien I* (1943), p. 197, assigns it more broadly to the third century B.C. (with this contrast *Die Gesetze im Pentateuch* (1940), p. 67 n., where Noth had adopted the date *circa* 400 B.C.), and so A. Weiser, *Einleitung in das A.T.*, 2nd edn. (1949), p. 240. S. R. Driver, *Introduction to the Literature of the O.T.*, 9th edn. (1913), p. 518, gives the date as "shortly after 333 B.C." In *The Growth of the Old Testament* (1950), p. 165, I gave the date as about 300 B.C., and L. Marchal, *Les Paralipomènes* (in Clamer's *Sainte Bible*) (1949), p. 12, gave the wider limits 350-250 B.C. R. A. Bowman, in *The Interpreter's Bible*, iii (1954), 554, goes back somewhat earlier to 365-350 B.C. O. Eissfeldt, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (1934), p. 613, offers the date *circa* 400 B.C., and so also W. Rudolph, *Esra und Nehemia* (H.A.T.) (1949), p. xxv, and A. Fernández, *Comentario a los libros de Esdras y Nehemías* (1950), pp. 13 ff., while Rothstein-Hänel, *Kommentar zum ersten Buch der Chronik* (K.A.T.), 2. Lief. (1927), p. lxxix, hold that the Chronicler's groundwork was prepared *circa* 432 B.C., and that it was revised *circa* 400, and subsequently interpolated. W. F. Albright, *J.B.L.* xl (1921), 104 ff., argued that Ezra was himself the Chronicler.

² Cf. Cook, in *C.A.H.* vi. 173; M. Gaster, *The Samaritans*, pp. 28 f. Cf. also E. N. Adler and M. Seligsohn, *R.E.J.* xlv (1902), 220 ff. H. Cazelles, *V.T.* iv (1954), 130 ff., holds that there was no conflict between Ezra and the Samaritans, and that there were two schools in Judaism after the time of Nehemiah and Ezra, the one honouring Nehemiah and the other honouring Ezra, and that the Chronicler tried to bring the two schools together. It is hard to see why Samaritan tradition should remember Ezra with hatred, rather than Nehemiah, if this view is true.

question of the chronological relation of Ezra's work to that of Nehemiah it is not necessary to go here.¹ A growing number of scholars has accepted the view, first propounded by Van Hoonacker, that while Nehemiah belongs to the reign of Artaxerxes I Ezra belongs to the reign of Artaxerxes II,² and though there are many who still dispute this,³ it seems to me the most reasonable view. There are others who place Ezra after Nehemiah, but still in the reign of Artaxerxes I.⁴ For our present purpose the difference is not considerable. For whether Ezra is placed about 430 B.C. or about 400 B.C., if his work exacerbated relations and increased the strain between Jews and Samaritans, we should be left with a probable period ranging from this time to about 350 B.C. as the period during which relations reached the breaking point. It is possible that even during this period there might have been intervals of rapprochement between north and south, as there must have been throughout the whole post-exilic period.⁵

Finally, something must be said of the bearing of this on the Pentateuchal problem. It has been said that the Samaritans accept the Hebrew Pentateuch, but only this section of the Jewish Canon. A great many minor variations mark their text, but only a few variations of greater significance distinguish the two texts.⁶ The Samaritans use their own special script, of course, and an argument for the date of the schism has been based on this. According to Jewish tradition Ezra transcribed the Pentateuch into the Aramaic character,⁷ and it has been suggested that this was done in order to keep the Jewish form

¹ I have discussed this at length in *The Servant of the Lord* (1952), pp. 131 ff., and more briefly in *B.J.R.L.*, xxxvii (1954-5), 550 ff.

² For an incomplete list of references cf. *The Servant of the Lord*, pp. 133 f.

³ An incomplete list of recent scholars who take the view that Ezra preceded Nehemiah will be found *ibid.* p. 135.

⁴ Cf. *ibid.* pp. 136 f., for references to some of the scholars who take this view.

⁵ Cf. Montgomery, *The Samaritans*, pp. 71 ff., on the continuing intercourse between Samaritans and Jews. M. H. Segal, in *Assaf Anniversary Volume* (1953), p. 412, suggests that Ezra vi. 21 refers to Samaritan groups who repaired to Jerusalem after the death of Sanballat.

⁶ On the Samaritan Pentateuch, cf. E. König, in *Hastings's D.B.*, extra vol. (1904), pp. 68 ff.

⁷ Cf. T. B. Sanhedrin, 21b.

of the text distinct from the Samaritan.¹ According to the Samaritan text of Deut. xxvii. 4 the reading of the Law was to be on Mount Gerizim, whereas according to the Jewish text it was to be on Mount Ebal. That the Samaritan text is here original has been allowed by a number of scholars,² since Mount Gerizim was the mount of blessing, while Mount Ebal was the mount of cursing.³ If this does represent a Jewish alteration of the text, we could well understand that Ezra should wish to secure its transmission without risk of correction by the Samaritan text. On the other hand, however, the view has been expressed that the form of the Samaritan character indicates a date later than the time of Ezra, and the artificial fixation of this character is thought to be a possible pointer to the time of the schism.⁴ This would seem to be a very precarious line of argument.

The book of Deuteronomy is quite certainly older than the time of Ezra, and if Ezra or a later hand introduced changes into its text it would not be surprising for the Samaritans to have older copies which they treasured and recopied. The more difficult

¹ Cf. M. Gaster, *op. cit.* p. 28: "There could only have been one reason for such a drastic step, namely, to break completely and to eliminate the Samaritan text from circulation among the Jews, to relegate it to a place of inferiority or declare it spurious as well as incorrect and unreliable, as was often declared in the Rabbinic writings, and to wean the people from any contact or any knowledge of the old script. The new alphabet formed the impassable barrier between the two."

² It may suffice here to quote Moore, *Judaism*, i. 25 f.: "In Deut. 27, 4, the Jewish text has 'Mount Ebal', where the whole tenor of the context demands 'Gerizim', as the Samaritan Hebrew reads; the same change has been made in the Jewish text in Josh. 8, 30. . . . Shechem-Gerizim was therefore manifestly the place so often spoken of in Deuteronomy where God would put his name; Jerusalem had usurped a precedence never meant for it. So far as the letter of Scripture went, the Shechemites could make out an embarrassingly good case."

³ Cf. Deut. xxvii. 12 f.

⁴ Cf. Albright, *From the Stone Age to Christianity*, p. 336, where it is maintained that a relatively late date for the origin of the Samaritan script is highly probable, and that the retranscription of the Samaritan Pentateuch into the archaizing Samaritan script should be dated in the early first century B.C. or slightly later, and that this retranscription symbolized the refusal of the Samaritans to follow the modernists of Jerusalem. B. D. Eerdmans, *The Religion of Israel* (1947), p. 236, maintains that the Samaritan script was invented by the Samaritans as their reply to Ezra's introduction of the Aramaic script.

problem concerns the other books of the Pentateuch. For it has long been a common critical hypothesis that the book of the Law which Ezra brought from Babylonia in his hand was either the present Pentateuch, or the Priestly Code.¹ In the latter case the final redaction of the Pentateuch in its present form is ascribed to a time shortly after Ezra's mission.² If the hated Ezra brought any part of the Pentateuch, it is often thought difficult to see how the Samaritans could accept it as part of their law, especially if the work of Ezra played a major part in widening the breach. It is highly improbable that the Samaritans borrowed the Pentateuch from the Jews after the breach had become complete, and almost certain that the whole Pentateuch must have been accepted as the work of Moses before things had reached such a point.

To traverse the critical hypothesis of the compilation of the Pentateuch is both impossible and unnecessary here. If its thesis that the Priestly Code had been compiled in Babylonia during or after the exile is allowed, there is no reason to suppose that Ezra had himself written it. His mission was not to promulgate a new law for the first time, but to make normative in Jerusalem a law which he brought with him from Babylonia, and which was already accepted in Babylonia as the law of Moses.³ The Samaritans derived their religion from Moses no less than

¹ E. Meyer, *Entstehung des Judentums* (1896), pp. 206 ff., defends the view that Ezra's law book was P. So also Carpenter and Harford, *The Composition of the Hexateuch* (1902), p. 265, and Oesterley and Robinson, *Introduction to the Books of the O.T.* (1934), p. 62. On the other hand, J. Morgenstern, *H.U.C.A.* x (1935), 145 n., holds that the Grundschrift of P was a full generation or more after Ezra, while R. H. Kennett, *The Church of Israel* (1933), p. 64, believes that the Law published by Ezra comprised the whole Pentateuch, and so A. Weiser, *Einleitung in das A.T.*, 2nd edn. (1949), p. 108. M. Noth, *Die Gesetze im Pentateuch* (1940), pp. 62 f. n., says: "Wir wissen einfach nicht, was dieses 'Gesetz in der Hand des Esra' gewesen ist und können höchstens vermuten, dass es eine Zusammenstellung aus vorexilischer Zeit überlieferter Gesetze mit vielleicht noch einigen neu verfassten Stücken war." H. Cazelles, *V.T.* iv (1954), 120 ff., maintains that whereas the law presupposed by the work of Nehemiah was D, Ezra's law was P.

² L. E. Browne, *Early Judaism*, pp. 185 ff., argues that Ezra's Law book was Deuteronomy. He nevertheless holds (*ibid.* p. 199) that the Pentateuch was completed shortly after the time of Ezra, and in any case before 330 B.C.

³ Cf. Albright, in Finkelstein's *The Jews*, p. 54.

the Jews, and whatever opposition they might show towards Ezra, and however much they might resent his attitude of intolerance towards them, there was no reason why they should not accept a work which they, as much as the Jews of Babylonia or Ezra himself, may well have believed to be the work of Moses.¹ It is possible that this work was already known in Palestine before Ezra came.² To have passed off as a work of Moses something which had just been written and of which no one but himself knew would have been very difficult. In the case of Deuteronomy this was possible because the work was found in the Temple, where it had probably lain for so long a time that no one knew when it was put there. There is no suggestion that Ezra's lawbook had just been discovered in Babylonia, and there would have been no special appropriateness about its discovery there comparable with that of the finding of Josiah's lawbook. But if the work had been compiled long before Ezra's own time and the work had been known amongst the exiles though no one had any precise knowledge whence it came, it would be possible for it to be accepted as an ancient work, carrying the authority of Moses. In such a case the work could have been known in Palestine to both Jews and Samaritans before Ezra made his journey. It was not, however, put into force, just as Deuteronomy had not been continuously enforced after it became known in the time of Josiah. Ezra's mission was to bring religious practice into accord with this lawbook, and there is no reason why the Samaritans should not accept the Law.

¹ R. Brinker, *The Influence of Sanctuaries in Early Israel* (1946), pp. 217 ff., rightly says that Manasseh would be unlikely to carry to Samaria a new and innovating Code introduced by Ezra, and if he did it would be unlikely to be accepted there if the promulgation of the Code and the schism were closely related events. These considerations are less effective against the view expressed above. If Ezra was not the author of the Code, and if the schism was not a single clear-cut event, but a process which was interrupted by periods of rapprochement, the argument loses its force. It is a pity that Josephus's fictitious Manasseh has so bedevilled the issues.

² Cf. Albright, in Finkelstein's *The Jews*, loc. cit. W. R. Arnold, *J.B.L.* xxxi (1912), 13 f., argues that the so-called Passover Papyrus from Elephantine offers evidence of the existence of the Holiness Code, and possibly of P, before 419 B.C., and therefore before Ezra's mission, if the date 397 B.C. for that mission is correct.

They could reject Ezra without rejecting Moses. If the breach between Jews and Samaritans, though enlarged by the exclusiveness of Ezra, was not yet final, and did not become final for half a century or more after the time of Ezra, with some lessening of tension for a time after Ezra disappeared from the scene, and if the Pentateuch reached its present form early in that period, there would be no difficulty about the Samaritans continuing to cherish a work all of whose material was believed to have come down from Moses.¹

That the Samaritan Temple was in existence by the time the breach was complete, at whatever time it may have come into existence, is highly probable. For if the Samaritans held the Pentateuch in honour they must have desired to follow its laws, and therefore must have had an altar and a sanctuary. Nor were they without solid grounds for claiming that their sanctuary was in accordance with the law. The book of Deuteronomy demands a single shrine for all Israel, but does not directly state where that shrine should be. Shechem plays so important a part in Deuteronomy, however, that it has long been thought by many scholars to be probable that its compilers had Shechem in mind as the appropriate location of the sanctuary.² If the work were prepared early in the reign of Manasseh, its authors may well have thought of a new unified and independent Israel, consisting of all the tribes, with its one shrine centrally placed at a spot which had more ancient associations with Israel's history than Jerusalem.³ But the fact that it was found at Jerusalem and in the Temple, and at a time when Judah had a pious and reforming king, sufficed to ensure that the Jerusalem Temple should be accepted as the central shrine. Later, during the period of the

¹ Cf. Kautzsch, *P.R.E.*, loc. cit., where it is maintained that the hatred after Nehemiah cannot be held to necessitate the acquisition of the Pentateuch before that time.

² Cf. B. Luther, in E. Meyer, *Die Israeliten und ihre Nachbarstämme* (1906), pp. 542 ff. ; G. A. Danell, *Studies in the Name Israel* (1946), p. 56 ; I. Engnell, *Symbolae Biblicae Upsalienses*, vii (1946), 21 f. Albright, *From the Stone Age to Christianity*, p. 241, thinks Deuteronomy had material from Shechem as its nucleus.

³ Cf. what I have written in *Studies in Old Testament Prophecy* (Theodore Robinson Festschrift), pp. 166 f.

exile, Ezekiel sketched the programme for a reorganization of religion.¹ Many scholars have thought that he too contemplated a central sanctuary in northern Israel and not in Jerusalem.² But again circumstances determined otherwise. If, however, it had not been without reason that planners had thought of a northern shrine, the Samaritans were not without reason in claiming that their shrine was the rightful one. But history rarely goes along the lines laid down by the planners, because so many factors other than reason go into its making. Nor did the Samaritans produce any religious leaders with the same dynamic quality as Ezra. From our safe distance it is easy to criticize Ezra for his intolerance; but it may well have been that but for that intolerance Judaism would have faded away, leaving as little mark on the course of the world's religious history as the Samaritans have done.

¹ Ezek. xl ff.

² Cf. C. Mackay, *Princeton Theological Review*, xx (1922), 399 ff., 661 ff.; xxi (1923), 372 ff.; xxii (1924), 27 ff.; *Expository Times*, xxxiv (1922-3), 475 ff.; Iv (1943-4), 292 ff., and *C.Q.R.* cxix (1934-5), 173 ff.; M. Gaster, *The Samaritans*, p. 15; J. Smith, *The Book of the Prophet Ezekiel* (1931), pp. 66 ff.; L. E. Browne, *Ezekiel and Alexander*, pp. 10, 17 ff. Cf. also W. L. Wardle, in *Supplement to Peake's Commentary* (1936), pp. 12 f., where it is held that Ezekiel thought of a site north of Jerusalem. So long ago as 1771, G. J. L. Vogel, in his annotations on the posthumously published work of G. L. Oeder, *Freye Untersuchung über einige Bücher des A.T.s.*, pp. 386 ff., maintained that Ezek. xl-xlviii were written in the Samaritan interest to persuade the Jews to abandon the Jerusalem Temple for a new shrine.