

# SOME TRACES OF HETERODOX THEOLOGY IN THE SAMARITAN BOOK OF JOSHUA

By A. D. CROWN, M.A.

LECTURER IN SEMITIC STUDIES IN THE UNIVERSITY OF SYDNEY

**I**N a recent discussion<sup>1</sup> it was suggested that one of the Samaritan Dosithean sects possessed a version of the Book of Joshua as a document basic to their eschatological needs and beliefs. The question immediately is posed as to whether any of the extant versions of the Samaritan Book of Joshua is the Dosithean book or is, in any way, related to that book.

Two differing recensions of the Samaritan Book of Joshua are known, the Arabic (and Hebrew translations thereof)<sup>2</sup> and the Hebrew<sup>3</sup>; in view of disputes as to the authenticity and age of the latter recension discussion will be restricted to the Arabic version.

The standard edition of the Arabic version of the Samaritan Book of Joshua (or Chronicle, as it is sometimes designated) is that of T. J. G. Juynboll<sup>4</sup> which he based on a manuscript brought to Europe from Egypt, c. A.D. 1584. In his long discussion of its origins Juynboll made brief reference to the opinion of Hadrian Reland that the work was of Dosithean origin<sup>5</sup> but passed over Reland's work with a "refutation" that was based only on general observations, in favour of his own conclusions. These conclusions of Juynboll are still, to a large measure, acceptable today; yet, despite his "refutation", he left open the possibility that the

<sup>1</sup> Cf. A. D. Crown, "Dositheans, Resurrection and a Messianic Joshua", *Antichthon*, vol. 1 no. 1 (1967).

<sup>2</sup> The Arabic text was published with a Latin translation by T. G. J. Juynboll as *Chronicon Samaritanum cui titulus est Liber Josuae*, Leiden, 1848. A re-translation in English was published by O. T. Crane, *The Samaritan Chronicle*, New York, 1890. Most of the current manuscripts of the Arabic version have a Hebrew text in a parallel column; this is quite distinct from the "Hebrew version" of Gaster. (See n. 3 below).

<sup>3</sup> Published by M. Gaster, "Das Buch Josua in hebraische-Samaritanischer Rezension", *Z.D.M.G.*, lxii (1908), 209-79, 494-549.

<sup>4</sup> *Op. cit.*

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* p. 53.

work had sectarian bases for he gave no attention to the purposes for which the work was written, instead, he directed his attention to the sources from which the book was compiled. Since his conclusions are a matter of some interest to this study they are set down in brief here. According to Juynboll the Scaliger manuscript was in two hands, the earliest portion dating to c. 1362-3,<sup>1</sup> the later portion dating to c. A.D. 1513.<sup>2</sup> The whole work was said to be a copy from an original composed c. A.D. 1250,<sup>3</sup> which had been available to the scribes both in Arabic and Samaritan characters. Despite the statement of the "author" of the Scaliger manuscript that he had translated the work from Hebrew, Juynboll gave it as his opinion that the work was compiled in its complete form only in Arabic. He claimed that chapters 9-25<sup>4</sup> of the Scaliger text were based on an ancient Alexandrian Septuagint text of the canonical Book of Joshua, and that chapters 25-37 formed an independent unit from another source.<sup>5</sup> Chapters 45-50 he regarded as stemming from an Arabic source or sources<sup>6</sup> which, in turn, depended on three more ancient sources which he designated B, C and D. Of these, D was held to be a fourth-century Samaritan source<sup>7</sup>; B was seen as a Greek source of approximately the same date<sup>8</sup> and C was seen as a more recent source from Egypt. More important, from the point of view of the immediate discussion, was his recognition that chapters 39-44 of the Scaliger text were a unit forged from two contradictory sources.<sup>9</sup> One of these sources was seen to be a priestly chronicle, from which the major parts of chapters 40 and 42 were drawn, whilst the other, *a more ancient source*, was seen as the origin of chapters 39, part of 40, 41, 43 and 44. In Juynboll's discussion of these chapters he notes a lack of harmony and contradictions

<sup>1</sup> Op. cit. p. 35.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. p. 40.

<sup>3</sup> Regrettably, many scholars who purport to cite Juynboll's opinion state this date as A.D. 1362. In fact they seem to have read the more easily accessible but inaccurate account of Juynboll's work in R. Kirchheim, *Karme Shomron*, Frankfurt, 1851 (cf. p. 55 f.). Many encyclopaedia articles seem to cite Kirchheim's view.

<sup>4</sup> Op. cit. p. 24 f.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid. p. 72 f. It is clear from Juynboll's discussion that he meant to include only chapters 9-24 inclusive. The figure 25 has been set down to report his words accurately.

<sup>6</sup> Ibid. pp. 84-86.

<sup>7</sup> Ibid. p. 86 f.

<sup>8</sup> Ibid. p. 87.

<sup>9</sup> Ibid. p. 82 f.

in the texts but he explains these by suggesting that the author was not concerned with creating harmony within his work but was simply manufacturing a book.<sup>1</sup>

Even if Juynboll were correct in saying that the work as a whole was not translated into Arabic in the thirteenth century A.D. but was composed from the sources adumbrated, it could still be possible that amongst these more ancient sources which he had identified are traces of Dosithean or other heterodox sectarianism which could enable us to identify relics of an earlier Dosithean work. This is particularly the case since the redaction of the sources into a text seems to have left them sufficiently intact for Juynboll to identify not only their original language but also their provenance.

The possibility of such identification is increased by detailed examination of chapters 39-44 which shows that, contrary to Juynboll's opinion, attempts have been made to harmonize the opposing sources. When reference is made to similar traditions in other Samaritan works it becomes clear that the shorter priestly source has been overlaid on the longer, more ancient, source apparently with the intent of making the theology of the earlier work conform to the priestly ideal. In these chapters, particularly, it would seem reasonable to search for signs of heterodox theology.<sup>2</sup>

Moreover, unknown to Juynboll, there are other versions of the Samaritan Arabic recension of the Book of Joshua which differ substantially from the Scaliger text, versions which incline us to the belief that considerably more than chapters 39-44 of the published version of the Samaritan Book of Joshua has survived from a Dosithean, or at least a heterodox, Book of Joshua.

The most important manuscript of these other versions is Samaritan MS. 374 in the John Rylands Library, Manchester (formerly Gaster MS. 1167)<sup>3</sup>, which presents in parallel columns

<sup>1</sup> Op. cit. p. 83.

<sup>2</sup> See below.

<sup>3</sup> This manuscript was not included by E. Robertson in his *Catalogue of the Samaritan manuscripts in the John Rylands Library, Manchester*, vol. 1, Manchester University Press, 1938, and vol. 2 "The Gaster Manuscripts", John Rylands Library, 1962.

of Arabic and Hebrew in Samaritan characters what are virtually two different versions of the Samaritan Book of Joshua. The first version extends from fols. 1-18a of the manuscript, the second extending from fols. 18b-110a, the last folio containing only the colophon. Between these two versions are two brief passages which seem, originally, to have been a conclusion to the first version, and tell of the "second kingdom" and praise the Pass-over. The occurrence of these two passages which have liturgical overtones poses many interesting problems which must be considered below. First, however, it is necessary to demonstrate the value to this study of Rylands Samaritan MS. 374.

The manuscript in question contains, in addition to the Arabic version, a translation into Hebrew in parallel columns which is alleged to have been made by the scribe in A.D. 1908, according to the colophon. Yet parts of the first eighteen folios which are omitted in the Scaliger version were published by Gaster<sup>1</sup> from another manuscript which he claimed to be of the fourteenth century A.D. in age.<sup>2</sup> This published version (= Ryl. Samaritan MS. 374, fol. 2b, line 12-fol. 14b, line 11) is, with the exception of some ten words and an extra line or so, identical with the Hebrew text in Ryl. Samaritan MS. 374 and it is clear that the Hebrew translation in the latter manuscript is not a new translation at all but represents a constant tradition of copying. Moreover, an Arabic equivalent of this same section has been found in the Cairo Genizah,<sup>3</sup> hence the traditions set forth in this hitherto unknown section of the Arabic recension are at least of some little antiquity.

A study of the rubrics in Ryl. Samaritan MS. 374 leads us to the belief that the manuscript is a composite of which fols. 18b-110, the section parallel to the Scaliger manuscript, are the younger, and that the first eighteen folios are the older; it could well be that they are older than the Scaliger version, particularly if the Scaliger manuscript was not defective as Gaster suggested.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> M. Gaster, "The Samaritan Hebrew Sources of the Arabic Book of Joshua", *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 1930, p. 567 f. <sup>2</sup> Ibid.

<sup>3</sup> I.e. Ryl. Samaritan MS. 310.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. "The Samaritan Hebrew etc.", op. cit. p. 579.

Up to the point at which the two intrusions occur in the text, Ryl. Samaritan MS. 374 differs completely from the Scaliger manuscript. Only from the point where Moses first dies (his death is described a second time later in the manuscript), that is, at the point where these intrusions occur, do the two manuscripts begin to coincide. Now, either the Scaliger manuscript was defective or some unknown source was used for the first part of Ryl. Samaritan MS. 374. It is difficult to see that the beginning of the Scaliger text was in any way defective. Though Juynboll indicated that this manuscript was a copy of an older work<sup>1</sup> he nowhere suggested that the first part of the codex was defective. Moreover, the opening lines of the Scaliger version give a clear indication that here is the beginning of a new book.<sup>2</sup> Hence, the first eighteen folios would seem to come from some source other than the source of the Scaliger manuscript. They also seem to come from a source that is different from the source of the remainder of the manuscript. Fol. 18b of our manuscript contains the somewhat surprising comment as a rubric that "This is a book which contains the Book of Joshua the son of Nun", etc., a pleonastic, if not banal, notice after some eighteen folios which had previously been introduced by a long editorial note calling the whole work the "Book of Joshua". Moreover, the rubric on fol. 18b is followed by five introductory words in praise of God such as are customarily found at the *beginning* of a Samaritan work. Furthermore, fols. 19-20 are given over to another editorial note which would seem to be out of place unless a new work were here being introduced. Yet, the initial editorial (fol. 1f) presents an outline of the contents and chapter sequences for the whole manuscript with never a hint of anything but that here is a complete, unified work: no break in the sequence is there implied. It would certainly seem, from the wording of the introduction (fol. 1f) where the intrusions on fol. 18 are described as "revealed matters", that these poems/hymns were already *in situ* at the time when the whole manuscript was copied. Again, from the rubric on fol. 2a which reads, "In the name of the Lord, the Great One", it may be judged that here was the beginning

<sup>1</sup> Op. cit. p. 17 f.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Crane, op. cit. n. 1.

of the manuscript found by our scribe before he added his own introduction which ends immediately before the latter rubric. It is probable that this rubric (fol. 2a) introduced a book which comprised only fols. 2a-18a.

At the point in Ryl. Samaritan MS. 374 which marks the beginning of the parallel with the canonical Book of Joshua (as, too, in the Scaliger manuscript)—fol. 37a—yet another rubric observes that this is the beginning of the Book of Joshua, though this time with no introductory note other than the rubric. We are faced with a multiplicity of rubrics and books of Joshua. For ease of reference and discussion let us designate the opening eighteen folios (really fols. 2a-18a) as A, the folios between the rubric on 18b and the third beginning of the Book of Joshua on fol. 37a as B, and the remaining folios as C.

Section B contains a detailed description of the death of Moses (fol. 33b f.) which differs in substantial measure both in outline and in minutiae from the description of Moses' death in A (fol. 15a f.). The two accounts could scarcely have been written by the same author and their very presence should lead to the suspicion that the manuscript is a composite of at least two similar documents. However, there is a reasonably clear indication in A that not only was this work a different document from B but also that A was once almost as extensive as B and C combined. Towards the end of fol. 16b occurs an editorial note which indicates that a section of the text has been excised, presumably because a parallel section, the words which Joshua the son of Nun spoke on the death of Moses, occurs in section B (fol. 35a). Then follows a brief mention of Miriam, not found in section B, and again, at the end of fol. 17b, is a further note which would be out of place were it not to be understood that a whole section of A, a section dealing with the career of Joshua until his death, has been excised. Presumably the excision was to avoid duplicating what occurs in section B. (It may also be, as will appear subsequently, that this excision was in the nature of censorship of an unpalatable version of the story.) In other words A was, most probably, at least as extensive as B and much of C. In this case A, as a parallel manuscript but one presenting a different tradition, must have been added to B and C, the whole being composite.

Here may lie the answer to the problem of the source of the editorial comments. The comments on fol. 1 are of reasonable modernity and are the latest level of the whole work, post-dating the redaction of all the parts. Gaster's comments would indicate<sup>1</sup> that if the editorial note were not added by the copyist in 1908 then it stems from some scribe in the late nineteenth century, perhaps Ab Hasda or his predecessor, Ab Sakhua.

The editorial notes on fols. 18 and 19 would seem, from their content, to have been written when B/C formed a separate work. A must, therefore, have been added to this work after the introduction to B/C was written, since this introduction knows of no preceding matter. Therefore the editorial comments which mark the censoring of A are later than the comments in B/C and must have been made when A was added to B/C since they are apparently directed at forming a single work from heterogeneous materials. The liturgical materials on fols. 18a,b must have formed an original sequel to A: the appearance of the word "Chapter" before these intrusions is parallel to the appearance of the same word above the section about Miriam on fol. 17a, which followed a eulogy by Joshua in the original text of the A MS. according to the editorial note at the end of fol. 16b. The format of the word "Chapter" followed by the text is not found in B/C.

The intrusions, as will later be demonstrated, differ to a substantial extent in their Joshua tradition from B/C and must antedate the B/C traditions. Therefore, A, though added to B/C after the latter was complete, must certainly antedate it. In other words we have in Ryl. Samaritan MS. 374 a text of which part, at least, is earlier than the Scaliger text and the rest is of the same genre as the Scaliger text. It would seem justifiable, therefore, to use these texts in comparison with the Scaliger text to search for traces of heterodox theology.

The first of the "intrusive liturgies", a Messianic passage, bears a striking resemblance to the writings of Marqah though there are some significant differences. The arrangement of the names of righteous ancestors in triplets as in this passage is

<sup>1</sup> Cf. "The Samaritan Hebrew Sources, etc.", n. 2.

first seen in Samaritan literature in the writings of Marqah.<sup>1</sup> Abraham, Isaac and Jacob are there, as here, named as the three ancestors of Israel *par excellence*, an arrangement which could have Gnostic or Christian roots.<sup>2</sup> In view of the statement in this passage that the three elders *are* south of Gerizim and in the light of the succeeding statement about the future burial of the *Taheb*, the Samaritan Messiah (from *SWB* = the Restorer), the passage must be understood as referring to burial places. Abraham, Isaac and Jacob are to the south of Gerizim for they are held to have been buried in the cave of the Machpelah near Hebron. In this, Samaritan tradition accords with Jewish tradition. An anomaly appears in the case of the three kings, Joseph, Joshua and the *Taheb*. Both Joseph and Joshua are mentioned by Marqah but Joseph, not Joshua, is called king and they are not to be equated or even linked as in our text. Both men are of different status in Marqah's writings. The name of Joseph is habitually coupled with the name of Moses<sup>3</sup> or is mentioned in association with his major forebears.<sup>4</sup> More particularly, Joseph is associated with the *Taheb* and his coming and the degree of emphasis laid on Joseph as the greatest of Israel's leaders except Moses invites the suspicion of a polemical reason for this emphasis.<sup>5</sup> That such a polemical reason underlays this emphasis is made certain by the ascription to Joseph rather than to Joshua of the physical possession of the land, particularly when this ascription is accompanied by a somewhat specious explanation for the statement.<sup>6</sup> Significantly in a discussion of the entry into Canaan and the Blessing ceremony at Mt. Gerizim Joshua is not mentioned.<sup>7</sup> Whilst Joshua appears in Marqah's writings as a hero he is, nevertheless, relegated to a second-class status to be ranked with and mentioned in the same breath as Caleb and the Seventy Elders. Even when Joshua is charged by Moses with the conduct of Israel it is not on his own account but in association with

<sup>1</sup> Cf. J. MacDonald, *Memar Marqah*, Beiheft of *ZAW* (Berlin, 1963), iv. 9.

<sup>2</sup> On the triad in Gnosticism, cf. J. Doresse, *The Secret Books of the Egyptian Gnostics*, London, 1960. Throughout the whole work.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. *Memar*, op. cit. ii. 93, 94, 169, 186, 226.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* ii. 101, 110, 111, 156, 157, 166, 169, 174, 227, 235, 238, 241.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* ii. 185 f.

<sup>6</sup> *Loc. cit.* Cf. also p. 174.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.* p. 102.



the elders and priests.<sup>1</sup> This evident detraction from the work of Joshua in Israel's history may well have been as a reaction to Dosithean teaching<sup>2</sup> as the Rabbis reacted against Joshua in view of Christian typology.<sup>3</sup>

In a remarkable passage discussing Deuteronomy v. 27 Marqah makes an oblique reference to the Righteous Teacher and Joseph, rather than to Joshua.<sup>4</sup> In Marqah, then, a writer who probably represented orthodox Samaritan attitudes though he may well have introduced to the priestly Samaritans the "new orthodoxy" of the idea of resurrection, Joseph and not Joshua is to be associated with the *Taheb*.<sup>5</sup>

That at least one group of Dosithean sectaries believed in a Messianic Joshua, i.e. a *Taheb* who was Joshua, is known, though whether they associated Joseph with Joshua in that belief is not known. It seems probable that if priestly Samaritanism emphasized the person of Joseph that Dosithean Samaritanism emphasized the place of Joshua alone in this belief. Hence the poem/hymn at the end of the A MS. would seem to be a composite of Dosithean and priestly eschatologies. Here, then is the first trace of heterodox eschatology in the Samaritan Book of Joshua, a heterodoxy that would seem to be unwarranted unless the work had a heterodox and not a priestly source.

There is in this same passage an indication that it derives from a period earlier than the date of composition ascribed by Juynboll to the Scaliger manuscript or even to the *complete* source which Juynboll claimed the Scaliger manuscript was drawn from. This could add strength to the view that older theological views are to be traced here than in the Scaliger manuscript. According to Ryl. Samaritan MS. 374 (fol. 18a) Joseph and

<sup>1</sup> Loc. cit. Cf. also pp. 126-9.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Crown, op. cit. for an outline of Dosithean teaching and their attitude to Joshua.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. L. Ginzberg, *The Legends of the Jews*, J.P.S.A., Philadelphia, 1946, ii. 4, vi. 95, 169, 173. The situation seen in these passages can scarcely be accounted for except as a Rabbinic reaction to the Joshua, Joshua/Jesus typology.

<sup>4</sup> Op. cit. p. 90.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. J. Bowman, "Early Samaritan Eschatology", *Journal of Jewish Studies*, vi. no. 2 (1955), 63-72. On the place of Marqah in relation to the Dositheans, cf. Crown, op. cit.

Joshua are buried to the *north* of Mt. Gerizim where the *Taheb* is to be buried with them. Tradition has it, as far back as can be traced, that Joseph's tomb is at Nebhi Yussuph, north of Gerizim in the "parcel of ground" (Josh. xxiv. 32) near Jacob's well. The location of Joshua's tomb is uncertain, but never, in priestly Samaritan tradition, is it placed to the north of Gerizim, always being placed instead to the south. The Scaliger manuscript relates that Joshua, Pinhas and Eleazar were buried at Kfar Amratha, Guweirah, the modern Awerta. Chronicle Adler relates that Joshua was buried at Timnath Serah (the Biblical view) but that Pinhas and Eleazar were buried at Kfar Amratha. Ryl. Samaritan MS. 374 presents three traditions at least two of which are incompatible. The first (fol. 18a) that Joshua was buried on his own property but no place is specified by name; the second in the passage under discussion, and not necessarily contradictory, that he was buried to the north of Gerizim; the third (fols. 85-87) that he was buried at Kfar Amratha near Pinhas and Eleazar. The comments in the latter passage make it clear that Kfar Amratha was probably Awerta and was not in Joshua's territory. On the other hand, the seventeenth-century traveller Evliya Tshelebi was shown a tomb of Joshua to the north of Shechem close to that of the "sons of Isaac".<sup>1</sup> Thus, despite the written priestly tradition there remained an oral tradition of the burial of Joshua to the north of the mountain.

How can one account for these discordant traditions, particularly the directly contrary traditions in Ryl. Samaritan MS. 374? It may be suggested that either one tradition is earlier than the other and was superseded by the other or that one tradition follows a particular line that was not acceptable. The association of Joshua's tomb in priestly literature with a southerly direction from Gerizim and with a northerly direction in a passage which seems, in the light of the Joseph-Joshua equation, to be a composite of Dosithean-priestly beliefs would seem to indicate that a particular line is being followed, a Dosithean line, perhaps, but at least a heterodox line. The lack of harmony in the body of Samaritan literature which sees Joshua's

<sup>1</sup> Cf. St. H. Stephan, "Evliya Tshelebi's Travels in Palestine", part 5, *Quarterly of the Department of Antiquities, Palestine*, viii (1938), 140 f.

burial place to the south of Gerizim would seem to indicate that there have been adjustments in this literature to meet the heterodox viewpoint and that there was as yet no common tradition. It may well be, though it cannot be demonstrated, that the earliest form of the priestly view was acceptance of the Biblical statement that Joshua was buried at Timnath Serah (or Heres) as in Chronicle Adler.<sup>1</sup> Attempts to project Joshua's burial place to Awerta, that is, near the burial plots of the High Priests of his day, would seem to be part of the movement in Samaritan priestly literature to reduce the role of Joshua during the *landnahme* by aggrandizing the work of the priests. Thus, the discordant views would be later in date than the tradition shown in part A of Ryl. Samaritan MS. 374, which part would therefore present a tradition older than that shown in the Scaliger manuscript.

Immediately after the Messianic poem/hymn is a passage in praise of the Passover which seems to be liturgical in type. A parallel to this work with some similarities of thought is to be found in Marqah<sup>2</sup> and thus the thought expressed in the passage would seem to be of some antiquity. It is perhaps significant that Marqah associates the identical traditions with the *Taheb*<sup>3</sup> and it may well be that at some era the Samaritans associated the *Taheb* with the Passover season though the association cannot now be found in normative Samaritan belief; no similar expressions or traditions appear in extant Samaritan liturgy and it would seem to be impossible, in the present state of our knowledge, to name the author of the passage.

It would seem probable that a poem/hymn of this nature cannot have been without purpose, but what was that purpose? The poems/hymns seem, as demonstrated above, to mark the conclusion of the A document but if that work were no more than a chronicle why conclude it with two works which seem to be liturgical in type but which in any case have theological overtones? If they were not inserted fortuitously on some blank pages at the end of a manuscript one would expect them to have some bearing on, or relationship to, the text, though expectation

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Adler and Seligsohn, "Une Nouvelle Chronique Samaritaine", *Revue des Etudes Juives*, I, xliv. 188 f., II, xlv. 70 f., III, xlvi. 124 f. (1901-3).

<sup>2</sup> Op. cit. ii. 31 f.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid. p. 33.

cannot be certainty. The juxtaposition of chronicle/legal type material and poetry is a feature of Samaritan liturgy but the use of poetry to mark the close of a chronicle, is, so far as can now be determined, unknown in Samaritan literary tradition. Is it possible then, that the poems/hymns were inserted to give the whole work a liturgical character and that the text of the A MS. was something other than a chronicle?

It seems clear from the material available to us that the Samaritans follow the Biblical tradition that the entry into Canaan after the exodus took place in the period immediately preceding the Passover festival and that the mannah ceased at the time of the Passover.<sup>1</sup> Moreover, in the Samaritan Joshua versions available to us the celebration of the Passover is several times noted. It is not difficult to see, therefore, a purpose in the association of Passover in this poem with the Joshua tradition. In his discussion of the first Passover Marqah associates that season with the *Taheb*<sup>2</sup> and the occurrence in our text of the associations Joshua/*Taheb* *Taheb*/Passover may well stem from an association of Joshua and Passover in Samaritan tradition. Moreover, according to some Samaritans<sup>3</sup> the Days of Divine Favour<sup>4</sup> only began with the entry into Canaan and since the return of *Rahutha* (Divine Favour) is to be ushered in by the *Taheb*<sup>5</sup> there is here a possible eschatological reason for associating Passover, Joshua and the *Taheb*.

By which branch of the Samaritans was this association made? For it no longer appears in normative Samaritan theology and, so far as can be gauged from the Passover liturgy in the New *Deftter*<sup>6</sup>, has not formed part of Samaritan tradition since the fourteenth century A.D. Moreover, if the A section of Ryl.

<sup>1</sup> The tradition is found in all the versions of the Samaritan Book of Joshua and also in Abu'l Fath.

<sup>2</sup> Loc. cit.

<sup>3</sup> See below and fol. 82b of Ryl. Samaritan MS. 374.

<sup>4</sup> The Samaritans divide the world into periods of Divine grace and Divine disfavour. Divine grace disappeared with the loss of the ark but will reappear in the Messianic era. Cf. J. A. Montgomery, *The Samaritans*, Philadelphia, 1907, p. 239 f.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid.

<sup>6</sup> Literally "book". The term refers to the Samaritan liturgical work composed by Amram Darrah and Marqah in the fourth century and revised in the fourteenth century. For details, cf. J. Bowman, "Pilgrimage to Mt. Gerizim", *Eretz Israel*, vol. vii (1963).

Samaritan MS. 374 were liturgical by whom was it used? Again, there is no indication in present-day Samaritan liturgy of a Joshua liturgy at Passover. However, the known association of the Dositheans with a Joshua tradition<sup>1</sup> would indicate that *if* parts of the Samaritan Book of Joshua were used for liturgical purposes then the Dositheans would have been the sect most likely to have used the book. It should be noted that the recitation of a chronicle-type (though not a chronicle) text is not unknown amongst the Samaritans, for the *Molad Moshe* was used by them rather as a *megillah* is used amongst the Jews, during the season of Tabernacles.<sup>2</sup> Whilst there is no evidence that the Book of Joshua was ever used as a *haggadah* the repeated emphasis on the first month (e.g. fol. 17a), the repeated emphasis on the Passover and the whole tradition of exodus and entry make the Samaritan Joshua version a suitable text for a *haggadah*.<sup>3</sup> The possibility that the work was once a Dosithean *haggadah* cannot be ruled out if the poems have any relevance to their context.

If there were any Dosithean elements in any part of the Samaritan Joshua manuscripts of the Scaliger type (including the B/C levels of Ryl. Samaritan MS. 374) then it must be assumed that in the process of copying and editing these manuscripts through the centuries those elements must have been erased as carefully as possible to make the text conform to what was currently normative theology. It is not easy to hide traces of editing, as has been demonstrated in regard to section A of our manuscript, yet it must also be remembered that such editing need not necessarily have any more sinister purpose than that of producing a tolerably smooth text with the minimum number of duplicate narratives. Proof of redaction is not necessarily proof of sectarian sources in a manuscript. Yet there is one trace of editing outside the section noticed by Juynboll<sup>4</sup> which can scarcely have had the purpose of preventing duplication and the suspicion must arise that here an editor has sought to harmonize sectarian and normative Samaritan theologies.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Crown, op. cit.

<sup>2</sup> I am indebted for this information to Professor John Bowman.

<sup>3</sup> The very obvious parallel of the texts used in the Jewish *haggadah* can be cited as tenuous support for this argument.

<sup>4</sup> Loc. cit.

On fols. 59a-59b of Ryl. Samaritan MS. 374 reference is made to the celebration of the Passover (not the occasion of the Blessing and the Curse at Mts. Ebal and Gerizim as suggested by Crane).<sup>1</sup> The Scaliger text does not, in contrast to our text, make clear the nature of the festival and it was no doubt this omission which led to Crane's speculative comment. In this account are a number of small discrepancies which give rise to a suspicion of harmonization. In the account the returning warriors are shown as having gone to Gilgal after a victorious campaign, from Hebron or its vicinity, to cleanse themselves in preparation for the coming Passover festival. The description of the purification is such that it is abundantly clear that the rites are based on Numbers xix. 11-19 (this is explicitly noted in a manuscript of the Hebrew version, Ryl. Samaritan MS. 257) and that seven days of purification are to be observed in one place. Yet, unaccountably, the purification rites which are begun at Gilgal and which, implicitly, are completed at Gilgal are also shown as being completed at Gerizim in the waters of a stream which flows down the mountain. Eleazar, the priest, is then shown as having offered sacrifices for the returning troops. The two parts of this story, the purification rites in two separate places, sit together somewhat uneasily and the impression of textual adjustment not merely for the sake of smoothing out duplicate narratives but rather for the sake of theological harmonization is strong. If the above assessment is correct there arise immediately the questions: to what theology was the adjustment being made and from what theology was the adjustment made. According to Samaritan sources<sup>2</sup> purification by means of the ashes of the Red Heifer was continued at Shechem until A.D. 1494. This Red Heifer had to be slaughtered by the High Priest. Thus for orthodox Samaritans purification would not only imply the presence of the High Priest, but also localization of the ceremony at Gerizim or, perhaps, in the Samaritan Diaspora, at Damascus

<sup>1</sup> Op. cit. p. 160, n. 51.

<sup>2</sup> This information is to be found in the *Hillukh* = Ryl. Samaritan MS. 182, as yet unpublished. The relevant portions are to be found in translation in my "Critical Edition and Translation of the Samaritan Burial Services", Leeds M.A. thesis, 1958, p. 70.

or other centres where an eminent priest was available.<sup>1</sup> Moreover, it must be expected that priestly Samaritans, because of their traditional observances, would assume without question that Passover was observed at Gerizim where the pilgrimage of the *Hag* took place. Could the sudden transfer of the scene of purification to Gerizim and the special mention in our manuscript of the *Hag* and the *Mo'ed* of the festival (fol. 59b)<sup>2</sup> be an attempt to normalize a situation which was heretical in their eyes? Could the text originally have specified a form of purification by means of water alone<sup>3</sup> and, perhaps, the celebration of the Passover in a heterodox way? The answer cannot now be given—but the textual peculiarities cast doubts which can probably best be answered by predicating a sectarian original of the work.

In the group of chapters which were recognized by Juynboll as being from contradictory sources, of which one source was priestly (see above), is to be found a second case of textual adjustment in which more positive answers can be found to the problems posed therein. Heterodox, if not certainly Dosithean, views can be clearly traced in the sections which appear to be (according to Juynboll) from the earliest levels of the work.

One of the basic tenets of Samaritan eschatology is that there will be a Day of Vengeance and Recompense which will introduce the final period of a history which can be seen as falling into four major epochs.<sup>4</sup> This day, which is known by a variety of names, is to be the beginning of the period of Divine Favour, *Rahutha*; in fact, is to mark a superlative restoration of the period of Divine Favour which had once been. In view of the close relationship between religion and the historical philosophy which sees all human events as part of *Heilesgeschichte*, in which philosophy the Samaritans differ little from the Jews, one might reasonably expect that eschatological dogmas and the details of such dogmas should be precisely determined or at least tolerably fixed inside a

<sup>1</sup> Cf. A. Neubauer, "Chronique Samaritaine", *Journal Asiatique* (December 1869), p. 412. A High Priestly family is there described in Damascus.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Bowman, "Pilgrimage, etc.", *op. cit.* p. 23 f. for a discussion of the importance of the *Hag* and the *Mo'ed* in Samaritan tradition.

<sup>3</sup> On the place of purification by water amongst the Dositheans, cf. Epiphanius, *Adversus Haereses*, 1.1.XI.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Montgomery, *op. cit.* p. 241.

religion that was homogeneous. Where a religion has heterogeneous roots or has subsumed into its compass heterodox opinions, then eschatological dogmas may be at variance with each other not merely in generalities but also in details: the differences relate to the sources of the separate opinions. This is largely the case with the eschatological beliefs of Judaism where not only do sectarian views find expression but where a variety of problems which faced different sects find a variety of eschatological solutions. Samaritanism was not homogeneous in history, having been torn by sectarian strife, and it may be inferred, with reason, that where differences of belief or in details of dogma present themselves in literature these differences may well represent heterodox opinion.

Despite the apparent unity of extant Samaritan eschatological beliefs, traces of rival eschatological traditions have been identified in Samaritan literature.<sup>1</sup> Further traces of the heterogeneous origins of Samaritan eschatology seem to appear in the Samaritan Joshua versions in regard to traditions concerning the Days of Divine Favour.

Abu'l Fath does not discuss the Days of Divine Favour when recounting the Joshua saga but does define the period from the entry into Canaan until the disappearance of the tabernacle (the end of the period of Divine Favour) as 260 years. Montgomery,<sup>2</sup> without quoting his sources, states that the Days of Divine Favour began with the revelation at Sinai and lasted for 260 years. Gaster<sup>3</sup> adumbrates the period from the entry into the land of Canaan until the loss of the tabernacle as being 260 years or 261. Chronicle Neubauer<sup>4</sup> does not present a direct statement on the matter but implies that the period from the entry into Canaan to the destruction of the tabernacle was 261 years.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Bowman, "Early Samaritan, etc.", op. cit.

<sup>2</sup> Op. cit. p. 24.

<sup>3</sup> M. Gaster, "Chain of the Samaritan High Priests", in *Studies and Texts in Folk-Lore, Magic, Romance and Apocrypha*, i (London 1925-8), 494 f.

<sup>4</sup> Op. cit. p. 398.

<sup>5</sup> The date of the entry is given as 2,794 years after the creation and the date of the loss of the tabernacle is given as 3,055 years after the creation. A subtraction gives 261 years. Note the error in Neubauer's translation, p. 433, where he cites 3,050 years.



Likewise Chronicle Adler. From the *Asatir*<sup>1</sup> it would seem that the Days of Divine Favour extended through the life of Moses, perhaps from the revelation at Sinai<sup>2</sup> until the time of Eli<sup>3</sup>, but no hint is given as to chronology except in the broadest sense. The *Hillukh*<sup>4</sup> gives the period from the entry until the days of Eli as 280 years, but this is a modern work and must be ignored for the moment.

If the extent of the Days of Divine Favour, whether 260 or 261 years, be seen against the dates in the chronicles for the entry into Canaan then it would seem that the era of Divine Favour began under Joshua's leadership and not as implied in the *Asatir*, and as clearly stated by Montgomery, with the revelation at Sinai. Here seems to be a dual tradition. The Samaritan Joshua versions both indicate that the Days of Divine Favour began with Joshua (Ryl. Samaritan MS. 374, on fol. 82b), though both versions, in what appears to be an error, extend the period to 361 years.<sup>5</sup> Chronicle Adler does not mention Joshua in relation to the Days of Divine Favour<sup>6</sup> the onset of *Panutha* being related to the disappearance of Moses' tabernacle without the length of the period being specified. (The inference is that Divine Favour began under Moses' rule.) When this varying attitude is seen against the way the chronology is derived the suspicion of adjustment for theological purposes is verified.

In Ryl. Samaritan MS. 374 and in the Scaliger text it appears as though two attempts are being made to explain the origin of the 260 year period. One of these attempts is explicit and is probably primary. In both these versions Joshua is said to have held his office for forty years and was then succeeded by a group of secular rulers who, for the most part, correspond with the Biblical Judges.<sup>7</sup> In the Scaliger text these men, including Joshua, are explicitly said to have had an accumulated rule of two hundred and sixty years. In Ryl. Samaritan MS. 374 (fol.

<sup>1</sup> M. Gaster, *The Asatir, The Samaritan Book of the Secrets of Moses*, Oriental Translation Fund, New Series, London, 1927. <sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 282 verse 35.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 306, n. 21.

<sup>4</sup> Ryl. Samaritan MS. 182, p. 3.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. fol. 88b of Ryl. Samaritan MS. 374.

<sup>6</sup> *Op. cit.* pp. 205-6.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. fol. 85b of Ryl. Samaritan MS. 374 and fol. 86. Some of the names cannot be recognized as derived from Judges but most are clearly from that source.

85a f.) the same chronology is implied. In both manuscripts the beginning of *Panutha* (error) is associated with the death of Samson and the tabernacle is lost before any reference is made to Eli.

Now a second group of personages can be seen who could account (and in other Samaritan literature do account)<sup>1</sup> for the total of 260 years. These are the priests from Eleazar down to, and including, the last priest of the *Rahutha*, Ozzi. In neither of the versions are the names of all the five priests mentioned and from this it would seem that the priests are of secondary importance and that the priestly strand is the secondary strand. (Also concluded by Juynboll.) Though the tradition of a quarrel between Eli and Ozzi is found, it is not related (except as an implicit rather than an explicit explanation) with the beginning of the *Panutha* despite the rubrics to the chapters which try to make this relationship appear. For all this, the chronology for the priests up to the beginnings of *Panutha* is identical with the chronology derived from the secular leaders. Suspiciously, whilst in every case where chronological tables are given, the beginning of *Panutha* corresponds with the death of Ozzi, in the text of Ryl. Samaritan MS. 374 and in the Scaliger version, Ozzi seems to live on.

That the coincidence of chronology is not a coincidence is made doubly clear from the priestly chronicles. In the *Tolidah*,<sup>2</sup> the *Shalshleth HaCohanim*<sup>3</sup> and Chronicle Adler<sup>4</sup> where the office of each priest is carefully dated and the required total reached, none of the secular leaders is mentioned nor is Joshua mentioned. Moreover, in Chronicle Adler the cause of *Panutha* is directly attributed to the schism between Eli and Ozzi and the same is true in the *Hillukh*. In other words one group of sources associates the Days of Divine Favour with Joshua and the period ends with the death of Samson, Ozzi the priest merely being an observer of the fact of the onset of *Panutha*, whilst a second group of sources which, of their nature are to be regarded as priestly, associates the Days of Divine Favour with a succession of High

<sup>1</sup> E.g. in Chronicle Adler, op. cit. ; Chronicle Neubauer, op. cit. ; and the *Hillukh*, op. cit.

<sup>2</sup> Or Chronicle Neubauer, op. cit.

<sup>3</sup> Or Gaster, "Chain, etc.", op. cit.

<sup>4</sup> Op. cit. pp. 201-6.

Priests, the period ending through a quarrel between priests. This group of sources implies that the Days of Divine Favour began with Moses.

Now, since the priestly literature carefully lays down a contrary tradition to the "secular" literature, it must be assumed that the "secular" literature is heterodox, though whether that heterodoxy is certainly Dosithean is not known. However, since the form of the heterodoxy seems to exalt Moses and since it seems to emphasize the role of secular as against priestly leaders, it may well be that the heterodoxy was Dosithean.

One important consideration arising out of this discussion is the phenomenon of the "fixed chronology", that is, of the apparent immutability of the date for the entry into Canaan of 2,794 years after the creation and the period of 260 (one) years for the days of Divine Favour. Why did the priestly writers go to the trouble of proposing alternative explanations for the chronology rather than extend the period of Days of Divine Favour to, say, 280 years as in the modern *Hillukh* and thus make certain that Moses was given the credit as ruling at the origin of *Rahutha*? The answer may lie in the fact that this chronology has eschatological overtones and therefore it was easier to adjust the explanation for the chronology than the chronology itself.  $2,794 \text{ years} + 261 \text{ years} = 3,055 \text{ years}$ , that is, half the period from the creation to the end of the rule of the *Taheb* in some traditions,<sup>1</sup> the second *Panutha* thus being a midway point in the span of history. It should also be noted that in Samaritan eschatology the period of Messianic rule after the coming of the *Taheb* is to be 110 years, the age at which Joshua died.<sup>2</sup> This is also the age at which Joseph died<sup>3</sup> and the coincidence of these figures could account for the Joseph-*Taheb* as against the Joshua-*Taheb* tradition. But that the Joseph-*Taheb* tradition is secondary to the Joshua-*Taheb* tradition would seem clear, for the whole chronology of the eschatological schema appears to be related to the Joshua tradition, the conquest and the settlement. If, as suggested above, the Joseph-*Taheb* tradition is the priestly tradition, then

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Montgomery, *op. cit.* p. 242, though Montgomery's arithmetic is in error. Cf. also the *Asatir*, *op. cit.* p. 304.

<sup>2</sup> Josh. xxiv. 29.

<sup>3</sup> Gen. i. 26.

the priestly tradition as a whole is secondary and is based on an alternative to an older heterodoxy. Again, though it cannot be said with certainty that the heterodoxy was Dosithean the emphasis on Joshua would strengthen the hypothesis of Dosithean origins for the Samaritan Joshua versions.

It is not, of course, impossible in attempting to evaluate, in literature which has had a long history of copying, influences of sects which have long since gone, that one can begin to chase a chimera, in short, to become so monomaniac as to see in the merest coincidence or chain of circumstances proof of one's viewpoint: scholars have fallen prey to such influences in the past.<sup>1</sup> In drawing the conclusion that the priestly sources were antagonistic to the Joshua tradition it becomes easy to read into every juxtaposition of the roles of Joshua and his priestly colleague, Eleazar, in the Samaritan Joshua versions comparative estimates of the emphasis placed on these names. This is, in truth, a dangerous procedure; yet, at the same time, it would be equally dangerous to ignore the juxtaposition of roles, for, where there is well attested evidence in the sources for one or other of the two Israelite leaders having undertaken a certain course of action, a complete reversal of roles may well have a polemical purpose.

Thus, in the canonical account of the conquest of Canaan the apportionment of the land was by lot (Jos. 13 f.) with Joshua having the prime authority in the territorial distribution. Yet in Scaliger,<sup>2</sup> Abu'l Fath and Ryl. Samaritan MS. 374 (fol. 63a) Joshua plays no part at all in the allotment. It is Eleazar who assesses the needs of the tribes and accordingly distributes the land to them. A reversal of the roles of the leaders has taken place and a reversal which may not be without purpose. A clue to the purpose may be found in Christian typology. In the Joshua-Jesus typology developed by the Church Fathers<sup>3</sup> the apportionment of the land had a particular eschatological significance<sup>4</sup> as a type of the distribution of the inheritance of the

<sup>1</sup> T. K. Cheyne and J. S. Black in the *Encyclopaedia Biblica* demonstrably had a fixation about Mizzur, Arabia and the Jeraḥmeelites.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. the text in Juynboll, *op. cit.* fol. 25.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. J. Danielou, *From Shadows to Reality, Studies in the Biblical Typology of the Fathers* (London, 1960), pp. 229-87, "The Cycle of Joshua".

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* p. 236 f.

elect. Dositheanism was not uninfluenced by Christian typology<sup>1</sup> particularly since, in seeking to elevate Joshua to the place of a Messiah, the Dositheans would have had to use the same typology and source material as used by the Church Fathers. It is significant in this regard that the Samaritan-Dosithean hero, Baba Rabba (The Great Gate, John x. 7), is said to have distributed the land of Canaan to his followers in terms similar to those in the Book of Joshua.<sup>2</sup> Can it be that the reversal of roles between Joshua and Eleazar seen in the Samaritan Joshua versions resulted from a recognition by the priestly writers of the importance of the act of land allotment to Dosithean believers? It is difficult to perceive that such a drastic change in the text could have come about unless there were good theological reasons for the change.

The evidence would seem to indicate that in the A section of Ryl. Samaritan MS. 374 is the truncated relic of a work which was parallel in form to the B/C section of the manuscript, and with the Scaliger version, and yet which showed some differences from both. The poetic relics at the end of the work which are not to be found in the Scaliger version seem to have traces of a tradition older than either the B/C section or than the Scaliger version, and it becomes probable that whilst Juynboll is correct about the sources from which the Samaritan Book of Joshua was compiled, he is incorrect about its age and origin. Traces of priestly editing lead to the conclusion that its origin was as a sectarian document, probably as a theological or eschatological work, perhaps even as a Passover *Haggadah* or a similar liturgical document. The particular form of heterodoxy is uncertain but may have been Dosithean.

Later, perhaps, when the Dosithean sect diminished in importance, or, perhaps, as a result of a priestly-Dosithean union, the work was adopted by the priestly Samaritans, and, after necessary adjustments to harmonize its view with those of orthodox Samaritans, it became a chronicle.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Crown, *op. cit.* on the use of Deut. xviii. 15 amongst the Dositheans and the Church Fathers.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*