

NEW LIGHT ON THE INTER-RELATIONSHIPS OF SAMARITAN CHRONICLES FROM SOME MANUSCRIPTS IN THE JOHN RYLANDS LIBRARY

By ALAN DAVID CROWN, M.A., Ph.D.

SENIOR LECTURER IN SEMITIC STUDIES IN THE UNIVERSITY OF SYDNEY

IN his *The Samaritan Chronicle II*¹ John MacDonald again raises the question first dealt with by him in his *Theology of the Samaritans* on the relationships between various Samaritan Chronicles. Working independently on a group of John Rylands Library manuscripts the present writer reached substantially the same conclusions as set down by MacDonald, as the latter generously noted in appraising the writer's Ph.D. on the subject.²

However, in *The Samaritan Chronicle II* the examination of the relationship to each other of the whole group of Samaritan Chronicles is secondary to the purpose of MacDonald's work and is somewhat perfunctory, lacking essential detail. It is particularly notable that there is no discussion there of the purposes for which the chronicles were written, yet purpose would seem to be crucial to the whole question of priority in Samaritan chronicles.³ There are also a number of points in his discussion, especially his somewhat indefinite statements about the original nature of the Arabic versions—which he terms Chronicle IV—which need further resolution. It seems that they can truly be resolved on the basis of evidence presented by manuscripts in the Rylands Library. It seems to be possible from a consideration of these manuscripts to indicate a substantially more detailed reconstruction of the history of this version (and other versions) than has hitherto been presented.

The crux of the whole discussion of inter-relationship is the acceptance in *The Samaritan Chronicle II* of the dependence of

¹ J. MacDonald, *The Samaritan Chronicle II* (Berlin, 1969), pp. 1-14.

² I.e. "A Critical Re-evaluation of the Samaritan Sepher Yehoshua", Sydney Ph.D., 1966.

³ Cf. my "Some Traces of Heterodox Theology in the Samaritan Book of Joshua", BULLETIN I (1967-68), and my "Dositheans, Resurrection and a Messianic Joshua", *Antichthon*, vol. 1, no. 1 (1967-68).

the Arabic versions [Chronicle IV] on Chronicle II [=Hebrew type, MacDonald's *Sepher Hayamim*], a dependence which is suggested to be self-evident and is described in the words, "The composer was *clearly dependent* [my italics] on H 2 or a similar version of Chronicle II".¹ The present writer does not dispute this conclusion of MacDonald; he hopes, rather, to demonstrate that this is the only conclusion which one can draw when all the evidence is considered in some detail. However, that detail must be presented, for the question of the dependence of the Hebrew on the Arabic or of the Arabic on the Hebrew has been the subject of considerable controversy over the course of half a century. In view of this controversy it is not sufficient to state the fact alone—the arguments of the proponents and opponents of one case or another must be considered and refuted, or, in turn substantiated, if a successful conclusion is to come to this debate.

In the following discussion not all the chronicle types and manuscripts listed by MacDonald are considered. Though MacDonald has provided a useful frame of reference by defining and tabulating seven types of chronicle it will be seen as the argument progresses that this tabulation is a description of state, a description of the finished product and does not indicate the processes by which these chronicles were enlarged or composed. Nor does it show their true relationship. It is by analysis of their process of composition or growth that their true relationships appear and ultimately MacDonald's table has to be reframed: in the restatement and in the analytical process it becomes clear that some of the manuscripts and chronicle types need not be considered or may be discussed *en-passant*.

The chronicle types listed by MacDonald are

- I. The *Asatir*. Edited by M. Gaster
- II. The *Sepher Hayamim*. Edited J. MacDonald²
- III. The *Tolidah*. Edited by A. Neubauer

¹ Op. cit. p. 12.

² Despite the title *Sepher Hayamim*, there is considerable doubt whether this Chronicle II is the *Sepher Hayamin*. See the second part of this article, which will be printed in the following number of the BULLETIN.

IV. The *Sepher Yehoshua*. Edited by Juynboll

V. The *Shalshalat Hacohanim*. Edited by M. Gaster

VI. *Abu'l Fath*. Edited by E. Vilmar

VII. Untitled. Edited by Adler and Seligsohn

Of the manuscripts used by MacDonald for his Chronicle II edition, only three are considered in this discussion. Because of the renumbering of the Samaritan manuscripts in the John Rylands Library their numbers here and in his discussion differ ; they are Rylands Samaritan MS. 257 = former JR(G)863 = MacDonald's J5 ; Rylands Samaritan MS. 268 = former JR(G) 864 = MacDonald's J1 ; the Luncz/Yellin text = MacDonald's J4. Of these manuscripts it will be shown that the Luncz/Yellin text can be dismissed as being drawn in its entirety and in detail from one of the two former manuscripts and it cannot be considered as an historical witness to the text and development of Samaritan chronicles. The details presented here would seem to cast doubt on MacDonald's entire discussion of the J4 text.

Rylands MSS. 257 and 268 are described in their rubrics as *Sepher Hayamim*. That they are not this is apparent from fol. 116 of Ryl. Sam. MS. 257 which refers to the *Sepher Hayamim* as a source of the manuscript. MacDonald is surely correct in referring to 268 as a Joshua manuscript and in drawing on 257 as being in part a Joshua manuscript. What is important, however, and what needs extensive treatment, is the relationship of the Joshua portion of the manuscript with the remainder, which is of the type of Adler and Seligsohn's chronicle (Chronicle VII). It is herein maintained that the Joshua portion of the manuscript is the earliest part of any Samaritan chronicle and that all Samaritan chronicles ultimately derive from the Samaritan Joshua tradition.

The definition of three chronicles as Chronicles III, V and VII depends on current appearances rather than on the analysis of their development. It is not certain that Chronicle VII is derived from Chronicles III and V as MacDonald maintains ; to establish the relationship one must consider the whole process of development of the Hebrew type of chronicle : only when this has been done can suggestions be made about inter-relationships

of elements of the Hebrew type of chronicle. The process becomes the datum of reference for the products.

Chronicle IV (Juynboll's chronicle = the Scaliger Codex) is compared here with another version in a manuscript with parallel Hebrew and Arabic texts (in Samaritan script) of considerable significance. This manuscript, Rylands Samaritan MS. 374, provides one of the keys to the process of growth and accretion in the complex development of Samaritan chronicles. It is from the manuscript and from a comparison with the Juynboll text that the relationship of the Samaritan Joshua texts with heterodox Samaritan groups becomes clear; a detailed discussion of this evidence has been presented elsewhere and is not repeated in this study.¹ Rylands Samaritan MS. 374 would again seem to confirm that whilst a type called Chronicle IV is differentiated (perhaps the manuscript should be termed IVb), it is to be connected with Chronicles I, II and VII directly and all these chronicles have a degree of interdependence which can be best examined in terms of a study of their growth. In view of the longstanding view that the Chronicle IV—IVb type, the Arabic chronicle, was the source of all the other versions except the *Asatir* we must turn first to consider the hypotheses relating to this type.

I

ANALYSIS : THE ARABIC VERSIONS OF THE SEPHER YEHOSHUA AND ABU'L FATH'S CHRONICLE

[= Macdonald's Chronicles IV and VI]

Eduard Nielsen aptly noted that "the scholar who neglects the research of yesterday certainly deserves nothing but oblivion amongst the scholars of tomorrow".² This statement would seem doubly apposite in a study of Samaritan chronicles, for almost every scholar since the days of Juynboll has made reference to his work but with so little agreement in citing his conclusions as to what Juynboll said that it is apparent that they

¹ *Supra*, p. 282. n. 3.

² E. Nielsen, *Shechem* (Copenhagen, 1959), p. 12.

have not read him. In particular it should be noted that many citations of Juynboll are actually citations of Kirchheim's version of Juynboll's conclusions—an inaccurate version.¹ It would seem necessary then, in considering the development of the *Sepher Yehoshua* [IV and VI], to reappraise the work of Juynboll and to reconsider other arguments allegedly based on it.

The first study of the *Sepher Yehoshua* was of the manuscript brought to Europe by Scaliger, probably from Egypt c. A.D. 1584.² It was not until 1684, after a number of unsuccessful attempts, that it was edited in part by J. H. Hottinger in his *Exercitationes Anti-Moriniana de Pentateucho Samaritano*, wherein he presented a summary of the contents in Latin and a translation of a number of its pages. Hottinger's work, which was severely criticized by Juynboll, remained the basic text and source of information until the days of Reland. So far as is known,³ Reland did not publish an edition of the work but used the codex as a source for many of his comments about the Samaritans and made numerous comments in the margin of his copy of Hottinger's *Smegma Orientale*,⁴ comments utilized by Juynboll. It was Reland who first mooted the idea that the *Sepher Yehoshua* was a Dosithean work of multiple authorship.⁵

In A.D. 1851 R. Kirchheim published a study of Samaritan history and literature (despite the title⁶) and included a Hebrew translation of Juynboll's text with what he purported to be a summary of Juynboll's views. The preface containing this summary was brief and did less than justice to Juynboll's long and detailed study; it also included many errors. In particular, Kirchheim stated that the date of the completion of the

¹ Cf. T. G. J. Juynboll, *Chronicon Samaritanum*, etc. (Leiden, 1848) and R. Kirchheim, *Introductio in Librum Talmudicum "de Samaritanis"* (Frankfurt, 1851), pp. 55 f. (=Karme Shomron). Consider the various articles in the *Jewish Encyclopaedia*; *The Standard Jewish Encyclopaedia*; *The Universal Jewish Encyclopaedia*; *Otzar Yisrael*; J. E. H. Thomson, *The Samaritans* (Edinburgh, 1919), p. 147; and I ben. Zvi, "The Samaritan Book of Joshua and its Recent Forgery" (Hebrew), *Knesset*, x. 130 f. These articles all betray the same phenomenon, copying from Kirchheim and claiming that they are quoting Juynboll.

² Cf. Juynboll, op. cit. pp. 2 f.

³ Ibid. No edition is noted in Steinschneider or Fuerst.

⁴ Cf. O. T. Crane, *The Samaritan Chronicle* (New York, 1890), Preface.

⁵ Loc. cit. and Juynboll, op. cit. p. 15.

⁶ Op. cit.

first part of the Scaliger codex A.D. 1362 was also the date of its composition¹ though Juynboll had been at pains to show that the Scaliger codex was the copy of an earlier work written c. A.D. 1250.² Kirchheim's version is the version usually quoted and is the source of a number of erroneous statements.

Juynboll's complete edition of the Scaliger codex in 1848 in the form of an Arabic text, a Latin translation and copious critical notes, has remained standard and many of his opinions are cited as fact and are the established orthodoxy today. Though his translation was criticized by Crane,³ who published an English edition of the text, that criticism was restricted to textual matters only. Though Moses Gaster has given a brief and summary opinion on the Samaritan Arabic *Sepher Yehoshua*,⁴ Juynboll's conclusions featured in Gaster's work only *en passant* and Gaster's opinions could scarcely be considered an evaluation of Juynboll's conclusions. The only real criticism of Juynboll's work is the indirect criticism of MacDonald, who has preferred a different set of conclusions without considering Juynboll's work.

On examination of the Scaliger codex Juynboll came to the conclusion that it had been copied by two scribes, the first part as far as fol. 235 having been copied in A.D. 1362-1363 (764 A.H.) by a scribe called Ibn 'abd el Ghani on behalf of a certain Ali Rabba ben 'Amqa, according to an introductory note on the first folio.⁵ Juynboll produced satisfactory but not indubitable evidence for the second part of the manuscript from fols. 236-256 having been written by another 'Abd el Ghani c. A.D. 1513.⁶ This scribe is said to have restored and rewritten part of the manuscript, in particular correcting in Arabic letters and filling lacunae in the earlier portion. Both scribes are

¹ Preface, p. 55.

² Op. cit. p. 99.

³ Op. cit. Preface.

⁴ Cf. M. Gaster, "The Samaritan Hebrew Sources of the Arabic Book of Joshua", *J.R.A.S.* (1930), pp. 567 f.

⁵ Juynboll, op. cit. p. 35.

⁶ The matter is not entirely certain, for the introductory and final notes are almost illegible, according to Juynboll. The fact that Dozy and other Arabists of his ilk were unable to give Juynboll much help in reading these notes is truly indicative of their illegibility. Several persons by the name 'Abd el Ghani are known, but all lived too late to be considered as the scribes of this manuscript. Cf. E. Robertson, *Catalogue of the Samaritan MSS in the John Rylands Library at Manchester* (M.U.P., 1938), p. 403.

said to have copied from texts in the Samaritan script (the codex itself is Arabic in Samaritan characters) but the second scribe is said by Juynboll to have had access to another manuscript in Arabic letters from which he drew his corrections.¹ It is difficult, without handling the Scaliger codex itself, to criticize Juynboll's description of the copying and correction of the manuscript. Yet, it seems quite clear that the scribe of the second part used a text which was difficult to read, though the difficulty may have been caused not, perhaps, through the nature of the Samaritan script (majuscule?), as suggested by Juynboll, but from age. It would seem significant that despite his correction of the text in Samaritan script with words drawn from an Arabic manuscript, and his completion of smaller lacunae therefrom, the scribe did not realize that the Arabic text on which he drew omitted some chapters. In other words, the Arabic text had the same faults as the text in the Samaritan script but Arabic language from which the first part of the codex was drawn. Juynboll carefully noted what appeared to be lacunae of chapters in the Scaliger codex² but he overlooked other lacunae and ignored, perhaps because he did not recognize it, the phenomenon of the *qataf*.³ One lacuna, perhaps of a whole chapter, which was identified by Juynboll is that between chapters 17 and 18 of the Scaliger text. (The identical lacuna appears in Ryl. Sam. MS. 374, indicating that this version, too, is drawn from the same source as the Scaliger codex.) However, yet another chapter seems to be missing, after chapter 18. Chapter 19 describes the deceit of the Gibeonites after the fall of Ai. The opening verse of the chapter, in fact, refers back to the fall of Ai and it would seem probable from that verse that the account of the fall of the city once stood in the text but it is there no longer. The whole description of the second siege of Ai with the ambush of the citizens of Ai is not in the text and may have been lost. The same phenomenon occurs in Ryl. Sam. MS. 374 (fol. 54a) though the opening words of the chapter are entirely

¹ Juynboll, *op. cit.* p. 15.

² *Ibid.*

³ On the *Qataf* see *infra*, and cf. my "Second Thoughts on the Age of the Anonymous Portions of the Samaritan Burial Liturgy", in *Essays in Honour of G. W. Thatcher* (Sydney, 1967), p. 68.

different from those of the Scaliger manuscript, following instead the words of Abu'l Fath's chronicle.¹ Yet in Abu'l Fath is found the account of the fall of Ai and the account of the first unsuccessful assault on Ai. On the basis of the Abu'l Fath version it must be suggested that the fall of Ai once formed part of the narrative of the *Sepher Yehoshua* and that here is a lacuna unnoticed by Juynboll because the evidence was not available to him.

It becomes clear from this that we are faced with a problem of origins much more complex than that seen by Juynboll. That Ryl. Sam. MS. 374 and the Scaliger MS. both seem to present the same lacunae is unlikely to be fortuitous; both would seem to have been based on a faulty source. Yet, it is not sufficient to follow Juynboll and say only that the source of the copy was faulty. For, despite all the similarities between the Scaliger MS. and Ryl. Sam. MS. 374, there is sufficient diversity between the two versions, with the latter version sometimes following Abu'l Fath and sometimes presenting a similar text to the Scaliger MS., to indicate a more complex history of the *Sepher Yehoshua* than posited by Juynboll.² At least two recensions based on a common Arabic original seem to be extant here. It would seem also that there are *qetafim* in this text which have gone unnoticed by Juynboll. A *qataf*, a Samaritan device for abbreviating the Law, *Torah*, in the liturgy, is the abstraction of phrases from a series of passages to represent the whole. In some instances the sense is lost in the abbreviation, though if longer passages are used as exemplars the sense may be recognizable. Examples of *qetafim* appear on fols. 45a, 45b and 50a of Ryl. Sam. MS. 374 and in at least one case the identical *qataf* is found in Juynboll's text.³ This identification of the *qataf* in the manuscript would testify against Juynboll's belief that the present form of the chronicle is the work of one man who concocted it from a variety of sources, for a *qataf* would have no legitimate place, if any place, in such

¹ In the R. Payne Smith version, "The Samaritan Chronicle of Abu'l Fath", *D.V.J.*, iv (1863), 324 f.

² For additional details see the notes to the translation of Ryl. Sam. MS. 374 in my thesis (op. cit. vol. 3). The manuscript is there cited according to its older numbering JR(G) 1167.

³ *Ibid.* pp. 221, 223, n. 170, 171, 181.

an eclectic work ; rather it would derive from a Hebrew-Aramaic text before its translation into Arabic.

Juynboll's division of the Scaliger MS. into component elements must, to a substantial measure, be maintained as valid. However the detailed exposition of the sources drawn upon in each case is open to question and, especially, his conclusions as to how and when those sources were put together are subject to serious doubt. Juynboll was convinced that the work was that of one author¹ and, because of that conviction, failed to consider the possibility that the whole work, and not merely parts of it, was translated from a Samaritan Hebrew-Aramaic original. In so failing, he denied, by ignoring the plain words of the editor in the first chapter, that he translated the work from Hebrew and he also failed to account for the substantial differences between his text and the sources of Abu'l Fath.

Juynboll based his argument that the work was eclectic on literary considerations. He drew attention to the fact that the Arabic vocabulary changed from chapter to chapter and from section to section and ascribed these changes to the diversity of source material rather than to different authors.² He showed that whilst there may be a superficial lack of connection between chapters, several times a comment by the editor (or author) drew attention to what was coming in a later chapter.³ Thus, Nobah was introduced in chapters 12 and 23 although he does not feature in the text until the Shobach episode.⁴ Similarly, the editor explained in several places that he would give detail subsequently.⁵ Juynboll's basic argument was drawn from the internal unity of the chapter titles and the differences in style and vocabulary between the titles and the text. Juynboll made the point that "*Haec Capitum divisio et ipsorum Inscriptiones sine dubio ei tribuendae sunt, qui hoc Chronicon ambice scripsit. . . . Ac hujus Arabici Chronici Scriptorem Inscriptiones addentem sua dicendi rationi usum esse, a scribendi ratione Fontium saepe Diversa, praeterea apertum esse*".⁶ (Juynboll's italics). In other words, whilst realizing that there was a stylistic disharmony between titles and text, he still

¹ Op. cit. p. 54.

² Ibid. p. 53.

³ Loc. cit.

⁴ Loc. cit.

⁵ Loc. cit.

⁶ Ibid. p. 42.

maintained that the work was a unit, the variability in style and vocabulary being dependent on the differences inherent in the sources, some of which, he claimed, were in Arabic and others in different languages.

There are a number of critical objections to Juynboll's theory. Except for the chapter titles he did not show that stylistic differences amounted to more than differences in terminology for functionaries, and whilst it may be that some of these differences are inherent in the sources drawn upon, he did not show that these terminological differences do not depend on Arabic. On the contrary, some of the variety in the terms could have come from sources in Biblical Hebrew, Greek,¹ Samaritan Hebrew, or Aramaic. Whilst criticizing Reland and showing that the terms *Bni 'Isra'il* and ' *shamrat* indicate heterogeneous source material rather than different authors,² Juynboll ignored the probability that the difference between these terms arose in Biblical Hebrew (Bnai Yisrael) and Samaritan Hebrew (Shamerim) rather than in Arabic. The form of other terms does not depend on heterogeneous sources at all but on some other factor, for their usage cuts across the division of sources as declared by Juynboll.³ Thus ' *limam*, for High Priest, appears in chapters claimed to be based on an LXX type text⁴ and in chapters claimed to have been drawn from Arabic sources. It should also be noted that other terms cited by Juynboll fail to be useful criteria for they occur infrequently, so ' *lbahr el 'adm*, *Bahr el qdm*, the Red Sea.⁵ Examples can be multiplied.⁶

An explanation of the facts more probable than that put forward by Juynboll is that the text has been translated from an Aramaeo-Hebrew source and subsequently heavily re-edited, chapter headings being added. Otherwise it seems difficult to explain why a text from heterogeneous sources, written to include threads of linkage in the fabric of the chapters, still has a marked disharmony between the chapters and their headings. If an extant translation had been edited and arranged to include these threads of linkage, this would account for the differences.

¹ Loc. cit. p. 75. ² Ibid. p. 54. ³ Ibid. Cf., Juynboll's (b) (c) p. 62.

⁴ Ibid. (a) pp. 62 and 75 f. Note the names *Es Sham* and *Galil*, which are unchanging in all the sources. ⁵ Ibid. p. 64. ⁶ Loc. cit.

Even this theory is inadequate in itself to account for the marked difference in treatment of the chapters copied by the second scribe, which chapters, according to Juynboll, rightly, have barely been touched by the 'author' in comparison with the heavy editing of the other sources.¹ Of this, more later.

That no single author was responsible for the text would appear from the first chapter of the Scaliger MS., a chapter which, as Juynboll correctly determined, stands apart from the remainder of the work to which it serves as an introduction.² In that chapter the author/editor stated as a matter of record that he translated from a work in Hebrew. There is no reason to disbelieve that this was not a composition *de novo*. This translation, we are told, was done orally "by word of mouth" rapidly, stating only what was in the manuscript and "nothing more".³ If this was the case then the translator could not have been the person who added the chapter headings and drew the threads of the narrative together. The type of editing in the *Sepher Yehoshua* needs more careful work than can be done by oral translation. Moreover, Juynboll points to the insertion into the text of quotations from an Arabic version of the Pentateuch.⁴ Yet the translator lays no claim to any such editing.

Another point raised in this chapter, and nowhere considered by Juynboll, is that the Joshua story is only part of a chronicle which once covered the period from the Exodus to the post-exilic period. Of this chronicle, only a fraction of the first part, the Bala'am cycle, remains, yet the translator implies that the Bala'am story was part of the longer tale all of which he translated.⁵ That the translator was telling the truth would appear to be borne out by Ryl. Sam. MS. 374. It was suggested in another discussion⁶ that the first eighteen folios of the latter manuscript represent an earlier and different recension of the *Sepher Yehoshua* than the Scaliger text and the second part of Ryl. Sam. MS. 374. Whilst, in the first section the Bala'am

¹ Loc. cit. p. 85.

² Juynboll made several references to this first chapter but seems to have missed, or else ignored, its full implications.

³ Cf. Crane's translation, op. cit. p. 13, with the text in Juynboll and with Juynboll's translation. Crane's rendering is accurate. ⁴ Op. cit. pp. 90 f.

⁵ Cf. the preface to the text.

⁶ Cf. my "Some Traces . . . etc.", ut cit.

story does not occur, a passage tells of the death of Miriam. Can it be that this section is the truncated relic of the whole section from the Exodus to Joshua? In the first portion of Ryl. Sam. 374, whilst the text is broken into chapters by the word *fsl* (Arabic column) or *perek* (Hebrew column), no chapter titles occur.

The inference is that the Scaliger text is not the work which the translator produced but only a fraction of that work, heavily edited with some additional matter. It is probable that the introductory chapter does not belong strictly to the Scaliger MS. at all but was the introduction to the first Arabic version, an introduction which was retained when a new version was produced. Supporting evidence for this hypothesis is seen in the fact that the same introductory chapter prefixes Ryl. Sam. MS. 374, even though this manuscript has a different text of a similar recension to the Scaliger version. Perhaps all the versions derived from the first Arabic version retained the same introduction.

Additional support for the hypothesis of more than one translation, the Scaliger text being a secondary recension, appears from a reconsideration of Juynboll's source divisions of the work.

Juynboll's primary division of the codex was into a book of Joshua ranging from chapters 9-25¹ and a remainder which was an accumulation from various sources. Without at this stage entering into the question of the relationship of the Scaliger text to the Hebrew versions, the evidence of the rubrics to the chapters which parallel Scaliger chapter 9 (i.e. Ryl. Sam. MS. 257, fol. 1; Ryl. Sam. MS. 268, fol. 1) and of the Hebrew column in Ryl. Sam. MS. 374, fol. 37a and of the words of Abu'l Fath that he utilized a Book of Joshua bound up with other material as one of his sources,² Abu'l Fath's Book of Joshua beginning as Juynboll chapter 9, all support Juynboll's contention that here began a Book of Joshua as an entity.³ It is not so certain that Juynboll is correct in defining the limit of this book

¹ Op. cit. p. 72 f. It is clear from the discussion therein that the division implied by Juynboll was 9-24 inclusive. The figures 9-25 are verbatim from Juynboll for the purposes of accurate representation. ² Op. cit. p. 306.

³ Note also the correspondence with the M.T. from this point.

as chapter 25 (24) and that chapters 25-37 formed an independent unit from another source. Juynboll based his arguments as to the extent of this section partly on the linguistic considerations noted above and in part on the conviction that an ancient Joshua tradition, Alexandrian Samaritan, was the source of this section. But, if an Alexandrian section were used as a source, a version which must have approximated to a Septuagint version, it seems unlikely that the version would have concluded as at chapter 24 of Scaliger. In that chapter the Joshua story had reached the account of the land division whereas the M.T. versions reach to the death of Eleazar and the LXX versions to the death of Pinhas. Moreover, since, as Kirchheim showed, the Shobach story could have had a Hebrew or an Aramaic source it is not improbable that the whole of the Shobach saga (which Juynboll used as a critical factor in his discussion of this source) has been subsumed into a work which may at one time have been as extensive as the present MT Joshua.¹ Juynboll's argument is reasonable on the basis of what he saw in his single manuscript but the additional evidence of the Rylands manuscripts indicates that his conclusions are of limited validity.

Ryl. Sam. MS. 257 (Chronicle II) presents a sequence of characters at the point where it diverges from the MT Joshua as follows—Joshua, Othniel, Eleazar, Pinhas, Abisha, Pinhas, Othniel.² It seems from this that the chronological order, normally maintained with care in Samaritan manuscripts has been disturbed. On examination of the text three things seem to have happened simultaneously. A Midrash has been appended to the account of the death of Eleazar; the Midrash is also found in the Scaliger version. This Midrash is a duplicate of the death story of Moses found in the *Asatir, the Memar Marqah*, and is therefore secondary to the Moses version.³ Secondly, a note has been added about Pinhas telling of his work in establishing the calendar; the note is possibly derived from the *Tolidah* (c. A.D. 1150) and was inspired by a mention of

¹ Cf. Kirchheim, *op. cit.* p. 55 n. 2 and my "Some Traces, etc.", *ut cit.*

² I.e. fol. 62 f.

³ Cf. M. Gaster, *The Asatir, The Samaritan Book of the Secrets of Moses* (London, 1927).

Pinhas which, in the original form (possibly as found now in the Scaliger text) told of the death of Pinhas.¹ Additionally, a complete section about Abisha has been appended to the notice that Pinhas had a son called Abisha. It would seem most probable that it was these additional materials which made it necessary to break the sequence and revert to Pinhas giving additional details of his life and a second note about Othniel.² Neither the extended notice about Pinhas nor the tale of Abisha appear in the *Sepher Yehoshua* (Arabic) versions. Moreover, a difference in the style of these appended notes is to be detected. Those parts of the additional materials in Ryl. Sam. MS. 257 which are also to be found in the *Sepher Yehoshua* versions are in a style which is close to the usages which are regarded as normal for Classical Hebrew. On the other hand, those additions which are not to be found in the *Sepher Yehoshua* versions are in the typical Aramaeo-Hebrew of the style of Neubauer's *Tolidah* version.³ On the basis of this evidence the text underlying Ryl. Sam. MS. 257 ran to line 4 inclusive of fol. 65, omitted lines 5-9, included lines 10-12a, and probably ended at that point. Since this is virtually where the LXX versions end and is but two verses longer than the MT, this was probably the basic length of the Joshua version, even though this estimation cuts across Juynboll's source/language division.

At this point we must consider some of the other arguments relating to Juynboll's argument that the basic source was of Alexandrian origin, not unlike the LXX and probably in Greek.⁴

Moses Gaster has also argued that the source underlying the *Sepher Hayamim* [= Chronicle II = Ryl. Sam. MSS. 257 and 268] is close to the LXX and has criticized Juynboll's work. He has recorded two different opinions. In 1908 he expressed the view⁵ that the *Sepher Hayamim* versions were closer to the MT than to the LXX and that in essence they represented a version not remote from the MT but not unlike Josephus'

¹ The note may be inspired by the *Tolidah* or its sources. Cf. A. Neubauer, "Chronique Samaritaine," *J.R.A.S.*, 1869, pp. 385-470, at p. 390.

² Fol. 56.

³ *Op. cit.*

⁴ *Op. cit.* pp. 74 f.

⁵ Cf. M. Gaster, "Das Buch Josua in hebraisch-Samaritanischer Rezension", *Z.D.M.G.*, lxii (1908), 209-79, 494-549 at pp. 216-19.

source for his history of the *landnahme*. In 1909 in a more substantial analysis¹ Gaster came closer to Juynboll's view that the source was closer to the LXX than to the MT and yet differed sufficiently from the LXX to be like Josephus' said source.

Juynboll's view of this source was dependent upon intuitive considerations and analysis of vocabulary, since he did not make a detailed textual comparison as did Gaster. In his *Z.D.M.G.* text Gaster gave a brief criticism of Juynboll's theory² which did no justice either to Juynboll's work or to Gaster's reputation. Of the verses cited by Juynboll as supporting his hypothesis, and which Gaster claimed did not appear at all in Juynboll's text, all do in fact appear except one (Jos. 5 : 4). Moreover, for his initial statement of 1908 Gaster was sufficiently ill-advised as to rely on Kittel, *Biblia Hebraica* for his 'Greek text'. Gaster missed the more serious criticism of Juynboll which was that he did not consider whether phrases which appeared to have been drawn from a LXX version of Joshua could have been drawn from the Samaritan Pentateuch. Thus, in citing Joshua 8 : 28 as being dependent, in the Scaliger version, on the LXX, Juynboll failed to note that the same reading might have been found in the Samaritan version of Deuteronomy 13 : 16. More significant is Juynboll's failure to consider the meaning of the lacunae which he had noted himself.

According to Juynboll³ the lack of MT Joshua 8 (preceding Scaliger 18) is redolent of the omission of parts of this chapter in some LXX versions, especially that verses 11b-13a and verses 30-35 are transposed in the LXX to post 9 : 1-12. However, as was noted above, the whole of the chapter dealing with the fall of Ai, MT Joshua 8, is missing and perhaps has fallen out by accident as previously indicated, therefore its omission in the text is no basis for comparison with the LXX. Moreover, at the beginning of Scaliger chapter 18 there is no trace of the transposition of the missing verses 8 : 30-35 which would have been there if the text agreed with the LXX. On the other hand a clear point of contact with the LXX is seen in that

¹ Cf. M. Gaster, "The Samaritan Book of Joshua and the Septuagint", *P.S.B.A.*, May 1909, pp. 149-53. ² *Loc. cit.* p. 218. ³ *Op. cit.* p. 74.

Scaliger places 9 : 1-2 at the end of the equivalent to MT Joshua 9. In only one of three cases is there any correspondence between the *Sepher Yehoshua* and the LXX and another case is seen to be beyond comparison.

In support of Gaster's view of the relationship of the basic text to Josephus' version it must be observed that a passing rough equivalent to MT 8 : 30-35 is found at the end of Scaliger chapter 21 which approximates to the position in which Josephus read these verses.¹

A more general survey of chapters 9-24 shows that the text is too far from its source through Midrashic accretions (chapters 13, 21) for linguistic examination to be of great value. Even where there is some reasonable degree of approximation to the canonical texts (MT, LXX) there are sufficient differences of substance to make identification difficult. Thus, in the account of Makkedah the long day is recorded in Scaliger and not the hailstones, whereas both feature in the LXX account. A preliminary survey of the land before distribution appears in Scaliger and Josephus² but not in the LXX or MT. The description of the land allotment itself in the *Sepher Yehoshua* is abbreviated and beyond comparison with the canonical versions though the same brevity and sequence of direction is found in Josephus.³

Quotations put into the mouths of Joshua and others in the *Sepher Yehoshua* seem to have preserved something of the underlying text more accurately than the remainder of the text and in these quotations there is sufficient proximity to both LXX and MT to indicate that a version of some such type underlay this section of the work. However, it seems impossible to identify with the certainty of Gaster or Juynboll what this text was. Translation, Midrash sectarian and anti-sectarian motives⁴ obscure the framework and the best that can be said is that the underlying account must have been a version of the type and genre used by Josephus, either in Greek or Hebrew, and all of it, not a portion as claimed by Juynboll, was utilized for this work.

¹ A.J. V : 1 : 19.

² Ibid. V : 1 : 21.

³ Ibid. V : 1 : 22.

⁴ Cf. My "Some Traces", etc. and my "Dositheans, Resurrection", ut cit.

Juynboll's view of chapters 2-8 of the Scaliger text is also not indubitable. He contended that these chapters were a more or less homogeneous source of Jewish origin in Arabic added to the work by the single author and that they were padded with phrases drawn from Arabic versions of the Pentateuch.¹ Juynboll interpreted a reference in chapter 41 of the codex to the Books of Bala'am as being to a Jewish source. However, the Bala'am traditions in the codex and in the other versions of the *Sepher Yehoshua* [the two columns of Ryl. Sam. MS. 374] are to be traced in Samaritan sources which do not seem to have been available to Juynboll. The *Asatir* contains a Midrash about Bala'am which has affinities with the versions in the *Sepher Yehoshua* (though not identical with them as claimed by Gaster) and antedates the so-called Jewish version Juynboll sought to identify.² There would seem to be no need to search outside Samaritan sources for the origin of this portion of the account.

Juynboll has argued that the text of this source was in Arabic when subsumed into the chronicle and that it was studded with quotations from Arabic versions of the Pentateuch, sometimes from the version of Sa'adyah Gaon, sometimes from Abu Sa'id's version, and at other times from an independent version.³ The quotations in the two former works are said to have been from memory because of discrepancies between source and text. It is unlikely that Juynboll is correct in his assessment of the sources of the quotations, even in terms of his own dating, for this would presuppose that Abu Sa'id lived before the Scaliger version was composed. At the very latest the first part of the Scaliger MS. belongs to A.D. 1362, the date at which it was copied, whereas Juynboll has maintained in any case that it is a copy of an older manuscript and may belong to the thirteenth century. There is some doubt as to when Abu Sa'id lived but Kahle, for good reasons, places him in the second half of the thirteenth century,⁴ which may well make it impossible for us to consider his version as a source. In this case, what of Juynboll's other arguments as to Pentateuch sources? Kahle again leaves us an explanation that was not available to Juynboll but

¹ *Op. cit.* p. 92.

² *Asatir*, *op. cit.* pp. 292-5.

³ *Op. cit.* p. 89.

⁴ P. Kahle, *The Cairo Geniza* (2nd ed., Oxford, 1959), pp. 54 f.

which is more satisfactory than the purposeless eclecticism proposed by Juynboll.¹ Kahle has shown that the Samaritans first used Sa'adyah's translation but gradually began to deviate from this version until a new 'textus receptus' was composed by Abu Sa'id; between Sa'adyah's text and that of Abu-Sa'id were many degrees of variation, as extant manuscripts testify, and these variant versions continued in use after the time of Abu Sa'id. It is probable that the editor who created the Scaliger type text from the first Arabic translation drew on one of these versions. This would explain the apparent eclecticism and reliance on memory.

A more serious objection to Juynboll's evaluation of chapters 2-8 is that traces of editing can be found in these chapters, which would indicate that the Bala'am story has been excised from its original position and inserted in its present position during the editing which produced the secondary recension. In the first eighteen folios of Ryl. Sam. MS. 374, which are believed to be an earlier version than the Scaliger text of the Joshua chronicle,² no trace of the Bala'am story occurs. Though these folios represent a much abbreviated version of the Joshua story, the abbreviation occurs at a point after the account of the death of Moses. There is an unbroken sequence between the narrative of the twelve spies and Moses' death with never a hint that the Bala'am episode was to be found here. In the Scaliger version of the *Sepher Yehoshua* the marks of the transposition of the Bala'am account can be distinguished with some clarity. Chapter 2 of the Scaliger version opens with a sentence equivalent to the opening verse of the chapter beginning on folio 15a of Ryl. Sam. MS. 374. Then follows an account of the instructions to Joshua from Moses, a note that a trumpet was blown to apprise the Israelites of developments taking place, and a proclamation of Joshua's new status. (A version of these traditions is to be found in the *Memar Marqah*.³) Chapter 6 of the Scaliger text then presents what is a complete dittograph of this account, prefixed by an introductory verse of a general nature which has been inserted to replace the chronological statements,

¹ P. Kahle, *The Cairo Geniza* (2nd ed., Oxford, 1959), pp. 51-57.

² Cf. my "Some Traces", etc., ut. cit.

³ *Memar*, V: 2.

which has been moved back to chapter 2. The sequence of events as in chapter 2 is repeated.

Now the preliminaries in chapter 2 are intrinsic to the death of Moses and have no connection with the Bala'am episode which follows those preliminaries in chapter 2; hence the Bala'am narrative is secondary in its present place and has been introduced there editorially. The original form of the text was probably that found in the opening folios of Ryl. Sam. MS. 374. It should be noted that only the account in chapter 6 of the Scaliger/Juynboll text, including the opening verse of chapter two, parallels the version found in the *Memar Marqah*, which may well be additional evidence for the transposition of parts of the text.

The Scaliger version does not ignore the account of the twelve spies as found in the opening folios of Ryl. Sam. MS. 374 and which was probably original in that position. A truncated version is inserted into the account of the two spies at Jericho (Scaliger, chapter 13) and is found in the same position in the second part of Ryl. Sam. MS. 374. It would seem to be significant that Abu'l Fath shows nothing of this truncated version of the spies, despite the quotations he drew from the *Sepher Yehoshua*.¹ One must infer that Abu'l Fath's *Sepher Yehoshua* was different from the Scaliger/Juynboll text and must have represented a recension in which the transposition had not taken place.

Additional evidence of the recensional history of the *Sepher Yehoshua* indicates that Juynboll over-simplified the situation. Gaster published an account of the twelve spies from a Hebrew text which he claimed was the Hebrew original of the *Sepher Yehoshua* (equivalent to Ryl. Sam. MS. 374, fol. 2b, line 12b—fol. 14b, line 11a)² and another part version in Arabic, of uncertain age, was found in the Cairo Genizah.³

The uncanny similarity between the Gaster version and the parallel Hebrew column in the older part of Ryl. Sam. MS. 374 indicates that the latter cannot be a new translation but that it

¹ Op. cit. pp. 314-16.

² *J.R.A.S.*, 1930, ut. cit.

³ Ryl. Sam. MSS. 310 and 310a. Formerly JR(G) 898.

represents a constant tradition of copying.¹ Admittedly the Hebrew and the Arabic columns of this part of this manuscript are very close, but it would be an impossible coincidence for two independent translations to be almost verbatim, as are the Gaster and the Rylands texts. The coincidence would be even less possible if Gaster were correct that his version was the Hebrew source of the Arabic translation; however, from reasons to be adduced it is most improbable that Gaster is correct and it must be suggested that Gaster's Hebrew text is a translation from a recension of the Arabic which antedated Scaliger and which has been preserved and transmitted with the Arabic of the first part of the Rylands manuscript.

The account of the twelve spies in Ryl. Sam. MS. 374 forms a continuous narrative leading to the abbreviated portion (fol. 17 f.) which concluded this section of the manuscript. The abbreviation is found in the Arabic and Hebrew columns and arose when two different recensions were put together to make one book.² This sequence would tend to indicate that the version in Ryl. Sam. MS. 374 is a translation from the Arabic; hence, Gaster's version must also be a translation from the Arabic. Nevertheless, it remains possible for Gaster's judgement of the age of the leaves from which he published his text to be correct namely, the thirteenth/fourteenth centuries A.D., and this would strengthen the probability that the first eighteen folios of Ryl. Sam. MS. 374, Hebrew section, had a long tradition of transmission and are not a new translation.

Juynboll believed that chapters 39-44 of the text formed a unit drawn from two contraopposed sources.³ He claimed that one of these sources was a priestly chronicle from which came most of chapters 40 and 42 and the other source, which he claimed to be more ancient, provided the material for chapters 39 and 44 and parts of 40, 41, 43; both were in Arabic when subsumed into the *Sepher Yehoshua*. Juynboll is undoubtedly correct in pointing to the contradictions between the place of Gilgal and the place of Gerizim in the text and is correct in

¹ Gaster reached the same conclusion after examining three copies, each said to have been an original translation. Cf. "Samaritan Hebrew Sources" etc. p. 573.

² Cf. My "Some Traces", ut cit.

³ Op. cit. p. 82.

suggesting two sources of which the priestly is the younger. However his opinion that the contradictions exist because the author was not concerned to harmonize his sources but was simply creating a book, is superficial and ignores the *raison d'être* of the material on which the *Sepher Yehoshua* is based. Examination of the material seems to suggest that, though the signs of juncture between two accounts are clear, there are equally clear signs of harmonization.

In the relevant chapters the priestly rulers from Eleazar, up to and including Ozzi, the priest of Panutha,¹ and the secular rulers from Joshua to Samson have spans of office which are identical in length. This would seem to be a harmonization rather than casual eclecticism. It is not difficult to separate the two accounts, the separation following the lines indicated by Juynboll, with one exception. Chapter 41 seems to provide a direct connection with chapter 39 and the whole of chapter 40 would thus be secondary. Although the career of Samson is introduced in chapter 40, the introduction to his career is found at the beginning of chapter 41 and the preamble to the introduction is found at the end of chapter 39. Thus there is no harmony between what the chapters contain and the introductory materials. Most of chapter 40 is given over to an account of Eleazar and the introduction of Samson in that chapter would seem to have the purpose of trying to smooth out the text a little and avoid too obvious a hiatus between 39 and 41. The priestly material is thus seen to be secondary to the secular material.

The close of chapter 41 indicates that the cause of the period of Divine Disfavour, Panutha, was internecine strife in the family of Pinhas. However, the cause of the strife is not described until chapter 43 and, instead, a description of the form of Divine Disfavour is inserted between the sequential items; the cart is put before the horse. The original sequence of chapters would seem to have been 39, 41, 43. An examination of the priestly additions to the sequence suggested indicates that the

¹ The Samaritans distinguish cycles in the history of the relationship between man and God. Panutha is the period of Divine Displeasure. The subject is dealt with fully in J. MacDonald, *The Theology of the Samaritans* (London, 1964), pp. 261-5.

priestly materials have been added with a purpose rather than haphazardly—they provide a priestly lineage from the Exodus to the period of Divine Disfavour as an alternative to a lineage of lay readers, and they also provide an explanation for Divine Disfavour alternative to that appearing in the secular source. In the secular source an immediate connection is seen between the career of Joshua, the secular Judges and the onset of Panutha.¹ Here was no casual creation of an eclectic work but a careful harmonization of an existing work.

Juynboll suggested that the remainder of the text stemmed from an Arabic source or sources² which, in turn, depended on three more ancient sources which he designated B, C, D. Of these he suggested that D, the origin of chapters 47-49, went back to a Samaritan source of the fourth century A.D.³ For B he claimed Greek antecedents and argued that this was the source of chapters 45, 46.⁴ C he claimed to be of more recent origin than either of the former, suggested that it was of Egyptian provenance and that it was the source of chapter 50.⁵ He noted that source D was used in its entirety and coincided with the change in scribe. From fol. 236 the manuscript was completed by a second scribe who, as noted above, drew on two manuscripts for his material, but Juynboll is most certainly in error in indicating that the material was used without editing; there are good reasons for suggesting that the scribe selected his material with care.

Ryl. Sam. MS. 374 concludes chapter 46 with an account of the death of Alexander, an incident not mentioned in the Scaliger/Juynboll version. The death of Alexander is followed by a prayer. The prayer has no intrinsic connection with what precedes or follows and its appearance in this position might indicate that it once served as a colophon to the whole work. Chapter 47 of the manuscript, which currently concludes the text, is a parallel to the apocryphal tale of Susannah and has been published by Gaster as a separate document.⁶ It would

¹ Cf. my "Some Traces", etc. and my "Dositheans, Resurrection", ut. cit.

² Op. cit. pp. 84, 86. ³ Loc. cit. ⁴ Ibid. p. 87. ⁵ Ibid. pp. 88, 89.

⁶ M. Gaster, "The Story of Amram", ap. *Studies and Texts* (London, 1925-28), i. 199-210.

seem not to be part of this chronicle. If one regards this chapter as an appendage to the text, then the work would have concluded with the prayer, which has the appearance of a conclusion of the type found in Samaritan manuscripts.¹ Hitherto this manuscript has followed the Scaliger MS. like a shadow, even to the point of exhibiting the same lacunae; yet, whilst up to this point apparently of the same recension as the Scaliger/Juynboll text, from this point it differs, lacking the chapters written by the second scribe in the Scaliger/Juynboll text. The point of departure is the last few verses of chapter 46. The evidence would thus indicate that the last folio of a text was lost and a second scribe attempted to complete the text and found a completely different version, Juynboll's source D.

Vilmar has suggested² that source D was not part of the *Sepher Yehoshua* at all, on the grounds that Abu'l Fath indicated or implied that he found the version of the nephew of Baba Rabba he published in a book which was not part of the Book of Joshua. Against this argument of Vilmar must be noted that the scribe of section D was not only able to add his new material to the text from his two sources but was also able to correct the portion written by the preceding scribe.³ Thus, at least, his source in the Arabic script contained the complete *Sepher Yehoshua*, including both the material of the first scribe and the additional material currently found in the text.

At the end of chapter 47 of Scaliger an editorial note indicates that a genealogy of the priests is to follow. Only a few High priests are dealt with in succeeding chapters and not in an unbroken chronological sequence. It seems as though some parts may have been omitted deliberately. This second version, which once, as argued above, must have been a complete version, may well be more primitive than the recension of the first part of the manuscript. Though it has been edited it has not been edited sufficiently to excise heterodox materials and includes

¹ Cf. the Colophons in Cr. 15 MS. and L 19 MSS. of the Samaritan Burial Services. (Cf. Cowley, *The Samaritan Liturgy* (Oxford, 1909). Cr. 15 MS. is in the Rylands Library.)

² I am dependent for Vilmar's view on J. A. Montgomery, *The Samaritans* (Philadelphia, 1907), p. 304. No copy of Vilmar is available in Australia.

³ *Supra*.

the life of Baba Rabba.¹ This "source D" was more complete than Abu'l Fath's text.

It is a matter of some interest that both scribes should have been named 'Abd el Ghani, even though there seems to have been at least two centuries between their work. It is not improbable that the names have a deeper interest for us than the names of copyists would normally have, for Juynboll and the scholars he recruited to help decipher the difficult script² may have misread them. They may have been influenced by their knowledge that the name 'Abd el Ghani was Samaritan, for Juynboll mentioned that the name was known amongst the Samaritans.³ The problem is that, at the times these portions were held to have been copied, the name 'Abd el Ghani does not occur in Samaritan records. Irrespective of the identity of the name, its repetition indicates that the work was preserved in one family or group and the copyists were members of that family or group. Is it possible for the group to have been the heterodox *el Fani*, the name given by Shahrastani to the Dositheans?⁴ According to Montgomery,⁵ whilst Shahrastani called the Dositheans *al-Alfaniyah*, Abu'l Fida called them *al-Faniyah*, which may be closer to the name, since Shahrastani was probably punning. The difference in corrupt script between the reading *el-Fani* and *el-Ghani* is so minimal as to depend on subjective judgement. Juynboll's decision between medial *fa* and *ghain* may well have been based on his knowledge of the name *el-Ghani*. If this hypothesis be correct, then there would be here further association of the *Sepher Yehoshua* with the Dosithean sectarian movement.

We must now synthesize these arguments in examining the process of growth of the *Sepher Yehoshua* and associated chronicles.

¹ On the place of Baba Rabba in Samaritan Tradition cf. my "Dositheans, Resurrection", ut. cit. Cf. also fol. 111 of Ryl. Sam. MS. 257 and E. N. Adler and Seligsohn, "Une Nouvelle Chronique Samaritaine", *R.E.J.*, xlv (1902), 188-222; xlv. 70-98, 223-54; xlv. 123-46.

² Juynboll, op. cit. pp. 35-40.

³ Ibid.

⁴ Cf. Montgomery, op. cit. p. 259.

⁵ Loc. cit.

II

SYNTHESIS : THE SEIPHER YEHOSHUA, ABU'L FATH'S CHRONICLE,
THE ASATIR

[=MacDonald's Chronicles I, IV, VI]

In presenting the following assessment of what appears to be the history of transmission and growth of the *Sepher Yehoshua*, it must be noted that the evidence is not unambiguous. Rarely have we sufficient detail to be able to make firm decisions on absolute chronology ; for the most part we are involved in broad sweeps of centuries and it would be foolhardy to go beyond the limits of the evidence to attempt sharp chronological definitions.

Whilst, in the foregoing analysis, Juynboll's theories as to dating were criticized, it is not necessary that his dating of the manuscript should be invalid for all parts thereof, even though the application of his conclusions to the whole manuscript has been excluded by noting that it was the end product of a process of growth and accretion. Thus, whilst his citation of Abu Sa'id's version as evidence for dating may be discounted (on the basis of Kahle's discoveries, as already noted), his dating of the chapter headings may not be discounted since this may represent an individual stage in the growth of the text. Juynboll's dating of the chapter headings may be respected as the date of one of the evolutionary stages of the text.

The grounds of criticism must now be restated for further examination. The first of these is the reference to, and an outline of the contents of, the *Sepher Yehoshua* as found in the Scaliger MS. nearly a century and a half before Juynboll's dating. According to Gaster¹ this summary appears in Abu'l Hassan es Suri's *Sepher HaTabbaḥh*, which is generally dated to the late eleventh century A.D. If this account belongs to the original version of the *Sepher HaTabbaḥh*, then here is reasonable evidence that an Arabic *Sepher Yehoshua* was extant considerably before the date ascribed to it by Juynboll. However,

¹ T. H. Gaster in the *Universal Jewish Encyclopaedia*. I cannot verify Gaster's statement. No indication is given of this in the description of the manuscript in the Rylands catalogue, op. cit. pp. 110 f. However, Robertson does not list the relevant pages in his description.

our extant manuscripts of the *Sepher HaTabbakh* are younger than the Scaliger MS.¹ and there can be no certainty that the said details are not a later addition to the text ; there is also some uncertainty as to the precise date when Abu'l Hassan lived. Though the concensus of opinion places him c. A.D. 1080 the matter is not without doubt. It would be dangerous to press the importance of this reference too far.

The most important criticism must be that the evidence points to the Scaliger text as having been only one of a number of versions of the *Sepher Yehoshua*, versions which were separate recensions.

Unknown to Juynboll a Coptic author writing in A.D. 1267, Abu Ishaq ibn al-'Assal,² referred to the *Sepher Yehoshua* and quoted from it a passage about the crucifixion of Christ. That passage appears in none of the extant versions and the manuscript known to Abu Ishaq ibn al-'Assal must have been longer than Scaliger/Juynboll. Now Graf³ has implied from this that the Scaliger version was "incomplete" rather than suggesting that there were a number of versions. That Graf was wrong can be seen from the following considerations :

- (1) The first eighteen folios of Ryl. Sam. MS. 374 are not found in Juynboll in an identical form but are subsumed into the story of the spies at Jericho. Scaliger/Juynboll thus represents a recension of the *Sepher Yehoshua* that is secondary to the Rylands manuscript. These folios do not have titles to the chapters but are marked by the word *fsl*. The chapter heads must have been added after the translation from the source language/languages had been made.
- (2) The original translator said that he had added nothing at all, nor did he rearrange any of the material since he gave an oral, verbatim translation (see above). His version of what this work contained shows not only that it was much longer than the Scaliger/Juynboll version, but that the first eighteen folios of the Rylands manuscript were probably part of this first translation.
- (3) The Scaliger text betrays signs that parts of the account were

¹ Robertson, *ibid*.

² Cf. G. Graf "Zum Alter der Samaritanischer Buches Josue", *Biblica*, xxiii. 62-67.

³ *Ibid*. p. 65.

transposed into their present place from another Arabic version (see above).

- (4) Abu'l Fath's source *Sepher Yehoshua* contained chapters missing in the Scaliger MS. and had no signs of the transposed truncated text of the twelve spies.
- (5) The scribe of the last section of the Scaliger text drew on a MS. in which the chapter headings were already written but which was not native to the Scaliger version (see above).
- (5) An Arabic fragment of the first eighteen folios of Ryl. Sam. MS. 374 from the Cairo Genizah is substantially different from those folios.

The cumulative evidence for a number of recensions of the *Sepher Yehoshua* is strong. The problem of dating them is not the problem of dating one work but the problem of the relationship between a series of works which were translated from Samaritan Hebrew-Aramaic sources.

The first version of the *Sepher Yehoshua* may well have been pre-Dosithean. Contrary to the general opinion amongst scholars that the Samaritans had no use for any canonical work outside the Pentateuch (by implication, hence they had no other canonical work other than the Pentateuch), they may well have valued the Book of Joshua as a bolster to their age-old claim to be the true descendents of the Bnai Yisrael. In the face of anti-Samaritan polemics and in the light of the bitter strife in the second century B.C. between Samaritan and Jew,¹ it seems not improbable that the Samaritans would seek to validate their claims by use of the sacred literature. In addition to a Joshua version, they may well have maintained documents which purported to present chronological and genealogical sequences from the 'Landnahme' to their own days as "proof" of the continuity of their tradition. The existence of such documents is implied by Eusebius' discussion of Herod's wife.² Though there is scope for interpretation of Eusebius' words, he seems to imply that the Samaritans preserved a "Book of Days", a *Sepher Hayamim* (which title is termed by MacDonald Chronicle II); if such a work were in Aramaic or Hebrew, it may well be the ancestor of the work we call today the *Sepher Yehoshua*.

¹ Cf. Montgomery, *op. cit.* Cap. 5.

² Ecclesiastical History, 1 : 7 : 15.

Such a work could have been expected to present a continuity of tradition from Joshua and such a work as the source of the notes about the Judges in our Chronicle would seem to be implied by the variation from the MT, as Juynboll noted.¹

We cannot be sure when the Dositheans first began to use the Joshua story to support their eschatological pretensions,² or even which group of Dositheans first began to use the text in this way. There is an old tradition, now lost to the Samaritans, that the Book of Joshua was called the *Book of Revelations*. So it is called by Abu Ishaq ibn al-'Assal.³ The name may well be derived from the fourth century Gnostic work extant from Chenoboskion, the *Revelations of Dositheus*.⁴ Perhaps a trace of this tradition is preserved on the first folio of Ryl. Sam. MS. 374, which refers to "revealed matters".

It has been suggested elsewhere⁵ that the Dositheans developed a schismatical sub-sect at the time when the doctrine of the resurrection was adopted by the parent body. It may well be that it was at that time that the parent body strengthened its claims and beliefs by producing a body of literature which, in opposition to both Judaism and nascent Christianity, linked the eschatological beliefs of the sects to Joshua as a type of Jesus and a successor to Moses. That the Samaritans were aware of the typological relationship of Jesus and Joshua, at least by the early second century A.D., may be inferred from the fact that the first exponent of this typology amongst the Christians was a Samaritan, Justin Martyr, who embraced Christianity before A.D. 132. It may well be suspected that Justin Martyr was applying Samaritan Dosithean views to Christianity rather than the reverse. In the midst of this hypothesis only one certainty appears. That is, that the Dositheans of Egypt had a Joshua version.⁶

The extent of this first Dosithean book is a matter of conjecture, but, if it were written under typological influence, setting out to prove that Joshua succeeded Moses as leader of Israel and

¹ Op. cit. pp. 83 f.

² Cf. my "Dositheans, Resurrection", ut. cit.

³ Graf. op. cit. p. 64.

⁴ Cf. J. Doresse, *The Secret Books of the Egyptian Gnostics* (London, 1960), p. 189.

⁵ Cf. my "Dositheans", ut. cit.

⁶ Ibid. The evidence of the Church Fathers is very clear.

as the person under whom the Days of Divine Favour began, it would be likely to have included parts of the life of Moses as well as the life of Joshua and his successors to the Days of Divine Disfavour. It may have been even longer. Since the *Asatir* (Chronicle I) is not merely the Book of the secrets of Moses, as Gaster maintained,¹ but may well find its purpose in the last eschatological chapter, it may have originated as a priestly counterblast to Dosithean claims.² The form of the *Asatir* may have been a mirror of the form of the Dosithean book including any items in history which would have supported its eschatological chronology. Certainly elements in the *Asatir* have no relationship to Moses but are rather related to the chronology and the eschatology, and it would seem legitimate to call this work a chronicle. If the hypothesis of its relationship to Dositheanism be correct then its date cannot be the incredible 250-200 B.C. ascribed to it by Gaster³ but it must be at the very least four centuries younger.

We do not know when the Shobach cycle was added to the developing *Sepher Yehoshua* nor can we readily determine the date of this addition. Juynboll quotes Shullam's account of the story from the *Sepher Yuchasin*⁴ to substantiate his claim that the story was of late Jewish origin. There is no means of checking what Shullam said, for the Midrash is not known in any other Jewish source nor in any extant Samaritan source. Gaster has attempted to show that this might be a Jewish Hellenistic legend⁵ while MacDonald⁶ commits himself only to the extent of saying that the legend appears to have been popular in early and late medieval times, but admits that it might support soteriological teachings. Juynboll was certainly in error, as Kirchheim demonstrated,⁷ in suggesting that the tale cannot have had a Hebrew or Aramaic source. The best additional note that can be offered in this respect is that the Shobach tale might have been part of the *Sepher Yehoshua* by the seventh century

¹ Op. cit., the title of the work.

² Ibid. pp. 298 f. Note that although the *Asatir* introduces Joshua, he has no connection with the *Rahuta* but is connected with Moses. In the last chapter Moses would seem to be connecting the *Panutha* with his successor. ³ Ibid.

⁴ Op. cit. p. 81.

⁵ "Das Buch Josua etc.", ut. cit. pp. 231 f.

⁶ Op. cit. "Chronicle II", p. 204.

⁷ Op. cit. p. 55.

and may have been one of the "spurious writings" to which Eulogius, according to Photius, took exception.¹

It is doubtful if the story of Baba Rabba could have been added to the work too long after the time of Baba himself, for priestly writings reduce him to something less than life-size; nor could the account have been added before he lived, despite Juynboll's contention that his source D dates from the fourth century (when Baba lived). In Palestine, from the time of Marqah onwards, the priestly Sabbeans seem to have been entirely in the ascendent and all references to the Dositheans from this time on seem to place their stronghold in Egypt. Juynboll is probably correct in assuming that the Chronicle was redacted in Egypt, in which country the Baba account may have been added, shortly after the time of Baba himself.

The story of the crucifixion in the only known version extant, the Coptic source, seems to have the obvious purpose of being used as a tool against the Jews and would need to have been added to the work when the anti-Jewish polemic had force. The nature of the passage in the Coptic source presupposes that the Jews were being persecuted by the Christians (an English translation of Graf's version is "He buried the cross in his vegetable garden and he said to the leaders of the Jewish community, 'The time will come when this will be demanded from you and if it is not you will pay for it with your lives . . .'") and we may well have here a reflection of the persecution of the Jews in Egypt in the late fourth century A.D.

The final stage in the growth of the Aramaeo-Hebrew source *Sepher Yehoshua* must have been the adjustment of the text by the priestly Sabbeans to bring it into line with their views and their own eschatological outlook. It is difficult to see that the Dositheans would have preserved a version which, in its present form, represents at best a composite and possibly more Sabbean outlook than Dosithean; the priestly additions must have been made before the first Arabic translation. At the same time it is difficult to see that the Sabbeans would have utilized a Dosithean source, even with a rationalized chronology and eschatology, so long as the Dositheans were active and a

¹ Cf. Migne, *Patrologia Graeca*, ciii, col. 230.

thorn in their flesh. According to Eulogius,¹ the Dositheans were still active in Alexandria in the seventh century, so one should not postulate that the *Book of Revelations* became a chronicle, the *Sepher Yehoshua*, before the eighth century A.D. It may be possible to refine this date a little.

The first eighteen folios of Ryl. Sam. MS. 274, which seem to have been relics of an older translation, show no trace of quotations from any Arabic version of the Pentateuch and may belong to the period before the Pentateuch was used in Arabic by the Samaritans. This would imply a period before Sa'adyah Gaon (A.D. 882-942), whose version was very popular with the Samaritans. It was in the late tenth century A.D. that Arabic became common for written materials amongst the Samaritans and it was at this time that much of the liturgy and the Samaritan Targum were rendered into Arabic.² This would seem to coincide with the date presupposed by the *Sepher HaTabbakh*.

A second recension of the *Sepher Yehoshua* seems to have involved the adding of chapter titles, and some restructuring of the text. It is possible that this second recension contained all that was to be found in the original translation. It seems to have been such a recension that was utilized for the closing portions of the Scaliger text. It was on such a text that Abu'l Fath drew, for his chronicle shows none of the juxtapositions and transpositions that were to be found in the source of the Scaliger codex and which exhibited none of the lacunae found in that source. It may well be that several versions of the second recension were extant, in some of which some of the basic Dosithean material was eliminated, for Abu'l Fath's source does not seem to have contained the tale of Baba Rabba. On Juynboll's evidence this recension must be dated to c. A.D. 1200.

The third recension, which seems to have been the source of the major portion of the Scaliger codex and of Ryl. Sam. MS. 374 from fol. 19 onwards, seems to have been marked by a good deal of redaction and the omission of substantial portions of material. It was in this recension, which now must have been regarded only as a chronicle and nothing more, that much of the

¹ Cf. Migne, *Patrologia Graeca*, ciii, col. 230.

² Cf. Cowley, *op. cit.* p. xxiv (introduction, vol. ii).

material dealing with the life of Moses seems to have been reduced, the account of the crucifixion dropped, the Bala'am story transposed, and a reduction and transposition of the account of the twelve spies. It may well have been at this time, too, that the panegyric in favour of Gerizim, with its heavy anti-Dosithean flavour, was added to the work (Ryl. Sam. MS. 374, fol. 103 a, f.).¹ It may well have been in the process of editing that the chapters relating to the fall of Ai were lost.

The Samaritans preserve a tradition that the extant versions of the *Sepher Yehoshua*, that is, the third recension, was first copied by Abd alla ben Sallama.² Abd alla ben Sallama is believed to have been an old man in A.D. 1387,³ but it is plainly impossible for him to have written a book that was extant in A.D. 1260, or, even earlier, in the eleventh century. It is not impossible for him to have produced a recension, which is what seems to have been implied by the words "It is said that the one who first copied it *like this* [in its present form?] is Abd alla ben Sallama".⁴ However, he would have had to have copied the manuscript when very young for it to have exhibited the features of illegibility and age by A.D. 1362 predicated by Juynboll. It is doubtful whether Abd alla could have been old enough for this, and it may be necessary to search for some other author. It has been suggested by Bowman⁵ that in the fourteenth century there was a priestly-Sabbean compromise when a degree of harmony and rationalizing of works of the two groups took place. A possible date for such a compromise, in view of known Samaritan history, would be from A.D. 1291 to 1308, when Joseph, a Damascene, came to Shechem, where he became High Priest.⁶ The third recension may well belong to the era of the compromise and may well have originated from the circle associated with this man,⁷ a circle which seems to have produced so much Samaritan literature.⁸

¹ Cf. this panegyric with Bowman's text on p. 23 of his "Pilgrimage to Mt. Garizim," *Eretz Israel*, vol. 7 (Mayer Memorial volume).

² Cf. Cowley, *op. cit.* p. xxvii. ³ *Ibid.* ⁴ Ryl. Sam. MS. 374, fol. 2a.

⁵ *Op. cit.* Also in private conversation. I am much indebted to my teacher John Bowman for the guidance he gave me in understanding the Samaritans.

⁶ Cf. my discussion of this point in "Second Thoughts etc.", *ut. cit.* ⁷ *Ibid.*

⁸ The second part of this article will appear in the next number of the BULLETIN.