NEW LIGHT ON THE INTER-RELATIONSHIPS OF SAMARITAN CHRONICLES FROM SOME MANUSCRIPTS IN THE JOHN RYLANDS UNIVERSITY LIBRARY OF MANCHESTER: II[1]

By ALAN DAVID CROWN, M.A., Ph.D.
SENIOR LECTURER IN SEMITIC STUDIES IN THE UNIVERSITY OF SYDNEY

III

ANALYSIS: THE HEBREW CHRONICLES—SEPHER HAYAMIM, CHRONICLE ADLER, TOLIDAH
[= MacDonald's Chronicles II, III, VI]

IN 1908 Moses Gaster published a text which he claimed to be the Hebrew original from which the parallel part to the Joshua strand of the *Sepher Yehoshua* was translated into Arabic.[2] He collated for his text three modern manuscripts but was not completely objective and tailored Ryl. Samaritan MS. 257 to fit his theory by omitting from his printed text all the material in that manuscript which fell after the death of Joshua : the material was two-thirds of the manuscript.[3]   Publication of the text led to a scholarly controversy involving Gaster, Yahuda, Kahle, Adler[4] and to these illustrious names should be added, recently, MacDonald.[5]

Without prejudging any of the issues involved the following data become clear from examination of the literature :

(1) Gaster's critics did not know the basic facts established by Juynboll even though they appeared to quote him : Yahuda,

---

[1] The first part of this article appeared in the preceding number of the BULLETIN.

[2] M. Gaster, " Das Buch Josua in hebraisch-Samaritanischer Rezension ", *Z.D.M.G.*, lxii (1908), 209-79, 494-59.

[3] The full text of the manuscript is printed in my " Critical Re-evaluation of the Samaritan Sepher Yehoshua ", Sydney Ph.D., 1966.

[4] Cf. A. S. Yahuda, " Uber die Unechtheit des Samaritanischen Josuabuches ", *Sitzungsberichte der Berlin Akademie der Wissenschaft*, xxxix (1908), 887 f.; E. A. Adler, " On the Samaritan Book of Joshua ", *J.R.A.S.* 1908 (15 Sept.).   Gaster, " My Reply ", *J.R.A.S.*, 22 Sept. 1908; P. Kahle, " Zum hebraischen Buch Josua der Samaritaner ", *Z.D.M.G.*, lxii (1908), 550-1.

[5] MacDonald, *The Samaritan Chronicle II* (Berlin, 1969).

and later Ben-Zvie, acknowledged that they had not read Juynboll but still used the materials they had gleaned of his conclusions from other sources to criticize Gaster.[1] Reliance on Kirchheim's version led Ben-Zvie to make fundamental errors.[2]

(2) Some of the critiques of Gaster's work were made on what must be judged to be a very superficial basis. Kahle expressed his opinion in a two-page note[3] based on correspondence with the Samaritans whose word was not reliable.[4] Adler's judgement was based on what Yahuda said for him[5] and M. H. Segal presented his reasons in a note in the *Jewish Chronicle*. Yahuda's arguments were the most cogent and these showed some marks of superficial acquaintance with the subject.

(3) Gaster was extreme in his views and thus brought some of this criticism on his own head. He consistently refused to pay more than lip-service to the probability that his text, whatever its antiquity, must have been affected by the transmission process ; hence he was forced into a defence of Samaritan claims for the antiquity of the Abisha scroll.[6]

It was not until a letter appeared in *The Times* that Gaster learned of the prior publication of a similar version of the *Sepher Hayamim* by A. M. Luncz in 1902.[7] This is the same as MacDonald's J4 text[8] ; it would seem appropriate to consider this text here in some detail.

In the introduction to his text Luncz gave some details of how the text came into his possession, saying that there had been sent to him by one of the learned Samaritans in Shechem a copy of the work *šenimṣah eṣlow*. Luncz noted that it differed from the related parts of the *Sepher Yehoshua* seeming to follow the

[1] Cf. I Ben-Zvie, " The Samaritan Book of Joshua and its Recent Forgery " (Hebrew), *Knesset*, x. 196 f.   [2] Ibid.   [3] Op. cit.

[4] Cf. Gaster (*Z.D.M.G.*), op. cit. p. 533 f., where he deals with Kahle's correspondence with the Samaritans.   [5] Op. cit.

[6] Cf. " My Reply ", op. cit. p. 1151.

[7] A. M. Luncz, " The Samaritan Book of Joshua " (Hebrew), *Jahrbuch zur Beforderung Einer Wissenschaftlich genauen kenntis des jetzigenund des alten Palestinas* (= Jerusalem Yearbook), Bd. VI, Heft 2 (1902), 138-55.

[8] Op. cit. p. 71. MacDonald states that this text was published by Yellin. Yellin had another article in the same issue of the work. (Cf. note 5, p. 94). The term " J " Chronicles refers to the manuscripts listed by MacDonald on p. 70 f.

M.T. except in regard to some additional matter and some variants. Whilst he would have been inclined to feel that this version had been forged from the M.T. with some Samaritan harmonization, he could not reconcile his knowledge of the contemporary Samaritans and their literary limitations with an excellent forgery which would have demanded a facility in Hebrew which was beyond their scope. Moreover he explained that he had paid only the current price for a copy rather than for an original work and, from his knowledge of the man who sent him the manuscript, it seemed unlikely that he would have demanded so small a sum for a forgery of his own.

He offered, therefore, two suggestions as to the possible sources of his copy. The first was that this work was the source from which the Arabic chronicle had been drawn. The second was that this was a retranslation from the *Sepher Yehoshua* but of some antiquity. In any event Luncz indicated that the work was incomplete, though his evidence for this statement was not clear, and he stated that he would make enquiries about the missing chapters with a view to subsequent publication. The remaining portions were never published.

Despite Luncz's opinion that this copy was not a recent forgery, this possibility cannot be categorically excluded as a third alternative source of the work. Luncz's text (J4) is considerably shorter than Gaster's *Zeitschrift* text. The difference in size appears to result from a number of omissions or contractions in the Luncz text. These omissions are (*a*) The description of the struggle at Makkedah is not complete, with the death of the kings not recorded, (*b*) The account of Joshua's conquest of the Negev is severely abbreviated, (*c*) The whole account of the struggle against Jabin, King of Hazor is omitted, (*d*) The land allotment and the description of boundaries is missing, (*e*) The whole of the Eleazar Midrash is missing. MacDonald has maintained that the J4 text is an independent witness to the text and uses it alongside the other manuscripts utilized by Gaster. However, it can be shown that the J4 version is not independent but has either been drawn directly from the same source or even from the same manuscript. Words in the " master text " have been dropped (or excised for

brevity) without the necessary corrections in the Luncz text to allow for the loss. Thus on line 17 of folio 34 of Ryl. Samaritan MS. 268 the second, third and fourth words of the line have been missed from the Luncz version although the latter makes no sense without them and the following pronoun indicates beyond doubt that words are missing. Again, comparison of lines 22-23 of folio 38 of the Rylands manuscript with the Luncz text shows that the Hebrew of the former contains an " either " " or " proposition ; in the Luncz text the proposition is nonsense because half a clause is missing. Examples of such omissions can be multiplied.[1] Similarly, the Luncz version employs terms found in other versions of the " Chronicle II " which have no warrant from other sources, and has similar orthography for errors. Thus the Luncz text uses " *Qanow* " his throne, *laṭur*, to spy out and agrees with the Rylands manuscripts in spelling *ṣew'a*, army, as *ṣiwah*. The evidence indicates not merely a common source for the Gaster and Luncz versions but that the Luncz version has been drawn directly from the Gaster versions as an apocope thereof, and the use of this text as an independent J4 source should therefore be regarded as an error.

Kahle's judgement of the text published by Gaster was that it was prepared (composed) in 1902, the copyist drawing on the *Sepher Yehoshua, Chronicle Abu'l Fath* and the M.T. of Joshua.[2] Ben-Zvie drew the same conclusion though in his case the versions on which he gave judgement were not the published text of Gaster but some other versions which appear to have been deliberate forgeries[3] and he transferred his judgement from these texts to Gaster's *Zeitschrift* version, *currente calamo*, without independent examination.

Kahle's judgement was based on correspondence with the Samaritan priests, but a simple test shows that what he was told by these priests was probably untrue. A comparison of the Hebrew column account of the twelve spies in Ryl. Samaritan MS. 374 with the version published by Gaster in the *J.R.A.S.*[4]

---

[1] Cf. my " A Critical Edition ", etc., op. cit. vol. 1, p. 275 for further examples.
[2] Cf. Kahle, op. cit.   [3] Ben-Zvie, op. cit.
[4] Cf. M. Gaster, " The Samaritan Hebrew Sources of the Arabic Book of Joshua ", *J.R.A.S.*, 1930.

shows the close relationship, perhaps identity, of these versions though at least two hundred years separate them.[1]   Yet the former was claimed by its scribe to be an independent translation from the Arabic, plainly impossible, presumably so that he would be paid a larger sum for the labour of translating rather than a smaller sum for copying.   Gaster has published a full account of his correspondence with the Samaritans (most of it is now housed in the Rylands Library)[2] and it is clear from this corres- pondence that the Samaritans gave a variety of answers as to how the Hebrew texts came to be written.   In one instance[3] the High Priest claimed that he translated it six years ago, whereas in a second version[4] he claimed that no one translated this text but that it came directly from the Sepher Hayamim (Chron. II and VII).   In view of such variation, how can one rely on a scholarly opinion based solely on this contact?   In any event, Kahle should have realized that the fact that Gaster was able to ask for and obtain a number of versions of the chronicle, identical or nearly so, indicated without equivocation that the text supplied was a copy and not a composition de novo.   In fact, on one occasion the High Priest indicated that he had corrected one of the copies by collating it with a number of other texts.[5]   It is likely that the High Priest told the truth only when he said that what he had sent to Gaster was a copy of part of the Sepher Hayamim, though what that work was must be determined later.

To be able to claim that the Sepher Hayamim published by Gaster was a forgery, one must be able to point to the sources of the forgery or at least to be able to explain references in the forgery with a tolerable degree of certainty.   Yet neither option is possible, for most of the material in the texts and that part of the text which is explicable is capable of several explanations. Where, for example, did the forger hit on the idea of using the name Nuris as the name of one of the cities of Issachar?[6]   The

[1] A letter of Gaster dated 10 Sept. 1912 is in the files of the John Rylands University Library reporting the opinion of Herbert Leowe on the age of the version published in the J.R.A.S. A copy of the letter is printed in the appendix to volume one of my " A Critical Edition ", etc.

[2] Cf. the Nachtrag in the reprinted version of the Z.D.M.G. text.

[3] Ibid. p. 536.   [4] Ibid. p. 537.   [5] Loc. cit.

[6] Ryl. Samaritan MS. 257, fol. 43.

village of Nuris (about seven miles west north west of Beisan) is a small Arab settlement not mentioned in any of the sacred writings of Jews or Samaritans or in any of the onomastic literature. It is central to what is thought to have been the territory of Issachar and has no value as a border marker. In the survey of Western Palestine[1] it is noted that ancient remains are found at Nuris but the site has never been excavated and has no known association with the Samaritans. If the chronicle is a forgery the name Nuris gives no verisimilitude because of this lack of association with the Samaritans. It would seem that the name is not explicable from extant sources.

The source of the *yithhallel* hymns (Ryl. Samaritan MS. 268, fols. 4, 6) also must be seen as a challenge to the views of those who propose that the *Sepher Hayamim* is a forgery. These hymns are not found in the Samaritan liturgy nor are they found in the Chronicle of Abu'l Fath, though they are found in the extant versions of the *Sepher Yehoshua*. If the *Sepher Hayamim* is a forgery from Samaritan Arabic sources, then there would seem to be no other source for the *yithhallel* prayers than the *Sepher Yehoshua*. Of the thirteen verses beginning with the word *yithhallel* in Ryl. Samaritan MS. 268 (*Sepher Hayamim*) only five are common to the six such verses in Ryl. Samaritan MS. 374 (*Sepher Yehoshua*) and only four are common with the five verses in the Scaliger text. Both Ryl. Samaritan MS. 374 and the Scaliger MS. have an extra *yithhallel* verse not found in Ryl. Samaritan MS. 268. Where, then, did the author of the latter manuscript find the extra lines for his poem if he were a forger? He could have composed his lines *de novo*. It is impossible to prove the contrary. On the other hand, there are indications from a comparison of the Scaliger version with the Rylands version of the poem in the *Sepher Yehoshua* that the Arabic version was once longer than it is today and has been reduced or conflated.

Thus, the second line of the poem in the Scaliger text— *sbḥn mn ḳl shy phy s'a'bḥ*—seems to be a conflate version of two lines beginning *sbḥn mn ḳl shy . . .* and *sbḥn mn qbl ḳl shy* in

Ryl. Samaritan MS. 374. In the Samaritan script Arabic ḳaf and kaf would appear to be the same and the scribe's eye could have passed freely from line to line to produce the conflate reading. Ryl. Samaritan MS. 374 also has conflate readings of this order and the groundform of the poem would seem to be close to the Hebrew version of the *Sepher Hayamim*. Again, the Arabic of the *Sepher Yehoshua* shows variety in vocabulary and terminology in the versions of this poem where the Hebrew versions remain tolerably constant, the Arabic variants all equating to the Hebrew constant. Thus the Scaliger text uses *phy s'a'bh* for " his will " whereas Ryl. Samaritan MS. 374 uses the hebraizing *thth rs'ah*. The Hebrew sources would here seem to be closer to the primary source than the Arabic, which would seem to be secondary to a Hebrew source. The Hebrew source would seem to have been the longer. Whilst it cannot be claimed that the version of the *yithhallel hymns* in the *Sepher Hayamim* was the source of the hymns in the *Sepher Yehoshua*, it seems improbable that the *Sepher Hayamim* was based on an Arabic source, and particularly the *Sepher Yehoshua* as cited by Gaster's critics.

A further objection to the notion of a recent forgery is the variation of style between passages. It would seem to be reasonable to propose that between a passage of a purely Samaritan interest and source and a passage that is close to or based on the M.T. a discrepancy in style might appear. This would be the case if the work were a modern forgery based on the M.T. and on Samaritan sources; it would also pertain if Samaritan materials were dropped into a text at different times during a long history of transmission of that text. Either of these premises would make it comprehensible that there should be stylistic differences in the Eleazar Midrash (Ryl. Samaritan MS. 268, fol. 40) between those lines based on an M.T. or like version and those lines drawn solely from a Samaritan source. It is not easy to comprehend why discrepancies in style should develop between passages of a Samaritan nature which are alleged to be drawn from the same source by the same writer. Thus, in the Shobach tale we find the following (Ryl. Samaritan MS. 268, fol. 33). The waw consecutive is seldom used except

in line 5 only ; the imperfect is used as a simple future tense or omnitemporally. The infinitive construct is missing as is the *hiph'l,* though there are places where the syntax would seem to demand both. By contrast, in a second passage of Samaritan content (Ryl. Samaritan MS. 268, fol. 22) the style differs. The waw consecutive is employed ten times in seventeen lines, verbs are used with a classical perspective as the syntax demands, and the syntax appears to present none of the abnormalities which seem to strain the style of the Shobach tale. If the work be a forgery with the segments drawn from the same work by the same author, then the change in style is difficult to understand. It would seem more probable that even those portions of Samaritan import are of different ages.

Whilst this evidence would indicate that Luncz and Gaster were to a degree correct in suggesting that the work had a longer history than allowed by Kahle, the High Priest may not have been entirely untruthful in telling Kahle that he prepared the work in 1902. The shorter manuscript which he sold to Gaster was almost certainly abstracted from the longer versions of the *Sepher Hayamim.* Textual comparisons.[1] make certain that Ryl. Samaritan MS. 268 (MacDonald's J1) belongs to the same series as other manuscripts of the " J " series, and, in particular, that there is a direct relationship between J1 and J5 which must be seen as a complete *Sepher Hayamim.* Of this more later. What the High Priest seems to have done is to abstract the shorter text from the *Sepher Hayamim* and, having so " pre-pared " it, claimed a price higher than that for a copy.

On the other hand there can be no doubt that the manuscripts examined by Ben-Zvie were forgeries.[2] An examination of these three manuscripts at even the most cursory level is sufficient to show that they have no relationship to any of the " J " manu-scripts. They have about the same relationship to these J texts as have Lamb's tales to Shakespeare's original work. Ben-Zvie rightly showed that the manuscripts he examined were com-pounded from Shullam's version of the Shobach story in *Yuchasin*

---

[1] Cf. the apparatus to the texts used in vol. 2 of my " Critical Edition etc.", where there can be no doubt of the relationship between the texts.

[2] Op. cit. p. 140.

and the medieval midrash, *Sepher Hayashar.*[1] Ben-Zvie pointed up differences between these manuscripts and the J texts without realizing that this vitiated his attempt to transfer conclusions from one set of manuscripts to another. The basic difference is that his texts showed none of the Aramaisms of early Samaritan writings and none of the Arabisms of later Samaritan writings ; they also lacked diacritical points of the type employed by Samaritans and had a multitude of idioms drawn from Rabbinic-Mishnaic Hebrew.[2] For all this, Ben-Zvie transferred his arguments from one set of manuscripts to the other set of manuscripts in the most cursory fashion ; without reading Juynboll (by his own admission), he turned aside Juynboll's arguments on the Shobach cycle with the words (Hebrew) " This supposition has no basis and claims too much ".[3]

It is significant that these forgeries date to 1904 A.D. and 1911 A.D. as Ben-Zvie showed[4] ; that is, after the Luncz version was published and after the controversy over Gaster's work.

If the *Sepher Hayamim* is not a forgery, then we must consider the other alternatives suggested by Luncz : either that it is a translation from the *Sepher Yehoshua* or that it is the source or drawn from the source of the *Sepher Yehoshua.*

Critics of Gaster and Luncz signified their belief that the Hebrew *Sepher Hayamim* was translated from the *Sepher Yehoshua.* So Yellin[5] (Yellin used the name *Sepher Hayamim* to describe the chronicle of Abu'l Fath) who wrote (Hebrew) " I have available at this time the *Sepher Hayamim* in Arabic and after I had compared the version in Hebrew with the version in Arabic I saw that for the most part they compared word for word and only in places where it contains complete stories from our Book of Joshua (i.e. M.T.) did the words of the Arabic version become very few ". Yellin then analysed those words which he considered to be Arabisms. But some of the Arabisms he cited were drawn from the *Yithhallel* prayers which do not occur in Abu'l Fath. Yellin's error would seem to imply that

---

[1] Ibid. pp. 141 f. for a survey of the comparisons made by Ben-Zvie.
[2] Ibid. p. 138. [3] Ibid. p. 136. [4] Ibid. p. 131.
[5] Cf. P. Yellin, " A Book of Joshua or a Sepher Hayamim " (Hebrew), *Jerusalem Yearbook* (cf. note 8, p. 87), pp. 203 f.

he regarded the J versions as drawing on and stemming from Abu'l Fath, Scaliger and the M.T.

Yellin's conclusions (and Adler's, for he presented similar views) can only be regarded as valid if they stand the following tests : (a) It is not sufficient to show a general correspondence between texts : the J versions must only present the same materials and details as are found in the Arabic versions except where additional matter could be drawn from the M.T. (b) Terminology, place names and personal names must be shown to be derived from the Arabic or the M.T. (c) Arabisms in the Hebrew must unequivocally be Arabisms and not Aramaisms. (d) Where the accounts permit dependence to be demonstrated that dependence must be of the Hebrew on the Arabic. If all of these conditions can be satisfied, then there can be little doubt of the origin of the J (Hebrew) chronicles. If the condition cannot be met either *in toto* or part, then Yellin's conclusions must be regarded as uncertain. If condition (d) allows the reverse to pertain, i.e. the apparent dependence of the Arabic chronicles on the Hebrew, then the probability must be allowed that the Arabic chronicles are secondary to the type of the Hebrew chronicles.

There is no doubt at all that the J chronicles and the Arabic chronicles are related ; it is the manner of that relationship which is debated. Because of this basic relationship, a general corres-pondence between structure and content can be no evidence of dependence of one on the other. Evidence lies in the detail of dependence—the relationships of particular clauses and phrases in the two languages. It is this detailed relationship that Yellin claimed to have found in the alleged word for word correspondence with Abu'l Fath. Since Abu'l Fath acknowledged that he was paraphrasing a source he had before him, word for word corres-pondence would provide unequivocal proof of the dependence of the Hebrew as translation of the paraphrase. It could never be the source of the paraphrase.

A detailed comparison of the beginning of the Joshua story in the chronicles disproves Yellin's contention that he found a word for word correspondence.

Whilst the J chronicles Ryl. Samaritan MSS. 257 and 268

have an opening rubric, the rubric appears at the end in the Luncz text. Even so, it might have been displaced or derived from the Scaliger version. This evidence neither supports nor gainsays Yellin. The next lines, presenting the chronology of the book, are more troublesome. This chronology in the J versions could not have been drawn directly from Abu'l Fath's chronicle, since the date there is reported to be 1794 years after the creation and even if one added all the chronological data in Abu'l Fath's chronicle the total would still not be 1794 (or 2794 as in the J versions) but would be either 2754 or 2799.[1] Nor could the date be drawn directly from other *Sepher Yehoshua* versions, for even if the fifteenth chapter of Scaliger were used the date would still have to be adjusted and interpreted. The chronology of the J versions would seem to belie Yellin.

The verse " No man shall stand before you," etc. which is verbatim in Luncz, Ryl. Samaritan MSS. 268 and 374 and the M.T., does not appear in Abu'l Fath's chronicle at all, whether in paraphrase or directly. The Scaliger version expands the verse a little by the glosses " O Joshua " and " Peace be upon him ". The succeeding verse is again verbatim in the J sources, but the Scaliger version extends it and Abu'l Fath paraphrases it. The original form of the verse, as judged from the paraphrase and the gloss, would seem to be as found in the J versions. The texts all now depart from each other. The *Sepher Yehoshua* versions present some additional lines not found in the Hebrew; the M.T. at this point also differs from the Hebrew versions and Abu'l Fath's chronicle is yet different. Clearly there cannot be seen here the word for word relationship indicated by Yellin which is essential for considerations of priority. On the con-trary, only the expected general relationship can be seen. In particular, it should be noted that of all the texts from which the J chronicles could have been drawn Abu'l Fath's text seems the least likely.

The Shobach story gives some preliminary indication as to the order of priorities and dependence in the chronicles, for with the exception of the account published by Shullam in *Sepher*

---

[1] R. Payne Smith, " The Chronicle of Abu'l Fath ", *D.V.J.*, iv (1863), 308. n. 4.

Yuchasin[1] there are no parallels which could complicate the transmission process. In Ryl. Samaritan MS. 268, fol. 20 the Shobach story begins with the words *Wyhy 'ḥr hdbhrym h'lh*, with which phrasing the Luncz text agrees verbatim, as does the *Sepher Yehoshua* version in Ryl. Samaritan MS. 374 in its words *wḳ'n b'd 'lḥtwb hwl'y.* However, the latter manuscript adds the detail not found in the J versions, that Shobach's father had been killed by Joshua's men during the conquest. It is at this point that the Scaliger codex begins its account of Shobach. Abu'l Fath presents a preliminary statement which is not based or related directly to the J versions and continues as the *Sepher Yehoshua* manuscript (Ryl. Samaritan MS. 374), noting that Shobach's father had been killed by Joshua. The J versions continue with a description of Shobach's military might and enumerate the details, namely a mighty camp, horses and cavalry and chariotry. This same description is found in Ryl. Samaritan MS. 374 but not in the Scaliger text or in Abu'l Fath's text, where a bald statement is found of Shobach's wealth without any details. It would seem here that the thought of the Hebrew versions is primary, since the Shobach account is a military account. While one can see how military equipment would be identified as wealth in an Islamic environment (or vice versa), the probabilities are that the description of military equipment is primary. Throughout the long account, the Hebrew version appears to be primary in that it is shorter and the variations from version to version seem to propose a text before glossing of the type of the Hebrew versions. Thus, if one considers the direct speech of the " Letter to the Giants " in the various versions, only the J versions are homogeneous. The *Sepher Yehoshua* versions are all longer and all have the appearance of glossing on one primary text rather than on each other. Even the Abu'l Fath account is five words longer than the Hebrew in the opening sentence, though it is considerably shorter than the other Arabic versions. However, this general indication cannot be cited as direct evidence, and the other conditions must be examined.

---

[1] Cf. S. Shullam, *Sepher Yuchasin* (Djitomir, 1861), p. 418.

7

A second part of the first condition laid down for discussing Yellin's work was that relating to the presence in the Hebrew source of only such material as could derive directly from the Arabic or the M.T. It is apparent that there are a number of sections in the J texts which do not appear in the Arabic chronicles or which differ substantially from them. These are:

(a) The J versions lack the tradition of covenant making on entry to the land.[1]

(b) The J versions lack the account of the entry of the spies at Jericho which is found in the Arabic versions.

(c) The J versions have the account of the fall of Ai as does Abu'l Fath. It is clear that neither of the *Sepher Yehoshua* texts can be the source of the Hebrew in this instance.

(d) The J versions (except Luncz which can be discounted for reasons stated) present a detailed account of the wars of Joshua following the fall of Makkedah. The details are missing in all the Arabic chronicles, which give only a brief general account of the wars after Makkedah. It is clear that the Arabic versions have done what was done in the Luncz version ; namely, a long version like the Hebrew was cut down. Despite attempts by Condor and Crane[2] to identify the name Mahzun in the Arabic chronicle version of this series of battles as El-Maharunna, it is simply a misreading of the name Hebron in a corrupt script. Abu'l Fath makes this doubly certain when he talks of the country of Chalil, i.e. the term used for Hebron, the place where Abraham (Chalil) lived in Southern Palestine. The Arabic chronicles would seem to have drawn on a text which had the names in Hebrew.

(e) On fol. 13 of Ryl. Samaritan MS. 268 there appears the description of the blessing and cursing ceremony at Ebal and Garizim. The account is missing from the Arabic chronicles, save for Abu'l Fath. However, the omission from the *Sepher Yehoshua* versions may be accidental.[3] The J versions of the

---

[1] The convenant tradition is found in Ryl. Samaritan MS. 347, fols. 38a-40 ; it also appears in the Scaliger text.

[2] A discussion of the place names is found in detail in my " The Date and Authenticity of the Samaritan Hebrew Book of Joshua as seen in its Territorial Allotments ", *P.E.Q.*, July-Dec. 1964.

[3] Supra, part I, the discussion of lacunae.

chronicle present a detailed account of the ceremonial which is completed with an account of the burial of the bones of Joseph, the latter being omitted from Abu'l Fath as well as the *Sepher Yehoshua* versions. Since all the additional data in the Hebrew versions could have been drawn from the M.T. of Joshua xxiv or from Deuteronomy xxvii. 1 f., with the exception of some Samaritan glosses about Pinḥas and Eleazar, the details cannot be immediately cited as evidence of material in the Hebrew versions and missing from the Arabic as an indication of priority. However, we must ask, if indeed the material were inserted from chapter 24 of M.T. Joshua, why was it inserted in this place? In the brief summary of the manuscript in the first part of Ryl. Samaritan MS. 374 the editor commented that when Joshua erected the Tabernacle he also buried the bones of Joseph (fol. 17a). It has been suggested elsewhere[1] that the first part of this manuscript is the truncated relic of an older version of the *Sepher Yehoshua*. In this version is an indication that the *Sepher Yehoshua* once contained the account currently missing from the *Sepher Yehoshua* versions, and that the account was to be found in the place where it is currently located in the Hebrew (J) versions. That the extant Arabic versions are not the source of the passage is self-evident from the above, since the passage does not occur in any of them. Moreover, the concord of this passage with the tradition noted in the introduction to the Rylands manuscript makes it most unlikely that the M.T. was the direct source of the account. Rather we must look to an older Samaritan tradition. Not only would this passage indicate that Yellin's views are untenable, but it would seem to indicate that the Hebrew versions have priority over the Arabic.

(*f*) The J versions have a long description of the territory of the two and a half tribes similar to that found in the M.T. The Arabic has no such length. The *Sepher Yehoshua* versions introduce brief descriptions of the Transjordanian territory by a note relating that Joshua described the borders of this territory according to the words of the Sacred Law. A brief snatch of Numbers xxxiv identifies that Law for us. Abu'l Fath, in

[1] See my "Some Traces of Heterodox Theology in the Samaritan Book of Joshua", *B.J.R.L.*, vol. 1 (1967-68).

keeping with his paraphrastic style, gives a yet more brief account, but also attests that the tribal borders were delineated as the words of the Law, presumably implying what the other versions say explicitly, Numbers. The snatch of quotation in the *Sepher Yehoshua* versions is only an abstract and seems to indicate that the account was once more complete. That completeness is found in the J versions ; the latter might appear to be older in style than the Arabic versions.

(g) The J versions (except the Luncz text) and MacDonald's H1 text of Chronicle II at the end of the section which might reasonably be termed the *Book of Joshua* contain a note said to be a *tashqil* or chronogram[1] of the Abisha Scroll.[2] This is not found in any of the Arabic chronicles. No lacuna can be discerned in the Arabic chronicles at the point where the tashqil should occur, on the evidence of the Hebrew. We may reasonably doubt whether the version on which the Arabic drew as a source contained any mention of the Abisha scroll. Abu'l Fath gives us further reason to doubt whether this *tashqil* could have been part of the source text. According to Abu'l Fath, the scroll was rediscovered in the time of the High Priest, Pinḥas, c. 1352 A.D., and Abu'l Fath set out the *tashqil* almost identically with the form noted in the J versions. The evidence of the Arab chroniclers from c. 951 onwards would seem to indicate that no ancient scroll existed.[3]

While the scroll as a whole may not have existed, a portion of it may have some little antiquity, for it seems that a fire destroyed most of it and it had to be restored.[4] However, it seems likely that even the most ancient part may be no older than the eleventh century A.D.[5] and in this case it is difficult to see how the *tashqil* could have formed part of the Hebrew text if that text represents the source or type of source of the Arabic chronicles.

[1] The best description available of a *tashqil* in Samaritan manuscripts is that in E. Robertson, *Catalogue of the Samaritan Manuscripts in the John Rylands Library* (Manchester, 1938), p. xxiii.

[2] Cf. E. Robertson, " Concerning the Abisha Scroll ", *B.J.R.L.*, xix (1935), 4.

[3] Cf. P. Kahle, *The Cairo Geniza* (Oxford, 1959, 2nd ed.), p. 67, n. 2.

[4] Ibid. and O. Eissfeldt, *The Old Testament, an Introduction* (Oxford, 1965), p. 695.   [5] Ibid.

The *tashqil* would seem to have been added to the text after the lifetime of Abu'l Fath.

This evidence would seem to run contrary to all the arguments offered hitherto ; yet it should be remembered that the J versions betray considerable confusion at the end of what might legiti- mately be called the Book of Joshua (see the first part of this article) with the chronological sequence of persons and events considerably disturbed. It seems to have been the insertion of the note about the Abisha scroll into the text which disarranged the chronology and this note would seem to be secondary to the rest of the text in the J sources. The reference to the Abisha scroll was not original to the Hebrew text.

Gaster's attempt to defend the antiquity of the *tashqil* by indicating that the Abisha scroll was mentioned in the *Tolidah* (A.D. 1149?) fails in that Neubauer's version,[1] on which he based his defence, is from a manuscript dated to 1276 A.H. and may have included late items.

Proposition (b) related to the source of the proper names in the texts. A direct translation from the Arabic would lead us to expect some demonstrable dependence in the Hebrew proper names on the proper names of the Arabic chronicles, unless the influence of the M.T. prevailed. In all the chronicles a variety of names is given for the Gibeonite cities. These are shown below in comparison with names in the M.T.

J versions/	H1	M.T.	Scaliger	Abu'l Fath	Ryl. Sam. MS. 374
Gibeon	,,	,,	,,	Gibaith	,,
Qaiza	,,	Hakephira	Qarit	,,	Qaiza
Zaita	,,	Be'eroth	Birut	Zita	Zita
Kiryat Jearim	,,	,,	omits	Kiryut	omits

One can readily perceive the progression from Gibeon to Gibaith in the misreading of *nun* for *tha*, an easy process in the poorly written Samaritan Arabic script. One can also trace the pro- gression from M.T. Kephira to Qarit if one sees the form in the J versions and in the Rylands text as intermediate. The *fa* has been read as *'ain* and then elided with *ya* ; the *ra* has been read

---

[1] Cf. A. Neubauer, " Une Chronique Samaritaine ", *Journal Asiatique*, vol. xiv (1869).

as *za* and the *he* of *ḳephira* has been read first as *ha* and then as *ta marbuta*. While this would seem to indicate that the development of the names in the *Sepher Yehoshua* is later than the development of the names in the J texts, even the latter depend on their form for transmission in the Arabic script. On the other hand, it is difficult to see how the name *Be'eroth* could become Zaita in the Arabic script, though the form could arise through corruption of the majuscule script.

Other place names in the Arabic chronicles are few since none of the Arabic chronicles lists the details of the land division. However, since the same sequence of territories is seen in sketch in the Scaliger MS. and Ryl. Samaritan MS. 374, as in the J MSS., it is probable that they once stood in the text. However, place names are found in plenty in the Hebrew chronicles, which give a complete account of the land division. These names have been examined in detail elsewhere,[1] and it was there demonstrated that they sit uncomfortably in the text, and that they seem to be additions to the text even at two levels. Since they are missing from the Arabic texts, we are faced with three possibilities : (*a*) If the Hebrew is a translation from the Arabic the names were added to the Hebrew some time after the translation was made. (*b*) If the Hebrew represents the tradition from which the Arabic translation was made, the proper names were omitted from the translated text. (*c*) The names were inserted into an independent Hebrew text after the Arabic translation was made.

Now the evidence of those names is that they reflect the prosperous Samaritan diaspora between the second and fourth centuries A.D.[2] With the exception of the Judean cities, Jerusalem, Hebron and Beersheba, twelve of the named places have known Samaritan associations in the period in question and, though we can no longer be certain, it is possible that they were mentioned in the text because of their Samaritan associations. Yet if these names do reflect the diaspora of the fourth century, they would have lost their relevance as markers in the diminished diaspora of Moslem rule. It would seem unlikely

---

[1] Supra, n. 2, p. 98.   [2] Ibid. p. 89.

that they would have been inserted into an independent Hebrew text of later date for the names would have had little import. If the Arabic is translated from the Hebrew, the translator who found so little interest or relevance in the territorial divisions that he abridged the text severely in translating might have dropped the names completely. That this would appear to have been the true sequence of events would seem to be indicated by the fact that there are no Arabic names in the city lists and that at some of the sites no settlement is known from the crusades onwards.[1]

The evidence under proposition (b) is thus equivocal. In regard to the proper names appearing in the description of the Gibeonite cities there is no doubt that a Hebrew version like the present M.T. is the basis of the names, but as they currently appear in all the chronicle texts, Hebrew and Arabic, they show traces of transmission in Arabic. On the other hand, there is no trace of any Arabicizing of the names in the land division description.

Proposition (c) indicates that the evidence of Arabisms in the text as noted by critics of Gaster must unequivocally be shown to be Arabisms and not Aramaisms.

The Samaritans have developed their own traditions of Aramaic as they have of Hebrew, which show what appear to be (to the eye used to Reichs Aramaic or Biblical Hebrew) rather unusual forms. Ben-Hayyim[2] has demonstrated that many of these forms have an ancient tradition that should demand the respect rather than the suspicion of scholars.[3] According to Gaster,[4] Yahuda was not well acquainted with the peculiarities of the Samaritan linguistic tradition and Yellin manifestly was not so acquainted. Thus, one may well suspect, in advance of discussion, that their judgements would be coloured by their expectations.

Gaster has made a point by point study of Yahuda's Arabisms and has demonstrated convincingly[5] that not only were a number

---

[1] Ibid.
[2] Z. Ben-Hayyim, *Studies in the Traditions of the Hebrew Language* (Madrid-Barcelona, 1954).   [3] Ibid. Cap. 3.
[4] Z.D.M.G. (reprint), pp. 541 f.   [5] Ibid. p. 543 f.

of the alleged Arabisms really Aramaisms but that some were even Hebraisms which occurred in the O.T. and were overlooked by Yahuda. He showed equally convincingly that the Arabic, the alleged source, was poor Arabic in many places and was Hebraising and seems to have been drawn from a Hebrew or Aramaic source. It is not proposed to repeat each stage of Gaster's study, except to add to the somewhat salutary and weak argument he offered in regard to the particle *hen* that this word appears in the M.T. in the sense alleged to be an Arabism in the Aramaic of Daniel (ii. 5).

Of the points made by Yellin, most were repeated by Yahuda and were covered by Gaster in his discussion. The following, however, were not dealt with by Yahuda or Gaster and must be noted here. Yellin cited *wel'o keh mn mqr'a*[1] as an Arabism. However, the same meaning of *mn* related to the participial form of the verb is common in the Aramaic of Marqah, no less than six examples appearing on two pages of MacDonald's text.[2] Yellin cited *hshr*[3] as an Arabism. In its context (Joshua's encirclement in seven walls of iron) *hshr* is best understood as an Aramaism, enclosure,[4] and the Arabic *qsm* as secondary. Yellin cited the use of *'hry kn*[5] to introduce new material as Arabic in style, since the words " and after this " are favourite terms in Arabic narratives. However, it should be noted that the practice is common in Jewish literature and the introduction " and after this is said " is found in the Old Defter, which dates back to about the fourth century A.D.[6] There is no need to see anything but Samaritan usage in this phrase.

At every point the Arabisms are not seen as Arabisms but as Hebraisms and Aramaisms. It is significant that the places from which all the examples were culled are the Yithhallel prayers and the Shobach story, which may be amongst the latest levels of the Hebrew version. It may also be significant that Ryl. Samaritan MS. 257 presents a number of Aramaic variants

[1] Ryl. Samaritan MS. 268, fol. 34. [2] *Memar*, pp. 117-18.
[3] Ryl. Samaritan MS. 268, fol. 34.
[4] Cf. M. Jastrow, *Dictionary of the Targumim* (New York, 1950), p. 972.
[5] Loc. cit. fol. 32.
[6] Cf. A. Cowley, *The Samaritan Liturgy* (Oxford, 1909), vol. 2, Introduction.

in both prayers and the story, presenting the apparent appearance of having once held both prayers and story in an Aramaic version. However, if these passages were once Aramaic this would presuppose that they were added before the Arabic versions were extant and that the Hebrew text into which they were inserted was an older Hebrew text than the one we now have.

It is reasonably certain from the foregoing evidence that the views of Yellin can be dismissed. At no stage do the Arabic versions appear to be the source of the Hebrew chronicles or to have priority over the Hebrew chronicles. On the other hand, it is not easy to dismiss the views of Yahuda, for, though some of his arguments have been shown to be faulty, he considered it possible that our current Arabic versions were secondary to a Hebrew version which was a translation from the Arabic in itself. The Gibeonite city names present an anomaly which make contradiction of Yahuda difficult. If, however, the passages—the Shobach story and the Yithhallel prayers—which Yahuda recognized as being of later date than the rest were written in Aramaic originally, then it would be reasonable to deny the validity of Yahuda's hypothesis that the earliest Hebrew version of the chronicles was a translation from the Arabic by suggesting that the Samaritans were following a common tradition of theirs and were modernizing city names. At every other point the evidence is unequivocal, that the Hebrew versions must be given priority over the Arabic.

IV

SYNTHESIS : THE HEBREW CHRONICLES, SEPHER HAYAMIM, TOLIDAH, ADLER

Discounting for a moment the continuous text of Ryl. Samaritan MS. 257 (which is identical after the J section with MacDonald's Chronicle VII = Chronicle Adler), the extant Hebrew texts are shorter than any of the versions except that of Abu'l Fath. They lack all the material which falls before Joshua became leader of the Israelites in his own right. They

also vary in length. Though the Luncz text was dismissed above as an apocope of the other J versions, the place at which it ends is significant. This text closes with the death of Eleazar, after noting the life of Othniel, but excludes the long Midrash about Eleazar. Whoever edited the longer text to produce this apocope considered that the Book of Joshua, by which title he called his work, ought to end at this point, whereas the person who copied the other J version, Ryl. Samaritan MS. 268 and added the colophon thereto included additional material under the same title. It is clear then that there cannot have been any clear-cut guide for the scribes as to where the J text should have ended, though there must have been some tradition as to the approximate end of the work. The shorter J versions must have been culled out of longer works and the evidence of Rylands MS. 257 shows with reasonable certainty what has happened. In this manu-script, which MacDonald distinguishes as J5 of Chronicle II,[1] the J section runs continuously into the longer chronicle which is known in the rubric as *Sepher Hayamim*, though the text is basically that of the chronicle known as Chronicle Adler [= Chronicle VII]. It is not easy to judge where the J text may be said to end and the apocopated *Sepher Hayamim/* Chronicle VII be said to begin. In fact it must be considered doubtful whether there was any independent work represented by the J manuscripts until the end of the nineteenth century. Rather the manuscripts are part of a chronicle and have been excised from their larger context and given the older name of the Book of Joshua or *Sepher Yehoshua* (though this term is avoided for the Hebrew texts to prevent confusion with the Arabic chronicles of that name.) The initial rubric to all the J manu-scripts makes it clear that they have been artificially " tailored " to their present lengths. This rubric, which presents the same wording, points out that the work is the *Sepher Hayamim* in which is to be found the Book of Joshua.[2] Whilst this phrasing verifies that there is no separate J work amongst the Samaritans other than the modern manuscripts culled from the chronicle,

---

[1] Op. cit. p. 72.
[2] The rubric is found at the end of the Luncz version, J4.

it also indicates that there was once a separate entity which should be called the Book of Joshua.

At this stage of the discussion, in which the name *Sepher Hayamim* is being used for two different chronicles, we must consider again MacDonald's terminology for the sake of clarity. Despite the rubric reading *Sepher Hayamim* for Rylands MS. 257, it is clear that this chronicle is only a derivative of the chronicle known by that name and is not that chronicle itself. On fol. 116 of Ryl. Samaritan MS. 257 we are told unequivocally ". . . is written in the *Sepher Hayamim* for we are not able in this small second copy (*mishna*) to mention everything". In other words, this chronicle is an apocope of the longer work. Whilst the manuscript is not identical with the Adler chronicle, it is nearly so and it can be demonstrated that both have paraphrased the same material. Both are derivatives of the *Sepher Hayamim*, as Chronicle Adler also indicates.[1] MacDonald has claimed that Adler and Seligsohn is not a derivative of his Chronicle II, which he calls *Sepher Hayamim*. In this he may well be correct,[2] though this would imply that his chronicle is also not identical with what the Samaritans called their *Sepher Hayamim*. Be that as it may. To avoid confusion we must maintain MacDonald's numbering system though alternatives may be suggested later. The number Chronicle IIA is here used for the chronicle *Sepher Hayamim* of which Chronicle VII is an apocope, and the name *Sepher Hayamim* is used for the same chronicle. MacDonald's *Sepher Hayamim* is known as Chronicle II or *Sepher Hayamim* (M)acDonald.

It is probable that the Book of Joshua has been part of the *Sepher Hayamim* since the twelfth century A.D. Jacob ben Aaron, the Samaritan High Priest in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, wrote to Rosenberg[3] that the Samaritans

---

[1] Cf. E. N. Adler and Seligsohn " Une Nouvelle Chronique Samaritaine ", *R.E.J.*, xlv, pt. ii, 98.

[2] The term *Sepher Hayamim* may be a generic term for Chronicle. It is quite probable that MacDonald's Chronicle II has no relationship to the source of the *Sepher Hayamim* from which chronicle Adler is drawn. However, it would be difficult to prove this.

[3] Cf. J. Rosenberg, *Lehrbuch der Samaritanischen Sprache und Literatur* (Leipzig, 1901), p. 153 f.

possessed a *Sepher Hayamim*, ostensibly chronicle IIA but most probably chronicle VII, of which they also had a shorter version, the *Tolidah*, Chronicle III. It seems likely that the information is correct, for the *Tolidah* has the appearance of being a bare abstract of Chronicle VII though it is by no means certainly the case. Now the *Tolidah* seems to have been extant since A.D. 1149[1] and, allowing for the fact that the *Sepher Hayamim* grew through the centuries as each High Priest brought it up to date,[2] the *Tolidah* may well have been culled from the *Sepher Hayamim*. Neubauer's version of the *Tolidah* has been recopied several times, as the text itself states, and therefore too much emphasis may not be placed on any section of the work. The *Sepher Hayamim* is acknowledged in Neubauer's version of the *Tolidah* to have been one of the sources of that work,[3] though to what level this acknowledgement belongs is uncertain. Nutt[4] seems to regard the section of the work containing this acknowledge-ment as the earliest level. However, in another section of the *Tolidah* where the language is substantially different and which may differ in date to the first mentioned portion, the author would seem to have drawn on the Book of Joshua for the tradition of Joshua's having built a tabernacle on Mt. Garizim.[5] Further circumstantial evidence of the relationship of the *Tolidah* and the Book of Joshua with the *Sepher Hayamim* is that both the *Tolidah* and the Mishna of the *Sepher Hayamim* (Chronicle VII) have lacunae in detail and information except where the Book of Joshua seems to have been utilized as a source. There seems to be here a chain of descent, the *Tolidah* having drawn on as a source and having acknowledged its debt to the *Sepher Hayamim* but also betraying knowledge of the Book of Joshua, whilst the *Sepher Hayamim* (Chronicle VII and, presumably, Chronicle IIA) depended for its detail on the Book of Joshua. The Book of Joshua would thus seem to have antedated both works, but since

---

[1] Cf. Neubauer, op. cit. p. 385.

[2] That this was the process of growth of the chronicles would seem fairly clear. Traces of this may be seen in Ryl. Samaritan MS. 257, where marginal entries add new material. [3] Loc. cit. p. 390.

[4] J. W. Nutt, *A Sketch of Samaritan History, Dogma and Literature* (London, 1874), pp. 124 f. [5] Loc. cit. p. 399.

the *Tolidah* acknowledges only the *Sepher Hayamim* as a source it is probable that the Book of Joshua was incorporated into the former chronicle when the *Tolidah* was prepared.

Is this Hebrew Joshua Book the old Dosithean version which seems to have underlain the Arabic text? Basic to the under-standing of the Arabic *Sepher Yehoshua* versions as stemming from a heterodox and, most probably, Dosithean source, was an appreciation of the dual traditions which appeared in the Arabic text.[1] These dual traditions appeared to give alternative chronologies or else seemed to normalize heterodox traditions to bring them into line with normative practices and beliefs. The chief of these dualities, the account of the origin of *Panutha* is found in the Chronicle following the J portion of Ryl. Samaritan MS. 257 = *Sepher Hayamim* VII and that account would seem to be a priestly account. From fols. 69 and 70 of that manu-script it would appear that the origins of *Panutha* in the *Sepher Hayamim* lies not in the history and actions of the Judges who followed Joshua but in the lives of the High Priests on whom the account now centres. The Judges now appear only as names in the priestly biographies and the origin of *Panutha* is associated with Eli as a primary cause rather than as a secondary cause. Yet this priestly account preserves traces of the Dosithean eschatology though the Dosithean *raison d'être* is lost. The work would seem to be based on a Dosithean text.

Again, the tradition of Joshua having renewed the covenant before taking a census[2] on entry to Canaan is missing from the *Sepher Hayamim*, though the census account stands in our Hebrew version. Since the census found its point in the covenant which preceded it, the two accounts must have stood together in the text and may have been in the original *Sepher Hayamim* IIA. The source of the Hebrew would again seem to have been a Dosithean text.

On the other hand, the body of the text of the Hebrew chronicles seem remarkably free from the contradictions and dualities of the type found in the Arabic chronicles. Thus, the description of the purification rites at Gilgal in Ryl. Samaritan

---

[1] Cf. my " Some Traces " etc., for a detailed discussion, and the first part of this article.   [2] Supra, n. 1, p. 98.

MS. 268 (J1), fol. 20, shows no sign of the composite version found in the Scaliger text and in Ryl. Samaritan MS. 374. Yet in the *Sepher Yehoshua* the same description of the rite at Gilgal called forth priestly editing which made the purification end, unaccountably, at Gerizim.[1] So it would seem that the Hebrew version in our current J sources is the earliest form of the account.

Again, there is a clear distinction in the J texts between the roles of Eleazar and Joshua as against the composite role which appears for Eleazar in the *Sepher Yehoshua*, where his function is both that of High Priest and mentor to Joshua. In the J versions the High Priesthood and lay leadership are separate. Thus the distribution of the land falls to Joshua in the J versions as against Eleazar's part in the circumstance in the *Sepher Yehoshua*. It was Joshua's function and status in the land allotment which seems to have reacted to produce the dual role of Eleazar in the *Sepher Yehoshua*, thus the Hebrew version would seem to preserve the earlier form. On the other hand, it is quite clear that the chronology and details of calendar in the J versions are those of priestly Samaritans.[2]

We are faced, then, with apparently contradictory evidence. On the one hand, the Hebrew chronicles show closer contact with the form we would have expected the Dosithean texts to assume and in their structure they seem to precede the Arabic chronicles, and yet in places they show a greater priestly orientation than is found in the *Sepher Yehoshua*.

The solution to the problem posed by this apparent contradiction lies in the way in which the text has been preserved. The J texts seem to have been fossilized into the *Sepher Hayamim* not later than the twelfth century,[3] that is, at the time when, according to previous arguments, the Arabic versions were circulating freely. It is probable that at the time the J versions were subsumed into the *Sepher Hayamim* and preserved there, all the material that fell before the death of Moses was excised as being of particular Dosithean import and the eschatology was adjusted. With this done there would have been little point in changing the rest of the account as it would have passed as

---

[1] Cf. my " Some Traces " etc., for a discussion of this in detail.
[2] Ibid.   [3] Supra.

priestly, and so it was preserved in a fossil form with the addition only of the tale of the Abisha scroll. In this way, through fossilization in a priestly chronicle, the Book of Joshua (Hebrew) may have a more primitive text than the *Sepher Yehoshua* (Arabic). It may reasonably be claimed, then, that the Hebrew text bears a close relationship to the source we have postulated for the Arabic, and what was said of that source in the discussion of the *Sepher Yehoshua* versions applies also to the early history of the Book of Joshua and the *Sepher Hayamim* IIA and need not be repeated.

By way of conclusion let us now redraft the table of chronicles presented by MacDonald[1] to summarize the arguments offered above, showing, in so far as is possible, the order of development.

SAMARITAN CHRONICLES

HEBREW AND ARAMAIC		ARABIC AND HEBREW
Chronicle IA	Book of Joshua (Dosithean)	Chronicle IB The Asatir
Chronicle IIA	Sepher Hayamim	
Chronicle IIM	Sepher Hayamim	Chronicle IV Sepher Yehoshua = IA+IB+IIA (only fractions extant today)
		Chronicle IVB Sepher Yehoshua Scaliger/Juynboll type.
Chronicle III	Tolidah and Chronicle V Shalshalat	
		Chronicle VI Abu'l Fath

Chronicle VII = *Mishna Sepher Hayamim* IIA
VIIA Adler and Seligsohn type
VIIB Ryl. Sam. MS. 257 type
J Book of Joshua (= type of Chronicle IA)
    as preserved in VII

[1] Op. cit. p. 225.